



Planning & Public Safety Committee

December 6, 2016

Summary and Motions

Chair Mossotti called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. All committee members were present. Council Members, F. Brown and Plomin were in attendance as non-voting members.

I. Committee Summary

A motion was made by Farmer to approve the October 11, 2016 Planning & Public Safety Committee Summary, seconded by Akers. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Farmer to amend the October 11, 2016 Planning & Public Safety Committee Summary, adding after item three, "No further comment or action was taken on this item", seconded by Henson. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Greenway Maintenance Plan

Mossotti introduced Susan Plueger, Director of Environmental Policy, who presented the Greenway Maintenance Plan Update. The updated included a Background on Greenway Acceptance; Greenways Awaiting Acceptance; Greenway Acceptance Process; Funding for Future Greenways Maintenance; Cost Estimates for Future Maintenance; and a Proposed Path Forward.

Scutchfield asked if it was possible to have the property maintained continually by the Home Owners Association or must it go to LFUCG. Plueger stated that it would not be required for us to take it over unless it was a trail that is going through or a critical storm water facility that needs to be managed in a specific way. She added that this is determined on a case by case basis.

Henson said we are in better shape than years ago and complaints have gone away. She asked about the Red Mile Trail area asking if that was a naturalized area or where does that fall. Plueger said it would be a naturalized area; they are sinkholes and we have added additional trees and pollinated gardens.

Farmer asked about the proposed path forward and how do you want us to take that and what is the outcome you are after. Plueger responded please move ahead; please proceed because there is a lot of work associated with this process. She said the first thing we would do is contact property owners, walk the site with them and document the punch list items and they would work and spend their funds to address those items. She said we need to know that this is the path forward the Council wants us to take so we can do the work and prepare to bring these to you.

Mossotti said she met with the development community and many developers are in limbo, not sure what to do with this land that has been left over from developments. Mossotti said moving forward with this will benefit those that developed the community and the neighbors that live and us because we will do it the right way.

A motion was made by Farmer to approve the Greenway Maintenance Plan, adopting sections 1-5 (1. Proceed with acceptance process for the 44 parcel with recorded plats; 2. Proceed with acceptance process for 13 future parcels as developments are completed; 3. Use existing budget to cover annual mowing costs for the 57 parcels (from savings in woody debris/litter removal activities); 4. Develop annual process for greenway acceptance in conjunction with budget development; 5. DES takes over

management of parcels and consider enhancements as funding allows and with neighborhood involvement) of the proposed path forward and refer it to the full Council, seconded by Lamb. The motion passed without dissent.

III. Long Range Transportation Plan

Mossoti introduced Max Conyers, Planning Manager for Transportation Planning, who presented the item. Conyers discussed the transportation planning process; Federal, State and Local funding; current and projects and priorities. David Filiatreau discussed some of the operational improvement examples.

Gibbs asked about a crosswalk on Euclid Avenue by Kroger. He asked if they could help with pedestrian safety here. Filiatreau responded that state would have to approve that because it is on a state route. Conyers added that the state is very cautious when approving traffic engineering projects. Gibbs asked if he could bring pedestrian improvement ideas to them and asked if it would have to be on a state road. Conyers said yes he could and it does not have to be on a state road; he said you can bring ideas to us and we can get them as a project and on an unscheduled, unfunded needs list and they make their way to the implementation plan.

Kay asked about the fully signalized sections and turning them into blinkers, for example at Old Vine and Woodland, and he said there is a list of others that have been suggested for that change asking if these are in this division's area. Filiatreau responded that yes, they do these studies on city routes and now they are getting traffic counts. He added that there are plenty of intersections that don't necessarily need signals and we wouldn't have to spend the money that a signal costs to maintain. He said we are looking at those and said if you have any you would like to suggest we'll look at those as well. Kay asked if he would send that list to the council with the suggestion if they have additional suggestions to make those to Filiatreau.

Kay asked Conyers how final decisions are made in this process and where things are on the priority list and what gets funded and who gets to decide what is at the top of the list. Conyers responded that the state is beginning their prioritization process now from the projects needs list and we will be invited to that process. We are scheduling meetings now so we can show them what our priorities are. And they will tell us what the priorities are for the 17 county district and we will focus on Central Kentucky and why we think these are priorities. He said we want to compromise with the state on projects. Final decisions are made by the Transportation Policy Committee. Kay if when the state legislature reviews, modifies and approves, does that mean that at that point they can do what they want with the plan. Conyers said that is correct. They categorize their funds by program. Kay said it is important for people to understand the balance of power relationship and final decision asking what percentage of projects get changed. Conyers said it was about 10-20%.

F. Brown said that we should work better with legislators and senators, because we need to let them know our projects and what we are looking at show support for each district. He asked if we exchanged roads with the state at one time. He said Tates Creek Road out to Man O War should be a city maintained road so we can inject our traffic concerns into that road because right now we need state approval on those intersections. He also said he is concerned with Euclid Avenue which is a state road, but he feels it should be city because it is a barrier to downtown and the University and we are constantly having issues with the traffic pattern. He asked how to do we approach this or find out from the state if we can do some things like that. Conyers responded that there have been conversations about this in the past. Dowell Hoskins-Squier commented that they have had conversations with the Transportation Cabinet about swapping some roads. It is not as simple as it may seem because the state and U.S. route system has to maintain continuity. Euclid Avenue connects to the state route system so if

you remove it, ask where you are going to route the state route and there aren't many options. There are complicating factors with transferring state routes.

Lamb asked if there was a proactive connectivity to the district Council Members when one of these projects is going to be moving forward that actually takes place within the district. She asked if this was normal in the process or if this is something you can add to it. She added that she is looking for the ability to tell her constituents ahead of time as opposed to them contacting her to tell her something is transpiring. Conyers said they do not go to each Council Member, he said each Policy Committee member represents three districts. He suggested contacting the committee member that represents the three district area or looking at plans and documents. He said they send out plans to legislative officials which has been helpful and they will do the same for Council.

Mossotti asked how we can accommodate the traffic flow on Nicholasville Rd with all of the retail, restaurants, apartments, hotels, etc...Conyers responded that they are widening New Circle Road which is the backbone infrastructure; he said the answer lies with innovative operations, signal coordination, access management, making more connectivity through bikes and trails and increasing transit system. He said he knows as we grow we will continue to experience traffic congestion and it is just a symptom of really good economy and people working and going places. Mossotti said the transit system has not been embraced by our community and we have looked at that for a while. She has constituents who call and say it takes 45 minutes to get home from downtown.

No further comment or action was taken on this item

IV. Street Width / Fire Emergency Access

Scutchfield spoke on this item as it is moving forward. She met with Fire and she has had concerns because they have had fires in some of her developments. She said the street widths in some of the new developments pose a serious issue when you have cars parked on both sides; whether or not the fire trucks can get through. Fire does have a regulation for what those street widths are and in the planning paperwork, it says they will defer to what the Fire requirements are and in the planning guide it is actually less than what the Fire guide is so we have a discrepancy there. She said one of the things they are going to look at in finding solutions is that instead of having one-sided parking determined after houses are built, if a road is a certain width then it is automatic. It is in development at the beginning and neighbors know that it is coming. Additionally, they will take a look at current streets that cannot be widened and safety measures for those streets for the fire engines to be able to safely get through to constituents. She said they will hopefully come back with a proposal from Planning and Fire.

No further comment or action was taken on this item

V. Items Referred to Committee

A motion was made by Farmer to remove the Greenway Manual and Plan, seconded by Akers. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Kay to combine the Nuisance Ordinance in Chapter 12, Code Enforcement Policies, Guidelines and Resources; and ROW and Temporary Signage and leave them in committee, seconded by Farmer. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Farmer to remove the Electronic Billboards, seconded by Akers. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Akers to remove the Trail and Path System, seconded by Farmer. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Farmer to remove the Long Range Transportation Plan, seconded by Akers. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Stinnett to remove the Constables, seconded by Farmer. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Scutchfield to remove the HB422 (Code Enforcement Hearing Boards), seconded by Akers. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Farmer to adjourn, seconded by Stinnett. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.

KT 12.13.16