

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING FOR THE  
BANCROFT STREET (GLENWOOD TO ASHLAND) PROJECT  
COLLINGWOOD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

David Dysard opened the meeting just after 6PM and went around the room with introductions of people from the neighborhood and the City of Toledo Design Team. Representing Toledo was: David Dysard, Dennis Lechlak, Doug Stephens, John Crandall, Stephanie Bartlett, and Dick Meyers. Kacey Smith from ODOT, District 2 was also in attendance. The total attendance was approximately 30 people with about 23 citizens.

(See attached attendance list)

Next, Mr. Dysard discussed the agenda (Exhibit 1 to these notes) and the design process (Exhibit 2). He stressed that tonight's meeting was about the broad conceptual design principals for alternatives developed by the City of Toledo staff with the members of the Design Review Team. He emphasized that the focus is the following elements of design: reduce speed of traffic; accommodate bikes; tree lawn width; reinforce historic character of neighborhood; provide for bus stops; walk ability; accommodate parking and major aesthetic elements. Other project design details will be developed later in the process of detailed design. The overall goal is to select a design concept by early December of this year, so more detailed preliminary design can follow between January and July of 2014. The overall Bancroft St. design principles as developed by the Design Review Team were then presented to the group by Mr. Dysard and after suggestion to add a provision for future burial of utilities were accepted by consensus. These design principles are shown as Exhibit 3. Finally Dave pointed out that a separate Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting would convene at 7PM to specifically address historic district issues.

Next, John Crandall reviewed the alternatives developed by the Design Review Team for the project which are summarized as follows:

Alt. A – 36' wide pavement (f/f) – Parking on north side with Share the Road for bikes.

Alt. B – 36' wide pavement (f/f) – Separate bike lanes with limited parking.

Alt. C – 40' wide pavement (f/f) – 12' median with no parking and bus pullouts.

Alternates A, B, & C can be built between Glenwood and Collingwood Blvd. where the City has 80' of right-of-way width, but only A & B can be built between Collingwood Blvd. and Ashland Ave. where the right/of/way width is 66'.

John stressed that the goal of this evening is not to pick an alternative, but to discuss each alternative, answer questions, and be sure the concepts are clear along with hearing likes, dislikes and concerns for refinement by the Design Review Team. The open discussion that followed was mainly focused on questions of understanding for the alternatives with the City staff clarifying the proposals.

Almost all of the allotted time was used to answer general questions in regard to the process and specific questions on the alternatives. A summary is as follows:

1. The method of evaluating the alternatives has not been determined and will be the topic of the next neighborhood meeting.
2. Likewise, no attempt has been made to prioritize the design principals developed with the Design Review Team and presented at the meeting. It was pointed out that all underground utilities are not a part of the design at this time.
3. It was suggested that this project should not prevent future improvements, by others, in the corridor such as a framework for underground utilities.
4. Much discussion on Alternate C (median)
  - Any research data that this would actually slow traffic or reduce accidents?
  - Looks confusing. No left turns for driveways. Would traffic patterns be revised on adjoining streets?

During the discussion of alternatives, Dave Dysard addressed the Glenwood Gateway Traffic Calming Exhibit where the City showed a modern roundabout along with a taper approach and encouraged those present to comment during the open house portion of the meeting. In answer to a question, the alternate for a compact urban roundabout has not been developed yet. It would have a diameter of 80' to 120'. This proposal will take more time and be investigated further later in the design process. However, the Design Review Team would like to get an initial reaction from the neighborhood tonight during the open house.

Due to time constraints, it was not possible to gage the like/dislike reaction to the alternatives, but there did appear that there were many concerns with Alternate C (median). During this portion of the meeting, it was requested that City staff add encroachments to the plans and the one-way adjoining street pattern.

The neighborhood general meeting was adjourned with an open house following with four stations (3 alternates and Glenwood Gateway) manned by staff. A summary of the comments received are summarized as Exhibit 4. A separate set of minutes was prepared for the 106 Consulting Party Meeting which lasted between 7:00 and 7:45PM. The City staff and consultants stayed until 8:00PM when the open house portion of the meeting ended.

Attachments:

- A) Attendance
- B) Exhibit 1 (agenda)
- C) Exhibit 2 (design process)
- D) Exhibit 3 (design principles)
- E) Exhibit 4 (comments posted on the alternatives)