

**GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

NOVEMBER 11, 2010

The regular meeting was held in the Scott County Courthouse on November 11, 2010. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Mike Bradley at 6:00 p.m. Present were Commissioners Greg Hampton, Janet Holland, John Lacy, Jimmy Richardson, Ralph Tackett, and Bias Tilford, Director Earl Smith, Planner Brian Shorkey, Engineer Brent Combs, and Attorney Charlie Perkins. Absent were Commissioners Melissa Waite and Horace Wynn.

Those in attendance intending to speak before the Commission were sworn in by Mr. Perkins.

Motion by Holland, second by Lacy, to approve the October invoices. Motion carried.

Motion by Lacy, second by Holland, to approve the October 14, 2010 minutes. Motion carried.

Motion by Tackett, second by Holland, to approve the November agenda. Motion carried.

Postponements/Withdrawals

There were no items for postponement or withdrawal.

Consent Agenda

There were no items eligible for the consent agenda.

PSP-2010-19 Cedar Hills Subdivision Amended – Amended Cluster Subdivision Plat for future lots and open space on a previously approved Cluster Subdivision Plan, located on Cincinnati Pike (U.S. 25 N.), north of Rogers Gap Road and west of I-75.

Mr. Combs recused himself from discussion of the application because of his prior work on the project.

Mr. Shorkey reviewed the history of the application, including the current requests and associated variances.

He stated that there was prior concern regarding a 50' easement being used for emergency access. That is now shown as a County-standard road. He stated that a traffic impact study will be required prior to final plat approval of the cluster lots.

He recommended approval of the preliminary plat for seven 5-acre tracts and for 47 cluster lots, including all four requested variances.

Commissioner Lacy expressed concern about the request to waive the fencing requirement. He suggested requiring a 5-strand, high-tensile fence. It was agreed that that requirement would be reflected in the variance request.

Chairman Bradley asked about the southern road being used as a construction road. Mr. Shorkey replied that it will be used for construction traffic, and then brought up to County standards.

Jeff Francisco, applicant, confirmed that the southern road will be used for construction traffic, and agreed to the 5-strand, high-tensile fencing.

Bruce Oliver, Summeridge Road resident, expressed concern about completion of the north end of Summeridge Road. He asked that the road be finished before the lots can be sold. Chairman Bradley clarified that the road is currently private, but approval of this subdivision plat requires it to be built to County standards and eventually offered to the County for acceptance.

James Brine, Summeridge Road resident, stated that if the road is built to County standards, and potentially 6-7 inches higher, it negatively affects his driveway. He requested some kind of assurance that that will not happen. Mr. Perkins stated that construction plans are required for the road that include elevations on existing structures. Mr. Larson added that there are grade standards that must be followed.

Mr. Brine also expressed concern about the safety of children with the additional traffic. He asked if an open area can be provided for children.

Christy Smith, Summeridge Road resident, expressed concern about the narrow road. She wanted clarification that the road will be widened by two feet to meet County standards and that it will tie in with the driveways. She also expressed concern about safety with the increased traffic and requested a play area for the children.

Dan Stadnyk, Summeridge Road resident, asked if speed limit signs can be installed. Mr. Perkins felt that the Commission could make that a requirement of the developer. Ms. Smith stated that, as president of the homeowners association, she was told that the speed limit in a cluster subdivision is 35 mph, but that the County Judge could grant a variance to that, and then the County would install the signs. Mr. Perkins felt that in the new section, the requirement could still be placed on the developer.

Chairman Bradley clarified that the road will remain private for at least two years, as per County policy. The homeowners association issue was addressed.

Kim Smith, Summeridge Road resident, stated that the homeowners association cannot afford to upkeep the road.

Scott Smith, Summeridge Road resident, also expressed concern about maintenance of the road and congestion on the existing part of Summeridge if it is the only cleared road during periods of snow. The homeowners association was discussed.

Road construction standards were briefly reviewed.

Deborah Hardin, Summeridge Road resident, asked who is responsible if there are driveway concerns after the road is constructed. Mr. Larson stated that it will be the responsibility of the developer. Mr. Shorkey suggested adding to the conditions of approval a requirement to invite a representative of the homeowners association to any pre-construction meetings.

Chris Adkins, Muddy Ford Road, stated that he is attempting to purchase a lot on the southern portion of the development, and asked if the southern portion can be approved without the four northern lots being approved. Discussion continued on when lots can be sold and possible reconfigurations. Mr. Francisco stated that he has no plans for further development.

Responsibility for potential damage by construction traffic was discussed.

Motion by Lacy, second by Richardson, to approve the Amended Preliminary Subdivision Plat for seven (7) 5-acre tracts, subject to the seven (7) conditions of approval (including the addition of being required to notice the homeowners association of any construction meetings regarding road construction), and including the requested variance to exceed the maximum length of a cul-de-sac. Motion carried 4-2, with Tackett and Tilford dissenting.

Motion by Lacy, second by Richardson, to approve the Amended Preliminary Cluster Subdivision Plat for 49 cluster lots, subject to the nine (9) conditions (including the addition of being required to notice the homeowners association of any construction meetings regarding road construction), and including the three (3) requested variances, and the modification of the fence requirement as reflected in the condition. By roll call vote, motion carried 5-1 with Tilford dissenting.

Strong plat revocation

Mr. Shorkey explained that if no changes have been made to a subdivided tract, a majority vote of the Planning Commission can revoke the subdivision, per KRS. A request was received by Mr. Dean Strong at 861 Boyers Chapel Road (Plat Cabinet 9, Slide 205 in the Scott County Clerk's Office) for such a revocation.

After brief discussion, motion by Hampton, second by Holland, to accept the revocation request. Motion carried.

Discussion of Bylaws

Chairman Bradley reported that the bylaws committee reviewed the portions of the bylaws that Mr. Smith had indicated were outdated or contradictory, and the changes were noted on the draft that was provided.

Mr. Perkins suggested, instead of stating the day and time of the regular meeting, stating "the day and time determined by the Commission," so that the bylaws don't need amended if the day and time are changed.

He also suggested amending Article IV regarding filling membership vacancies to state that "vacancies will be filled according to law."

Mr. Smith suggested that he review the draft with Mr. Perkins and the bylaws committee again, and submit a final draft to the Commission at the December meeting.

Article III regarding conflict of interest was discussed. Mr. Perkins stated that, for similar reasons, *Roberts Rules of Order* can be referenced as the adopted guideline for conflict of interest.

It was agreed that a final draft will be presented at the December meeting.

Executive Committee references

Mr. Smith noted the many references to the Executive Committee in several Commission documents. He stated that the references need amended/deleted, or re-instituting some kind of Executive Committee needs discussed.

Commissioner Lacy spoke in favor of the bylaws authorizing an Executive Committee and setting forth their specific duties. He stated that such a committee serves as a liaison between the Commission and staff. Commissioner Tilford agreed, stating that such a committee should hear any employee grievances.

The role of the monthly workshop was discussed.

Commissioner Lacy requested that the bylaws committee discuss re-instituting the Executive Committee, including its make-up and scope of responsibilities. Chairman Bradley asked if there was support for the idea. Mr. Perkins added that the responsibilities of the former Executive Committee were always approved by the full Commission, but never incorporated into the bylaws.

It was agreed that Mr. Perkins, with the help of Mr. Smith, will draft language as part of the bylaws regarding the make-up and responsibilities of an Executive Committee.


The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully,

 *John Long* *Vice Chair*

Mike Bradley, Chairperson

Attest:



Charlie Perkins, Secretary