

VII. COMMISSION ITEMS – The Chair will announce that any item a Commission member would like to present will be heard at this time.

- a. **INITIATION OF SUBDIVISION REGULATION TEXT AMENDMENT TO UPDATE ARTICLE 6-8 FOR SIDEWALKS AND SHARE-USE PATHS** – The staff will request that the Planning Commission initiate amendments to Article 6-8 of the Land Subdivision Regulations to update the requirements for sidewalks and shared-use paths. If initiated, the requisite public hearing would be held this fall, after mailed notices are sent.

Staff Presentation – Ms. Wade distributed the staff alternative text of to the Planning Commission. She asked the Planning Commission to initiate this text. She said that the next step is to continue to work with stakeholders related to this change to address the concerns about costs and to assure the proposed changes are understood.

Commission Questions: Mr. Berkley said that he is concerned about the six-foot minimum width for sidewalks. He said that he spoke with the Builders Association and they said that it costs approximately \$800.00 to construct sidewalks on a 45-foot lot. He said that he would like to know the justification for the need to go over and beyond the National ADA requirements. He also said that he would like justification for Non-Residential and Industrial Collectors to increase their sidewalk widths from four-foot to eight-foot. He said that the Planning Commission initially were presented, by Mr. Scott Thompson, a five-foot sidewalk, along with a reduction on the width of streets. He said that he is not in favor of advancing this initiation.

Ms. Wade said that the ADA requirement states there be a five-foot clear at landing locations to allow for turning movements of wheelchairs. She said that the desired width of sidewalks is six feet, to allow for two mobility chairs or strollers to pass side-by-side, without one of them going off the sidewalk to allow the other to pass. Mr. Berkley said that five-foot also meets ADA requirements. Ms. Wade stated that a five-foot landing does but six-foot entirely meets the requirements.

Mr. Berkley gave an example of a 45-foot wide lot with a 25-foot wide driveway, why can't the pedestrians pass at the driveways. Ms. Wade said that sidewalks are not only provided in residential areas, sidewalks are also present in apartment, townhomes, commercial developments, and ED land. She said that the staff wants to ensure the sidewalk requirements are being met across all land uses. Mr. Berkley asked why a sidewalk needs to be eight-foot wide along a non-residential and industrial collector. Ms. Wade said that she discussed that with Mr. Thompson and he said that in the industrial and business zones there would be a large number of people working and people coming in to visit, therefore, there would be more people utilizing the sidewalks in those areas. She said that the Lexington Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan has a matrix system that calculates that higher volume of traffic on a street, necessitates wider to accommodate the pedestrian traffic. Mr. Berkley said that there is no regard to cost, the engineering of the projects, the greater amount of land used, and more non-permeable surfaces. He also stated that the Planning Commission should have been presented the reduction of the streets at the same time. Ms. Wade said that the cross-sections will be updated based upon the final decisions, reflecting what has been adopted. She said that Mr. Thompson said that the less pavement/street reduction is in a result of traffic calming. She said that in some places where the sidewalks are wider, the sidewalk doesn't need to be completely located within the right-of-way, there is an allowance for an easement onto the property, which also allows the setback to remain from the right-of-way, in single family residential areas.

Ms. Mundy asked if there will be accommodations for additional runoff for storm sewer system. Mr. Martin said that all of that is taken into account in new subdivisions. Ms. Mundy asked if the homeowner would be responsible for replacing their sidewalk. Ms. Wade said that the homeowner would be responsible for replacing their existing sidewalk and that they wouldn't have to increase the current sidewalk along their frontage to six feet. Ms. Mundy is concerned that when the homeowner's sidewalk begins to buckle, they would be responsible for replacing a six-foot sidewalk, which will be costly to them. Ms. Wade said that ultimately the homeowner pays for whatever the builder is putting into that lot, which includes sidewalks and other infrastructure. She added that the staff is looking at ways to improve our community's quality of life and that includes wider sidewalks.

Mr. Owens said that the ADA minimum requirement is five feet. Ms. Wade said that it is a minimum of five feet at landings so that people can maneuver and turn around in a wheelchair. Mr. Owens said that he believes a five-foot sidewalk is adequate and that six feet is excessive, as well as an eight-foot sidewalk, unless it will be a shared-use trail. Ms. Wade said that six feet is the minimum to allow two people in mobility challenged situations to pass, which meets ADA requirements. Mr. Owens asked the staff to provide them with examples of other areas that have already made these requirements. Ms. Wade agreed to work with staff to provide such examples.

Mr. Bell said that he is concerned about the passing of two wheelchairs and not having one of them go off the sidewalk to allow the other to pass. He agrees with the staff in trying to anticipate the future of walking and biking.

Ms. Mundy said that she searched the Internet for ADA requirements for sidewalks, she said that it states "a defined walkway is required across all driveways, which will consist of a paved four-foot wide, at minimum, with a cross slope of one percent to meet ADA standards." Ms. Wade said that she has been told differently by the Bicycle & Pedestrian Planner.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Mr. Duncan said that the staff isn't asking to approve these changes, at this time. We are asking for the initiation of the discussion so that it can continue through work sessions and meetings. He said that with the Planning Commission initiating the text amendment, there will not be a timeline to address.

Action - A motion was made by Ms. Plumlee, seconded by Mr. Brewer, and carried 6-2 (Berkley and Mundy opposed; Penn absent) to approve INITIATION OF SUBDIVISION REGULATION TEXT AMENDMENT TO UPDATE ARTICLE 6-8 FOR SIDEWALKS AND SHARE-USE PATHS, for the reasons provided by the staff.