

**GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
October 13, 2016**

The regular meeting was held in the Scott County Courthouse on October 13, 2016. The meeting was called to order by Chair Rob Jones at 6:00 p.m. Present were Commissioners Jeff Caldwell, Johnny Cannon, Regina Mizell, Byron Moran, John Shirley, Steve Smith, Mark Sulski, and Frank Wiseman, Director Joe Kane, Planners Megan Chan and Matt Summers, Engineer Brent Combs, and Attorney Charlie Perkins.

Motion by Caldwell, second by Shirley, to approve the September invoices. Motion carried.

Motion by Smith, second by Wiseman to approve the September 8, 2016 minutes. Motion carried.

Motion by Caldwell, second by Mizell, to approve the October agenda. Motion carried.

Postponements/Withdrawals

Chairman Jones stated that the Abbey at Old Oxford (Price Farm) (PSP-2016-51) application has been postponed to the November meeting.

Consent Agenda

There were no applications on the Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

All those intending to speak before the Commission were sworn in by Mr. Perkins.

ZMA-2016-48 Bevins Rural Residential Subdivision Plat – Preliminary review of the Final Subdivision Plat to create 7 tracts from the parent tract, located on the northeast corner of the intersection of New Coleman Lane and Ironworks Road.

Mr. Summers reviewed the staff report. He reminded the Commission that they recommended approval of the rezoning, which was approved by Fiscal Court, but it was agreed that the Preliminary Subdivision Plat would come back to the Commission due to the New Coleman Lane access issue. He stated that the current

plat creates seven (7) tracts instead of the eight (8) that were proposed on the previous plat.

Mr. Summers reviewed the reconfiguration of the lots and their respective access points. Tracts 1 and 2 will use existing entrances on New Coleman Lane. The remaining lots will use Ironworks Road. He stated that the Commission can require the applicant to widen New Coleman Lane, as required by the Subdivision Regulations, or they can approve the requested variance to remove that requirement. If the variance is granted, the Commission should state clear reasons why they are doing so, and if necessary, address whether staff should amend the portion of the Subdivision Regulations that requires the upgrade.

Mr. Summers recommended approval of the subdivision plat and denial of the variance.

The Commission briefly discussed the variance request.

Bruce Lankford, representing the applicant, asked if a policy requiring the road upgrade was ever adopted. Mr. Perkins stated that it is a requirement in the Subdivision Regulations; therefore, that is the policy.

Mr. Lankford then asked if the projected increase in traffic assumes that all of the increase in traffic will use New Coleman Lane. Mr. Summers replied that it does not assume which road the traffic will use.

Mr. Lankford asked that the hearing can be continued to the November meeting so that they can further look at the options.

Commissioner Sulski did not feel that the traffic with access to Ironworks will use New Coleman Lane.

Commissioner Shirley asked Mr. Summers if an upgrade being accomplished by a public/private partnership with the County has ever been pursued. He felt that the property taxes generated by this new development justifies such a partnership.

Chairman Jones supported that idea, but that would be between the applicant and the County.

Mr. Lankford asked that the Commission vote on the plan as presented, and then the applicant may discuss the upgrade with the Fiscal Court. Commissioner Shirley stated that he could not vote to approve the application on a "maybe."

Commissioner Smith felt that the Subdivision Regulations should be followed.

Mr. Lankford stated that the applicant reconfigured the lots in order to decrease the number of access points on New Coleman Lane to the two existing entrances, and the Commission still is discussing whether to require the road widening. Chairman Jones felt that to waive the requirement for this applicant to upgrade the road would not be fair to all the previous developers who have been required to make upgrades.

Commissioner Sulski felt the application should be approved including the requested variance.

Mr. Perkins stated that variances apply to setbacks, building lines, etc. and not to policies.

Motion by Smith, second by Moran, to approve the Final Development subject to ten (10) conditions of approval. By roll call vote, motion carried 6-3 with Wiseman, Sulski, and Cannon dissenting.

PSP-2016-53 Canewood, Unit 1-C, Section 4 Amended - Amended Preliminary Subdivision Plat for 10 lots, located at the termination of The Masters, west of Canewood Blvd.

Mr. Kane reviewed the staff report. He stated that the application was denied at the August meeting due to the requested waiver to reduce the rear yard setback to 15' on the two double frontage lots. The two lots in question now meet the setback requirement. The lots are configured in the same manner as they were on the previously approved plat and are compatible in size and setbacks with the existing lots on the street.

Rory Kahly, EA Partners and representing the applicant, agreed with the conditions of approval. He briefly reviewed how the ten lots were platted in relation to the bypass right-of-way.

Bill Burke, The Masters resident, stated that Canewood has several sections that each have different lot sizes and design styles. He felt that the lots on the cul-de-sacs should be the same size as Stonebrook Court. If the lot sizes are significantly changed, then it changes the look of the neighborhood (The Bluffs).

Mr. Burke asked that a condition of approval be included that requires the applicant to receive approval from the Homeowners Association. Mr. Perkins stated that a condition of approval can be added stating that the lots are subject to the same HOA conditions as the rest of The Bluffs. However, the Commission cannot enforce design

standards of the HOA if they are not being followed. That is a private matter between the lot owners and the HOA.

Discussion continued on HOA authority.

Rob McGoodwin, representing Snap Hook Development, applicant, stated that the City ordinance requires them to subject these 10 lots to the Canewood HOA, but they also agree that they will conform with all the regulations, requirements, and restrictions of all of the lots that surround these 10 lots.

Motion by Shirley, second by Wiseman, to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat subject to the ten (10) conditions of approval. Motion carried.

PDP-2016-54 Georgetown Centre Parcel A – Preliminary Development Plan for a 14,000 sq. ft. retail shop within the parking lot of Georgetown Centre, consisting of 8.73 acres, located at the corner of Paris Pike (U.S. 460 E.) and McClelland Circle (U.S. 460 Bypass).

Mr. Kane reviewed the staff report, stating that the request is to amend the development plan for Parcel A, which includes the K-mart retail store and garden center. The amendment would add a 14,000 sq. ft. retail building in the corner of the parking lot. It would remove some of the existing parking and reconfigure the remaining parking.

He stated that the parking lot is currently underutilized and also shared with the other retail center tenants. Because of that underutilization, an additional retail center would be beneficial, but the Commission should determine if a 14,000 sq. ft. retail center can be accommodated. There are 728 existing parking spaces, and the proposed building will result in a net loss of 80 spaces. The parking ratio would then be one space per 268 gross square feet. Considering loading and unloading areas and other factors, plus the shared parking agreement, Mr. Kane felt that the ratio that is proposed after development is sufficient to accommodate a building of this size. A variance from the regulations would be required for a decrease of 20 spaces.

Mr. Kane also recommended that, if the retail center includes or becomes a restaurant or other use that would generate the need for more parking than a retail use, it would be left to the discretion of Planning staff whether to bring it back to the Commission for approval. He recommended the same if a drive-thru is included.

He then stated that all signage must be added to the existing pole signs. Stormwater and lighting plans must also be approved. Regarding landscaping, the applicant

must fill in any perimeter and interior landscaping that is missing. The canopy requirements are not applicable since it is a redevelopment.

He recommended approval contingent on the six (6) conditions of approval and the shared parking agreement being in place and provided to Planning staff.

Commissioner Smith asked if the hedgerows, trees, and landscaping in the entire parking lot can be revitalized and brought up to standards. Mr. Kane stated that they are only required to fill in landscaping in the areas that they are disturbing.

Darrin Croucher, Thoroughbred Engineering and representing the applicant, stated that the applicant will revitalize the landscaping on all three parcels.

Motion by Smith, second by Sulski, to approve the Preliminary Development Plan subject to the six (6) conditions of approval, including the variance regarding parking. Motion carried.

Mr. Perkins stated that Bruce Lankford asked if he can wait to sign the conditions of approval on the Bevins Rural Residential application until he speaks with the applicant. He recommended allowing Mr. Lankford to do so, and if any changes are requested, the application will come back to the Commission at the November meeting. The Commission agreed.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Attest:


Charlie Perkins, Secretary

Respectfully,


Rob Jones, Chair