

Study Review Committee Meeting Summary

May 28, 2015

The meeting was called to order in the Fiscal Court Conference Room at 5:03 p.m.

Attendance:

Voting Members: Greg King, Mary Ann Smith, Denia Crosby, Jan Horton and Bob Klingenfus

Non-Voting Members: Mayor Dennis Deibel, Mayor Bob Rogers

Staff: Jim Urban and Amy Alvey

Others: Billy Doelker and Michael Tigie

Approval of Minutes:

In the absence of Chairperson Jefferies, Greg King presided over the meeting.

The Meeting Summary of the April 23, 2015 meeting was reviewed and approved.

Amy Alvey also distributed a complete copy of the Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations as requested at the last meeting which showed the inclusion of Detached Accessory Dwelling Units to allow SRC members to review the proposed language. Discussion followed with no changes or corrections being made.

Land Development Code Revisions:

- a. **Planned Residential Developments (PRD)** – Jim Urban explained that housing trends are moving more towards smaller lots with smaller homes that have high end finishes and amenities that address a range of age group's needs. There are numerous versions of PRDs but are on small lots where the homes utilize the majority of the area with a courtyard area, normally separated by a pedestrian walkway and not streets. Parking normally is in the rear of the home or alley. Discussion followed.

Ms. Radcliffe stated that most communities regulate PRDs by total size of the property, such as 10 acres, and the developer decides the home designs and setbacks.

Billy Doelker, Key Homes, stated there is a need for smaller homes, 1,200 square foot or less, for single people all the way to empty nesters. Smaller lots are key because owners want less maintenance but nice homes with high-end amenities. Homes would be constructed in a similar design to keep the continuity of the development. Parking is not normally an issue with PRD developments because many young people who rent and are used to shared parking areas. Most PRD developments are under 10 acres to keep the community type feel. Discussion followed.

Mr. Urban stated that not all new developments will want to go to PRD and there still will be the standard subdivision request but PRD developments give the development community flexibility to provide what their clients want.

Mr. King requested a copy of Louisville Metro's regulations regarding PRDs be emailed out to members.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend to staff to prepare draft zoning regulations for PRD and bring back to the next SRC for further discussion. Motion carried with members voting yes.

- b. **Setbacks** – Amy Alvey gave an overview of the front yard setbacks for the I-1 and I-2 Industrial zoning districts, which is 100 feet. Staff has seen many issues in the Industrial zoning areas where the 100-foot setback is nearly impossible to comply with and still have a buildable lot once all the setbacks have been met. Staff recommends decreasing the front yard setback to 50 feet. Discussion followed.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the proposed change to the Planning Commission of front setback requirement in I-1 and I-2 zoning districts from 100 feet to 50 feet. Motion carried with members voting yes.

There was further discussion regarding setbacks in residential zoning districts, particularly R-2 Residential. Staff reviews many applications requesting smaller lot sizes and reduced setbacks. Options are to recommend changes to the current regulations and lower the minimum lot area and minimum side yard setback for R-2 residential, which is the most common default zoning, apply for a zoning change to PRD (if approved) or require the development community to continue to apply for a zoning change with variance requests. Discussion followed.

Staff suggested that no action be taken today regarding residential setbacks to allow the SRC members time to review the material provided.

- c. **Review Process**—Mr. Urban explained that our current regulations regarding Site Plan Review is unclear of when a proposed project is required to go to TRC and or the Planning Commission for review and which plans can be approved at staff level. Division 390, Site Plan Regulations, of the Zoning Ordinance outlines when a new site plan or revised site plan is required. The issue then becomes who approves the proposed plan. If the property is zoned correctly for the proposed use, no variances or waivers are needed the question then becomes can the plan be approved by staff or must it go to the Planning Commission for review and approval.

Staff is recommending that traffic be the benchmark or trigger deciding who reviews and approves the site plans. All site plans will be submitted to the traffic consultant for traffic review under Division 270-040 Road Capacity Standards. Staff suggested the following:

- Category 1- Development proposal does not trigger impacts on the road network and shall undergo review by the Zoning Administrator and Planning Staff.
- Category 2- Development proposal that generates more than 20 peak-hour trips and will have an entrance on a road with greater than 1,500 average daily trips (ADT) shall require a traffic assessment and shall undergo review by the Technical Review Committee.
- Category 3—Development proposal that generates more than 100 peak-hour trips and will have an entrance on a road with greater than 2,000 ADT shall require a traffic impact study and shall require approval by the Planning Commission.

Discussion followed.

Due to the absence of Chairman Jefferies, acting Chairman King requested that no action be taken and to continue the discussion at the next SRC meeting.

The Study Review Committee will plan to meet again on June 25, 2015 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.