Study Review Committee
Meeting Summary
July 23, 2015

The meeting was called to order in the Fiscal Court Conference Room at 5:07 p.m.

Attendance:
Voting Members: Kevin Jefferies, Mary Ann Smith, Denia Crosby and Jan Horton.
Non-Voting Members: Mayor Dennis Deibel, Mayor Bob Rogers
Staff: Jim Urban and Amy Alvey
Others: None

Approval of Minutes:

The Meeting Summary of the May 28, 2015 meeting was reviewed and approved as corrected.

Land Development Code Revisions:

a. **Planned Residential Developments (PRD)** – Jim Urban gave a brief review of previous discussions of the Planned Residential Developments (PRD). 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.

   The handout provided to members was not the most recent version of the proposed language. Amy Alvey will email out the updated version to the members and others present at the meeting and discussion will continue at the next SRC meeting. No action taken.

b. **Signs**- Jim Urban gave an overview of proposed changes to the sign regulations regarding temporary banners and snipe signs. Current regulations do not allow free-standing banners and state that they must be attached to a building. Proposed language would allow temporary, free-standing banners but could not be placed in the road right-of-way. Snipe signs for nonprofit organizations would be allowed to be placed on private property, out of the road right-of-way, with the permission of the property owner. No signs of any type are allowed in the right-of-way. Staff has proposed a definition of right-of-way to be added to section 290-030, Sign Definitions. Discussion followed.

   Mayor Rogers stated that the City of Pewee Valley has a special event permit that outlines what types of signs can be placed within the city and relieves the applicant of the current sign regulations (only for the special event period). Mayor Rogers will forward a copy of their special event permit to staff to review.

Mr. Urban stated that he and Planner Brooke Radcliffe are preparing a video that will be on the County website and run on Channel 25 that explains the sign regulations. The video will also have graphics of signs and banners and placement of those types of signs out of the right-of-way.

Ms. Alvey stated that staff will forward sign graphics to the members in advance of the next meeting.

c. **Minor Plats** – Amy Alvey gave an overview of the current definition of Minor Subdivision which states that it is a subdivision of land into not more than three lots within a five-year period. The intent of the definition is to prevent multiple divisions of land, in a small timeframe, for residential use and to keep a developer from circumventing the subdivision regulations and requirements.

Recently staff was asked if the "3/5 rule" applied to all properties including commercial and industrial. The current interpretation of the definition is it applies to all properties. Larger commercial property owners are uncertain the amount of acreage a potential buyer may want or need. After two divisions or sells offs a commercial property owner would be required to wait five years before dividing and selling any of the residual property. Discussion followed.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the proposed change of the definition of Minor Subdivision (Article II- Definitions, Section 2.2) to Planning Commission to read as follows:

> Minor Subdivision – A subdivision of land into not more than three lots within a five-year time period and not involving a new public street or private road in zoning districts AG-1, CO-1, T, R-1, R-1A, R-2, R-2A, R-3, R-4, R-4A, C-N, O-1 and O-2.

Motion carried with members voting yes.

d. **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.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the proposed language addition under Section 390-40, Site Plan Review Procedure as presented by staff. Motion carried. Member Smith voted no.

e. **Setbacks**- Jim Urban began the 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.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the proposed Minimum Side Yard Setback changes to five (5) feet for zoning districts R-2, R-2A, R-3 and R-4. Motion carried with members voting yes.

Other Business

Mayor Deibel suggested to staff that future road bonds only be accepted as cash or letter of credit.

The Study Review Committee will plan to meet again on August 27, 2015 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.