

an open records request. Mr. Baillie asserted that we have an excellent professional and licensed staff in the engineering Division of Engineering to ensure we get the best development possible.

Mr. Baillie clarified dispersal vs funneling in regards to traffic and that Planning staff focuses on dispersing traffic. The applicant must connect roadways, as discussed in the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, Mr. Baillie mentioned that the suggestion for a right in, right out on Harrodsburg Road would be in violation of the Land Subdivision Regulations.

Commission Questions - Mr. Nicol asked what the Planning Commission approved as a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to provide signage for stub streets. Mr. Baillie responded saying that approximately three years ago, an Ordinance was passed that said all new stub streets needed stub street signage. Mr. Nicol asked about the cost of putting signage on every stub street and if that was a proposal that the Commission could make. Mr. Baillie said it was possible, but that would be quite a bit of work and money to make happen.

Ms. Worth asked a question about doing traffic calming devices with the development and not after the fact and if that is on the table or if it comes later. Mr. Baillie said that was something that the Commission could add, and gave a few examples of things they could add, such as speed tables.

Mr. Penn said that the Commission needed to focus on the plan in front of them and not the plan down the line. Mr. Penn did ask if Mr. Baillie saw anything in the alternative plan that would work. Mr. Baillie responded that the alternative plan unfortunately would not be supported as it would not meet the regulations.

Mr. Pohl asked if it would be appropriate for the Commission to have a condition indicating that should connecting Agape Drive or Larissa Lane be impossible for motorized vehicles, they be developed for bike and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Baillie indicated that a condition like that could work for Agape Drive, but would not make sense for Larissa Lane.

Mr. Michler asked what the Comprehensive Plan says about bringing greenways up to roads and parks, and the design and visibility of the city's greenspaces. Mr. Baillie indicated that we did not have regulations in regards to that framework at this time.

Mr. Nicol made a comment about context sensitivity, saying it's not the Commission's job to determine lot size.

Mr. Penn wanted to add a condition to the development plan to keep meaningful access to the greenway.

Zoning Action – A motion was made by Mr. Nicol, seconded by Mr. Penn, and carried 9-0 (Barksdale abstaining, de Movellan, and Bell absent) to approve PLN-MAR-22-00005: COWGILL DEVELOPMENT, LLC., for the reasons provided by the staff.

Development Plan Action – A motion was made by Mr. Nicol, seconded by Mr. Pohl and carried 9-0 (Barksdale abstaining, de Movellan, and Bell absent) to approve PLN-MJSUB-22-00001: MARGARET W. CAMIC PROPERTY (W.E. SAVAGE PROPERTY) deleting the 12th condition and replacing it with a condition to keep a meaningful access to the greenway.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMEMENDMENTS

** The Planning Commission voted to take Zoning Ordinance text amendments items out of order.*

1. PLN-ZOTA-22-00003: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES 1, 8, AND 23 TO UPDATE REGULATIONS FOR FAMILY CHILD CARE HOMES – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to Article 1, 8 and 23 to update the regulations related to family child care in a residential zone. Current terms and their definitions must be updated to meet adopted changes to KRS 100.

INITIATED BY: Urban County Planning Commission

PROPOSED TEXT: Copies are available from the staff.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: Approval for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommends: Approval, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed text amendment supports and implements the 2018 Comprehensive Plan, in the following ways:
 - a. The amendment responds to the implementation item calling for an increase in flexibility on types of home occupations allowed (Theme C, Policy #6).

- b. The proposed changes will maximize context-sensitive employment opportunities within the opportunity zone tracts, providing equitable community development and prioritizing local residents for advancement opportunities (Theme C, Diversity Policy #5).
 - c. The amendment will encourage a diverse economic base to provide a variety of job opportunities, allowing upward mobility for lower income residents of Fayette County (Theme C, Policy #2).
 - d. The amendment will strengthen efforts to develop a variety of job opportunities that lead to prosperity for all (Theme C, Goal #1.a).
2. The amendment will modernize the Zoning Ordinance, reconciling its requirements with relevant state laws.

Staff Text Amendment Presentation – Ms. Autumn Goderwis presented and summarized the staff report and recommendations for this text amendment. Ms. Goderwis stated that this text amendment is to allow more flexibility in regard to at home childcare and to reconcile the current Zoning Ordinance to align with new Kentucky state law.

The current ordinance allows for in home childcare up to six children as an accessory, and seven to twelve children as a conditional use. Ms. Goderwis said that this text amendment will change the current definition, and add two new definitions that better suit the accessory and conditional use options.

The “Type II Childcare Center” is a licensed in-home childcare center where care is provided for seven (7) to twelve (12) children, including children related to the licensee. The “Family Childcare Home” is for six or fewer children, with up to four children related to the licensee, for a total of up to 10 children.

Ms. Goderwis concluded her presentation by stating that staff is recommending approval for this text amendment.

Commission Question – None.

Citizen Comment – None.

Motion – A motion was made by Ms. Worth, seconded by Ms. Barksdale, and carried 9-0 (Bell and de Movellan absent) to approve PLN-ZOTA-22-00003: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES 1, 8, AND 23 TO UPDATE REGULATIONS FOR FAMILY CHILD CARE HOMES for the reasons provided by the staff.

2. **PLN-ZOTA-22-00004: AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL OFFICE (P-1) ZONE TO MODIFY RESTRICTIONS ON BEAUTY SHOPS AND BARBER SHOPS** – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to remove the current limitations (number of cosmetologists and square footage) on Beauty Shops and Barber Shops in the Professional Office (P-1) zone (Article 8-15).

INITIATED BY: Courtney and Rodney Carpenter

PROPOSED TEXT: Copies are available from the staff.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval** for the reasons provided by the staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Approval** for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed text amendment to remove restrictions for beauty shops and barber shops in the Professional Office (P-1) zone will increase the opportunity to utilize land inside the Urban Service Area for professional services that are necessary for the community. Allowing beauty shops and barber shops to expand may help to reduce vacant office space within the community, as recommended by Theme C: Jobs and Prosperity, Prosperity Policy #9 of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Text Amendment Presentation – Ms. Traci Wade presented and summarized the staff report and recommendations for this text amendment. Ms. Wade gave background on the text amendment and the reasoning behind the restriction that this text amendment is attempting to change. At the time, the Urban County Council was concerned with large barber/beauty shops selling retail items in the P-1 zone, and those concerns have not materialized because of this restriction.

Ms. Wade relayed that staff is recommending approval because this text amendment will allow barbers/beauty shops to utilize more existing square footage, which is consistent with the Jobs and Prosperity Policy #9 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commission Question – None.

Citizen Comment – None.

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