



## Planning and Public Works Committee August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Summary and Motions

---

Chair Bill Farmer Jr. called the meeting to order 1:00pm. Committee members Jennifer Mossotti, Charles Ellinger, Steve Kay, VM Linda Gorton, Chris Ford, Diane Lawless, Julian Beard, Harry Clarke and Peggy Henson were in attendance. Kevin Stinnett and Shevawn Akers attended as non-voting members.

### **1. Approval of Summary**

Motion by Beard to approve the summary. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

### **2. Capital Road Projects for Major Corridors and the Ability of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG) to Maintain Maintenance of those Roads**

Planning Commissioner Derek Paulsen provided information on the major corridors owned by the LFUCG and associated maintenance costs, including a list of all city owned roads and the cost to repave them.

Farmer suggested that it is a policy discussion to determine how they will fund it.

Stinnett stated that these are the roads that the LFUCG owns and that the Council Members are expected to maintain in their repaving budget, but there are not sufficient funds in the budget to do so. The thought is to add funds to the budget going forward to pave these roads outside of the normal paving dollars. He is hopeful that we can agree on a list and go back to evaluate and come up with a plan going forward to maintain these roads.

Lawless stated that we do not own Alumni Drive but the city is responsible for maintaining it. She added that the University of Kentucky (UK) Master Plan wants to change the way it runs. She is hoping to get assistance from the state. Paulsen said they had talked with UK about their interest to redo Alumni Drive and the way it flows, along with people from District 7, representatives from the state and the Department of Transportation. They are meeting again in October and are still hazy as to what the alignment will be. They do know that there is a lot of construction going on around the stadium. They also have the FEMA project that ends by Nicholasville Road and are trying to come up with a way to do all of the projects together. They are going to discuss a budget number and design, will come up with a proposal. UK is trying to get state funds for the projects.

Farmer commented on pg 14 of the packet and asked that the list be broken down, adding Council Districts so they can get an idea of where they are, along with adding their current rating. They will not necessarily all need to be paved on the first day. Kevin Wentz came to the podium and announced that there is a contract with a developer

in Northern Kentucky who is assisting them with putting together a GIS application, a pavement management system. It is initially complete and is in the process of being implemented on an iPad. What he would like to see this do is to assist them in predicting when roads will need to be resurfaced. He envisions that all roads will be evaluated on an annual basis. This will not happen immediately but this application will allow them to implement the system. This will increase efficiencies and allow budgeting ahead of time. Farmer asked about a timeframe for this. Wente said it is ready now and he is in the process of ordering an iPad because he had it developed on an Apple based computer system, which will be facilitated on an iPad so that they would no longer have to drive each corridor with a spreadsheet. It will have GPS-based locator so that there is no question as to which street is being evaluated. There will be no more spreadsheets. Council Members will receive a color-coded map based on roads of greatest need so that they can allocate your resurfacing moneys to those roads or roads they deem necessary based on the needs of their constituency.

Farmer asked if next month would be too soon for a follow-up. Wente stated that this is a policy decision. The first part of the policy would be to effectively agree on what are the critical LFUCG corridors because some are completely within council districts and some of the roads divide council districts. It would be a matter of the committee determining the roads of greatest need, based on Council Member Stinnett's inquiry into this issue. From there we would move to look at current ratings and track those moving forward for budgetary allotments.

Akers thought Citation Boulevard was a state road. Wente said it is ours to maintain, such as Man O War.

Lawless asked if the GIS program would give a view of the roads and if they will be able to look at them. Wente said no, they would be in the field evaluating roads as they do now but the information reported will be in a graphic format as opposed to an excel sheet. Lawless stated that the rating doesn't always look like the road does. Lawless added that they had also commented on the traffic as a policy (dead end streets versus a cut through across town) and asked if there will be ability to gauge that also. Wente said that was the intent. He forecasts that the efficiencies provided by this program will allow them to rate roads on an annual basis as opposed to doing half of the county every other year.

Clarke asked if we adopted a policy such as this, will we be talking about two different funding sources (one for primary corridors and another fund for neighborhood district paving). Paulsen said he would defer to Council to decide how they would like it done. Clarke asked if we went with one fund, how would they determine which comes first? Maloney stated that they will have to see how much Municipal Aid Program (MAP) money we receive next year and then come up with a percentage for what goes to Council Districts and what goes to major corridors. He reminded Council Members that \$1.5MM will come right off the top for bond repayment. They will need to determine what to set aside for each. Clarke asked Stinnett for a specific reason for doing it this way. Stinnett stated that prior to 2006 the government only used MAP money for resurfacing and did not put local dollars from our budget toward resurfacing. In 2006, we started adding \$3MM in bonding to catch our roads up and were in a deficit of about \$30MM. This was halted for a couple of years due to the recession. We came back last year and added \$13MM in local dollars to fund some of our road issues. However, you will never have enough district money to do Beaumont Circle, nor would you want to use all of your money to do one road. Stinnett used Lansdowne as an example. It would cost approximately \$850K and five or six neighborhood roads could be done for the same cost. The thought is to come up with roads everyone used and come up with a list of roads and a

plan to maintain these roads. Once they come up with a plan, they can decide during the budget process how to fund it.

Henson asked what determined if it made the critical list; was it a rating of 65 or below? Paulsen said it was him going through and deciding which were most expensive. Farmer added that this was not about ratings, it was about arterial. Paulsen said the attempt was to get a starting list that everyone agreed were the most critical.

Gorton asked about Reynolds Road being on the critical list and feels that Malibu Drive is equally travelled but was not on the list. Paulsen commented on the list and how it was created. The point was to provide a starting point and add/remove from the list. Gorton suggested they look at Malibu Drive. Farmer stated that the problem will be to define critical roads as they are a moving target.

Akers suggested that they look at all corridors from the first list and assess them to determine which roads need it most and divide up the rest between districts.

Brad Frasier came to the podium and recommended that rather than focus on page 14, they should add the information requested; Council District, cost, traffic volumes, and classification of the roadway. He feels the classification of the roadway is very important (local streets versus collector roads, minor and major arterials). Typically, the level of importance goes up, the critical functionality increases along with the road classification. Frasier suggested they modify the information and re-present it for feedback. The committee was in agreement. Farmer asked how much time they would need. Frasier said they could give their preliminary work up in a month but he does not want to lock in traffic volumes at this point as he does not know their schedule is or what they have as far as existing data. Farmer stated that they will see where they are in a month. This issue can remain in committee until everyone is comfortable with the information.

### **3. Private Streets: Enforcement, Maintenance, Specifications**

Mossotti commented on the item and her request for information. She stated that there have been instances in the past of private streets being brought into the public domain and concerns about traffic enforcement, parking, etc. We have accepted private streets in the past that were not up to standard. In the future, should we even consider having more private streets done? She understands that there are developments and gated communities that have private streets and the homeowners pay for maintenance, plowing, etc. But when the development is complete or they no longer want to do it, we end up getting these private streets dedicated to us. She felt it was important to bring it up as a point of discussion to see if others shared her concerns and move it forward. Bill Sallee is going to provide additional information regarding this issue for the packet next month.

Stinnett asked for the resolution and the Chief Administrative Office (CAO) Policy that is referenced in the memo from Paul Schoninger. Farmer agreed that this is relevant information for the next meeting.

Stinnett said that if we want to continue to take private streets, we need to figure out how to take them. He added that on one of the streets identified, we are making them put in sidewalks before we take over the street. Citizens cannot afford to pay for curb and gutters on private streets. We need an approach for new

neighborhoods; do we allow private streets going forward and then develop an approach for existing private streets?

Farmer said that next month we will have another discussion with more information included in the packet on the issue. Maloney came to the podium to give an update on repaving.

#### **4. Design Excellence Update**

Kay provided an overview of where the Task Force is in their work and where they are going in the next month or two. He said that the draft is almost complete and will be reviewed by the Law Department. It will then be reviewed by the Division of Planning. They are working to schedule a workshop for Council Members after the next task force meeting on September 16<sup>th</sup>. The workshop would allow the Council to review the completed draft to ask questions and offer input before it goes out to the public. The framework makes a distinction between standards and guidelines. A section on standards provides quantitative information on what we believe offers design excellence in the downtown area (height, windows, etc.). The guidelines sections gives examples of things they would like to encourage as well as things they would like to discourage, along with illustrations. In addition, they are working on a set of incentives, but this is in the early stages and will be available at the workshop. They also plan to incorporate the work of the Courthouse Area Design Review Board. They will be dissolved and their work will be incorporated into the design standards.

Clarke asked Kay for the footprint of the area. Brandy Berryman, from the Downtown Development Authority, stated that it was mostly the downtown core (B-2, B-2a and B-2b). Gorton provided a visual of the area. Third Street is the northernmost point. To the south it is mostly along High Street but juts down to the parking lot at Rupp Arena. It goes over to Midland Avenue and a little further East to Woodland to get the Eastside of Downtown. On the Westside, it cuts off at Jefferson Street and almost to Newtown Pike along the Main Street corridor.

Farmer asked about the length of the current draft in pages. Kay said approximately 50 pages.

Farmer asked about the purpose of the incentive program. Kay said there had been talk in the Infill & Redevelopment Committee for a while about incentives as it presents more hurdles to go through. This is a continuation of that because if we are going to ask the community to impose additional regulation upon itself, it would be helpful to have incentive provided.

Gorton commented on the history of the Downtown Master Plan. One recommendation was to adopt form based codes. This recommendation drove us to Design Excellence rather than Form Based Codes.

Farmer asked when Kay would come back to committee. Kay said that after the workshop and public comment, they would come back to the Planning committee in October or November. He would like to complete it before the end of the year.

#### **5. Adult Day Cares**

Henson commented on the definition of adult day care center versus a day shelter, which serves drop-ins and people in need and provides services. The Division of Planning provided a definition of an adult day care center, which Henson received walking into the meeting. Henson asked that this item be deferred until the next meeting.

Ford commented that he was agreeable to waiting until next month to discuss this issue.

Ford commented on four motions made at the last meeting (page 19 of the packet). He commented on the changes that Henson wants to make to those motions.

## **6. Items in Committee**

Farmer stated that the Elm Tree Lane sidewalk closure was referred to the Planning Committee at the July 9<sup>th</sup> Work Session and needs to be added to the items in committee list.

Clarke would like to make a recommendation at the next meeting about erecting large poles in Right Of Way or dismiss the issue.

Clarke would like to remove the re-paving program and the review of street tree and tree protection ordinances from the list.

Motion by Clarke to remove the re-paving program and the review of street tree and tree protection ordinances from the items in committee list. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

Gorton asked for an update on working with Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS) on road salt services and asked if anyone is looking at it. Farmer does not think anyone is looking at this issue and will place it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Farmer commented on the possible revision of the sign ordinance and would like to leave it on the list.

Farmer felt we were moving in the right direction on the use of alternative fuel resources and felt this can be removed unless someone wants to leave it on the list. Henson asked for an update on alternative fuel issue prior to removing it from committee. Farmer is amenable to having an update at a future meeting.

Farmer stated that we talked about adult day care centers and private streets.

Farmer met with Myers about the notification process for H1 overlay and Myers is close to having something to bring to committee.

Farmer added that we talked about capital road projects.

Farmer said performance bonds versus letters of credit was discussed last month but did not sense that there was an interest in committee action. Stinnett referred the item and it can remain on the list until Stinnett can comment.

Farmer said the B1 ZOTA issue was sent back to the Division of Planning because the changes made were material and the item will remain on the list.

Farmer talked about the last four items since they are just updated. Paulsen will find out about the Oliver Lewis Way Project and update the committee.

Farmer commented on the Todds Road widening project and the downtown traffic study, which are quarterly updates. Kay updated the committee on the Design Excellence Task Force.

Lawless asked when the B1 ZOTA issue will be heard by Planning Commission. Sallee said either this week or at the September meeting. Lawless asked if there would still be an opportunity to make additional changes when it comes back. Farmer said that there would be an opportunity to do that.

Ford commented on the Oliver Lewis Way project and would like clarification on what we are studying (Newtown Pike extended to campus with various phases or Oliver Way), suggested that perhaps we need to rename the issue "Newtown Pike Extension."

Motion by Beard to adjourn. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.