

**Joint City-County Planning Commission
of
Barren County, Kentucky**

March 19, 2018

The Joint City-County Planning Commission of Barren County, Kentucky met in a regular session on Monday, March 19, 2018 at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of the Glasgow City Hall.

The following Commission Members were present:

Eddie Atnip	Joan Norris
Danny Basil	David Rutherford
Lewis Bauer	Janis Turner
Rondal Brooks	Candy Wethington
Freddie Button	Forrest Wise
Tommy Gumm	

Brad Bailey and Ricky Houchens were absent.

Chairman Gumm called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Chairman Gumm expressed condolences to David Rutherford in the passing of his mother.

I. GENERAL BUSINESS:

Agenda Item # 1 – Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Rondal Brooks and seconded by Danny Basil to approve the February 20, 2018 minutes. Motion unanimously carried.

Agenda Item # 2 – Approval of Invoices

The following March, 2018 invoices were presented for payment.

A motion was made by Forrest Wise and seconded by Rondal Brooks to approve the March invoices as presented for payment. Motion unanimously carried.

Agenda Item # 3 – Committee's Report

Budget Committee: Candy Wethington reported that the committee had met with Kinley-Horn representatives and they are putting pricing information together for the committee. This

information should be available by early April so the committee can move forward with the budgeting process.

Comprehensive Plan: Eddie Atnip reported that the Comprehensive Plan Committee was also a part of the meeting with Kinley-Horn representatives

Agenda Item # 4 – Treasurer’s Report

Janis Turner, Treasurer, presented the following report:

The bank balance at the end of February was \$45,581.50. Deposit in the amount of \$3,010.00 consisted of: \$2,460.00 from Barren County fees and \$550.00 in fees from the City of Glasgow.

Agenda Item # 5 – Director’s Report

Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, also reported that a meeting had been held with Lindsey Walker, Kinley-Horn regarding the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Myatt stated he would like to get some of the local elected leaders involved so they can know what the Comprehensive Plan is, and understanding what its value to the community is. One of the suggestions was to add the Mayors and Judge to meet with the Committee in early June so if there is a proposed increase to the budget to cover the cost of the Comprehensive Plan Study, they can see the value in it.

Mr. Myatt also told the Commission Members that as of January 1, 2018 all members have zero (0) hours of Continuing Education hours. The members can get 8 hours of Continuing Education on June 21, 2018 at Cave City, KY. This is a KACO Training and the cost is \$65.00/person.

II. PUBLIC HEARING:

- 1. 031918-01-G – Zone Change Application – Ruby Handley, Applicant/Owner – I-1 (Light Industrial District) to B-2 (General Business District) – Property located at 617 West Main Street – 0.24 +/- Total Acres – Glasgow**

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm reminded everyone on the Commission that any approval or denial must be in accordance with KRS 100.213.

Page Three
March 19, 2018

Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, was sworn in and reported to the best of his knowledge all appropriate notices had been posted. Mr. Myatt explained the proposed Text Amendment.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in favor of the proposed request.

Ruby Handley, 8777 Tompkinsville Road, Glasgow, KY 42141 spoke in favor of the zone change.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in opposition of the proposed request.

No one present addressed the Commission.

Chairman Gumm closed the hearing.

A motion was made by Danny Basil and seconded by Janis Turner to approve the proposed Zone Change because the proposed map amendment is in agreement with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Motion unanimously carried.

2. 031918-02-G – Zone Change Application – Grace Heers, Applicant/Owner – R-2 (Medium Density Residential District) to R-4 (Medium Density Multi-Family District) – Property located at 102 and 104 Lauderdale Drive – 1.24 +/- Total Acres – Glasgow

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm reminded everyone on the Commission that any approval or denial must be in accordance with KRS 100.213.

Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, was sworn in and reported to the best of his knowledge all appropriate notices had been posted. Mr. Myatt explained the proposed Text Amendment.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in favor of the proposed request.

No one present addressed the Commission.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in opposition of the proposed request.

No one present addressed the Commission.

Page Four
March 19, 2018

A motion was made by Eddie Atnip and seconded by Rondal Brooks to approve the proposed Zone Change because the proposed map amendment is in agreement with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Motion unanimously carried.

3. 031918-03-G – Zone Change Application – Providence Properties, Applicant/Owner – R-1 (Low Density Residential District) to R-4 (Medium Density Multi-Family District) – Property located at End of Shalimar Drive – 3.70 +/- Total Acres – Glasgow

Eddie Atnip recused himself from the proceedings.

A public hearing was conducted.

Chairman Gumm reminded everyone on the Commission that any approval or denial must be in accordance with KRS 100.211.

Kevin Myatt, Planning Director, was sworn in and reported to the best of his knowledge all appropriate notices had been posted. Mr. Myatt explained the proposed Text Amendment.

Commission Member Rondal Brooks stated that the current roadway was not worthy to be called a roadway.

Commission Member Danny Basil: I just want to make sure I understand the study that you read from.

Kevin Myatt: Yes Sir.

Basil: This could have from 20 to 200 units on it.

Myatt: Their study in a normal situation, not on this property itself, there could be between 20 and 220 total units.

Basil: OK.

Myatt: Now the 220 total units is based on the R-4 zoning classification, not for this property, but just as a general consensus.

Basil: But there could be that many units there under some usage.

Myatt: No. It wouldn't get that total amount because of the setback being placed on the property for starters and the total percentage of the lot might be more than 65%.

Page Five
March 19, 2018

Basil: So what would be the maximum number of units that can be placed on this development as applied for.

Myatt: Roughly anywhere, if they fully developed it completely out and put eight-plexes on there or twelve-plexes roughly or anything like that between 56 and 90 units.

Basil: And this is only going to generate three (3) cars per day going one direction and only eight (8) cars per day going the other direction.

Myatt: I'm just telling you what the Engineering Report turned in.

Basil: I was just trying to make sure I had understood the report. And that's what I understood the report to say. Is that what that report said?

Myatt: That's what the report said.

Basil: OK, that's all I need. Thank you.

Lewis Bauer: Kevin, can we go back to Exhibit C again please.

Myatt: Sure.

Bauer: And could you again explain the pink area and the properties owned by Mr. Gibson and the area.

Basil: That property was rezoned and sent to the City Council. I think the City Council actually rejected the first zone change that took place, I think there was a technically or something like that. Not all the City Council members were there, was kicked back to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission then subsequently accepted the Binding Elements that were placed by the applicant at that time, to leave a buffer area along Magnolia Drive. That no commercial development could take place and that no commercial or any other development can access Magnolia Drive. When it was approved, it was approved with those binding elements and they still hold true. So any development of this property can take place, it's just going to have to access Happy Valley, or, I'm sorry, US 31-E, North Jackson.

Charles A. Goodman, III: Kevin, let me ask you something so I can understand it. The element that was approved that no commercial access could be gained to the adjoined roadway but it did not say anything about residential, whatever residential may be, it could be access to the adjoining roadway.

Page Six
March 19, 2018

Myatt: Correct. As best I understood the binding elements, no commercial development can access the roadway and the best I can understand, it cannot be combined to the adjacent property owner to be accessed, meaning combining these lots with anyone else.

Goodman: Commercial or residential?

Myatt: It didn't specifically say commercial or residential, it just said it couldn't be added to any adjacent Property owners.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in favor of the proposed request.

Liz Nelson: I'm one of the owners.

Gumm: Please raise your right hand, state your name and address.

Nelson: I'm Liz Nelson, 910 Hallifax-Bailey Road in Allen County.

Gumm: Do you solemnly swear and affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth?

Nelson: Absolutely.

Gumm: OK, you may proceed.

Nelson: I just want to clear up a couple of statements. The property does not allow us to build more than 50 units out there because of parking and the 65 or 75 % percentages and things like that. And the other issue is that the reason the study came back on the amount of cars being so low is because we provide low income housing and most of the people out there, the 72 units I think we only have about 65 cars. Not everybody out there has a car. So when they performed the study, they were going off the data, because going in and out, there is just not that many. So hopefully that will clear up that. And the other issue was is that in order to fix the driveway to like you said on Shalimar and plus some of the exterior finishings that on, making a better quality of life for the other 72 units apartment there is building these and constructing these would help fund that. So it is a bigger project than just building that.

Goodman: I've got a couple of questions from a legal standpoint. You or the entity that you are a part of own the existing Shalimar Apartments and I would assume then your arrangement with what is known as Shalimar Drive the private access is by an easement agreement with the existing property owner. You don't own Shalimar Drive?

Page Seven
March 19, 2018

Nelson: No sir, I do not own Shalimar Drive. It is owned by the Williams Brothers who own the industrial section that is surveyed there.

Goodman: You have an existing easement arrangement with regard to Shalimar Drive. What is your, arrangement, do you have an arrangement with regard to the additional property that you have acquired?

Nelson: Yes sir. Between the Williams Brothers and I it has all gone, we have just learned from Mr. Myatt that they were separated in the maps with the City. In our minds it was always one lot.

Goodman: Do you have any agreement with Ron Williams and his brother with regard to any improvements to the existing Shalimar Drive, we had discussed that.

Nelson: The improvements are going to come through the funding. Yes, we have plans to fix all the driveways and all of that. That will be all of our responsibility.

Goodman: And did you say you had plans to upgrade the Shalimar Apartments

Nelson: Yes sir.

Goodman: Are those documented in a written agreement or is it just in the future “we’re going to fix them up”?

Nelson: Well, it will be all of the same permit that we pulled. We are going to pull the permit for the new construction as well as pulling the permits. I’ve already met with everybody in Mr. Myatt’s office that needs to be and they are aware of the drawings, everybody has seen them and we are way down the road getting all of this under way. Yes sir.

Gumm: Thank you.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in favor of the proposed request.

No one present addressed the Commission.

Chairman Gumm asked if anyone present would like to speak in opposition of the proposed request.

Gumm: Before I do that I would like to read from a petition that was turned into Kevin today, March 19th. This is “Petition Against Change of Zoning from R-1 to R-4”. The statement ahead of the signatures reads “The undersigned are concerned citizens who urge our leaders not

Page Eight
March 19, 2018

to change the zone from R-1 (Low Density Residential District) to R-4 (Medium Density Multi Family District), property located at the end of Shalimar Drive, Glasgow, 3.70 +/- Acres. There are 62 signatures on this document. I acknowledge receipt of this document but I am going to ask counsel if we can enter this into evidence due to the fact that I do not see any specific statement of Finding of Facts in the initial statement.

Goodman: In an administrative hearing you are not bound by strict application of the rules of evidence. However, in order to make a determination for or against the proposed zone change, there has to be a finding over and above in excess of the document that has been proposed to you. It cannot be the sole and it cannot be a material basis for your decision. I would ask that anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the zone change if you were a signatory of the petition that you, under oath, acknowledge that fact when you speak.

Gumm: At this time is there anyone that would like to speak in opposition to the Zone Change. Please state your name and address.

Joe Renfro: Joe Herbert Renfro, 104 Dogwood Avenue, Glasgow, KY.

Gumm: Mr. Renfro, please keep your hand up. Do you solemnly swear that upon the testimony that you are about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth?

Renfro: Yes sir.

Gumm: I'll ask you the question – is your signature on this document?

Renfro: It is.

Gumm: Okay, you may proceed.

Renfro: Me and a couple of the neighbor ladies went around to all the property owners, people living there. They all signed the petition that they are not for a zoning change for this area. It would not be beneficial for any of us in any way. It would create more traffic in that area over there which is hard to get to, everybody knows it. They might improve it. If they were going to improve it, looks like to me in 40 – 50 years existence they would have done something to it before now. But anyway, I'm not for it and I think most of these people here in the neighborhood, if they would hold up their hand, their residents over there, all these people are against it. It is not a benefit to us in any way and we can't see how it would benefit the public to have more of what we've got over there. Thank you. The citizens in that subdivision paid to bring that sewer up there where he is talking about. This property that Tom Holmes once owned paid nothing, this property, I don't think, paid anything either. It was all paid for by the residents in that area at that time.

Page Nine
March 19, 2018

Gumm: Anyone else in the audience that would like to speak in opposition to the zone change? Please come to the microphone. Please state your name and address.

Helen Pickens: Helen Pickens, P. O. Box 5445, Louisville, KY.

Gumm: Would you raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth?

Pickens: I do.

Gumm: You may proceed.

Pickens: Ok, I own property, almost 8 acres that joins up there, that wooded area. My concern is the excess traffic, all the traffic. There are not roads to accommodate this. Second of all, it's low income. With low income that's mostly HUD, Section 8. They have no investment in anything. Somebody pays their rent, somebody pays their mortgages, a lot of times their utilities. They have no investment so they have no reason to want to take care of anything, not trespass, and not mess up property that's already there because they don't have an investment in it, so they have nothing to lose. The most they can lose is their Section 8. There are nice homes that's built, I've got property I can put signs up, "No Trespassing" but it won't do me any good. What am I going to do, take them to court, I can't sue them, because it's low income. And it will be the same thing, sorry, their low income, they don't have a job and there is nothing we can do. That bothers me a whole lot right there. And like rental property out there, the rent will decrease because nobody wants to live with that many units. She says only 50 but it's up to 220, they are saying that. Look at the traffic, look at all the people that would put there. Shalimar right now, I don't know how many times the police are called up there weekly but it's been numerous times. There has been drug busts in Shalimar, that's a low income. Those apartments, they said it's going to be like Shalimar, so when we put another Shalimar up here we are going to bring in more drugs, more traffic, more trespassers, people that don't have an investment in it. That's what concerns me the most. You know, these subdivisions are family homes right now, that have children, people that are raising their children, people that are retiring, you know, they live alone. Their spouses dies, their widowed. How are they going to feel all these people traveling around all the time, you are not going to feel safe. I would not even drive to Shalimar at night, I don't feel safe, I would not walk up there, I don't feel safe, I will not walk on my property that is adjacent to Shalimar at night because I do not feel safe. And I sure don't want more put there to make it worse.

Gumm: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak in opposition to the zone change? If not, I am going to close the hearing.... Do you have something?

Page Ten
March 19, 2018

Myatt: Under the protocol it says if she has any questions of anything that was stated, she has to be allowed to speak as well. If they have any questions of what she has stated, they in turn can cross exam.

Nelson: I know change is hard and I know it is difficult when big changes happen, it makes it even harder. Just a couple of facts that might help you guys. Glasgow is projected to grow by 5% in population in the next two years. 5% is big. As a council you guys are trusted to make good decisions to allow for that growth to happen in the best way possible. I understand their fears. I know that Shalimar needs work, I have owned it only 3 years and I am doing everything I can to clean it up. I took a vacancy of 85% when I took over to clean out all the drugs, clean out all the stuff, to make it a better place. Now, in order to have funds to make it a better place I have to have more units to do that. Behind there, as Mr. Myatt stated, it is a sloping lot back there. It is going to be very difficult to be able to walk or get back there. Not only that, that limits my number of units, I cannot do 220. By your rules I'm probably maxed out somewhere between 50 and 55. And as far as the traffic, The engineers have already stated what the traffic will do. The facts are the facts. And like Mr. Myatt also said the engineering company has stamped that and we have somebody to go back to if that is incorrect.

Renfro: What would be your alternative for a sewer if they won't let you hook on to this one that's in Place? Have you went that far to know?

Nelson: We have a main sewer running right through the middle of the property, between Building C and D. We have a sewer there. We also have ah (laugh), that's C and the next building is D so we have a main sewer that runs right through there but it is my job to follow the rules and guidelines that the council puts forth. If they tell me to tap there I have to tap there. If they tell me to tap up there, I have to tap up there.

Renfro: It's understandable being it didn't cost you anything.

Pickens: I have a question. You said you have 85 units that were empty.

Nelson: Yes.

Pickens: Okay, so now you've got, they are all filled?

Nelson: I'm at about a 7% vacancy today.

Pickens: Okay. So you took that much money and what have you improved? How many police cars have you had up there in the past 6 months?

Nelson: I haven't had record of that.

Page Eleven
March 19, 2018

Pickens: How many times have they found drugs up there in the past 6 months?

Nelson: No record of drugs being found since I took over.

Pickens: Okay. Can you explain to me why you have to build another structure to have money to take care of the ones you've got? If you can't take care of the one you have now with the funds it makes, how building another and going in debt for it pay for the first one?

Nelson: I totally understand your thinking here and let me try to do the best I can. I've been in this industry for 27 years. Okay, when you have units, it cost this much to take care of any amount of units under of 100. I'm at 72. This is my cost to take care of 100 units, if I add 50 more units expeditiously I'm only adding this much cost. Now I have room for profit that I can in turn put back in the property. Because right now there is no profit, we make the bills. Our taxes that we pay are astronomical because we are commercial. Cost of the cost. There is no room for improvement without building another set of buildings because if I add 50 more units, like it said, it is only expeditiously this much more to maintain them, then there is room for profit there.

Pickens: Okay, you are right I don't fully understand because I have rental property and so I have so many houses and it takes this much for the upkeep of each and every one and that much time. So if I build 10 more houses, I gonna have that much more expense, I'm gonna that much more time in it, so ..

Nelson: Well there are two factors going on...

Gumm: Excuse me, excuse me. I gonna stop this because it is not relevant to our decision. We have to make our decision based upon Findings of Fact and the law and it really does not have anything to do with her financial capability or not, so...

Pickens: I understand. My question was though, how, if it is so run down now, how are they going to build more and know that they are going to be kept up in low income?

Gumm: That's exactly what I'm saying, that is not a consideration of this committee. I'll just ask you to stop unless you have another relevant question to ask.

Pickens: Okay, is there any way that there can be a chain link fence or something put where they don't come over on my property? Can you petition it off?

Nelson: Those are all options the counsel has the right to tell what I have to do or don't have to do so, I do what I'm told.

Pickens: Okay.

Gumm: Any other questions before I close the hearing? At this time I'm going to close the hearing and entertain a motion.

Goodman: Mr. Chairman.

Gumm: Yes sir.

Goodman: It might be appropriate for me at this time to read to the Planning and Zoning Commission what is required in terms of their finding, not telling them obviously how to find but what the statutory guidelines are. When you have a proposed zone change the Planning Commission must find that the Map Amendment is in agreement with the adopted Comprehensive Plan or absent that if it is not in Agreement with the Comprehensive Plan that the existing zoning classification given to the property Is inappropriate and the proposed rezoning is appropriate or that there have been major changes of Economic, physical and social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated at the Time the Comprehensive Plan was adopted and has substantially altered such character of the area. That is the legislative mandate under which this body must decide whether to recommend approval or denial of the zone change.

A motion was made by Lewis Bauer and seconded by Janis Turner to deny the proposed zone change for the Providence Properties, Applicants/Owners, for a proposed map amendment from R-1 (Low Density Residential) to R-4 (Medium Density Multi-Family Residential) for property located at the end of Shalimar Drive. This motion is based on the fact that the proposed map amendment is not in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. Motion unanimously carried.

III. DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

1. 031918-04-G – Preliminary and Final Plan – Phase III Lovers Lane Development – Ken Ford, Applicants/Owner(s) – 0.75 +/- Total Acres – Along Lovers Lane – Glasgow – Plans Prepared by American Engineers, Inc.

The following Staff Findings and Recommendations were presented.

Staff Findings:

1. Currently the subject property is located within a B-3 (Highway Service Business) District. As per 158.196(P) of the Glasgow Zoning Ordinance, the subject property will follow all R-4 (Medium Density Multi-Family Residential District) standards.

2. The existing tract of land contains 10.9 total acres, of which 0.60 acres will be disturbed during Phase III. The site slopes to the east, away from Lovers Lane and towards Red Cross Elementary School and a blue-dotted stream.
3. As shown on Sheet C-3, the Applicant is proposing a new 4,800 square foot building for a proposed multi-family dwelling.
4. Section 158.400(1) of the Glasgow Zoning Ordinance requires a dwelling to provide two (2) spaces for every family dwelling unit. The applicant is proposing 17 spaces. ADA requirements require one (1) handicap space; the applicant is providing one (1).
5. Sheet C-4 is the detailed proposed grading sheet for the development.
 - A. As shown on the plans storm water runoff is to drain to the east side of the site, to a proposed retention basin. The west and southwest sections of the proposed development are to tie back into the existing topographic contours. The south section shall drain north to the proposed retention pond via a proposed drainage ditch.
6. Sheet C-4 is the stormwater prevention plan, indicating that the total disturbed area is 0.60 acres of the total 10.9 acres and the total runoff coefficient increased by 0.38.
7. A storm water maintenance agreement has been signed with the City of Glasgow Stormwater Coordinator.
8. Sheet C-5 shows Erosion Control measures implemented during the sites initial construction. Silt fences are to be located along the east property line.
9. Sheet C-6 shows the water and sewer utility will come from Lovers Lane and enter the building on the south side, also the building will be serviced by one proposed fire hydrant.
10. Sheet C-6 shows the electricity is to be provided by the GEPB and communications lines provided by GEPB and SCRTC by an underground service on north side of the property and will enter on the north side of the proposed building.

Staff Recommendation:

It is the Staff's recommendation of approval of the Preliminary and Final Development Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Adequate soil erosion and sedimentation control measures, shown on the approved plans, be implemented during and after site construction in order to reduce soil erosion and to minimize water quality impacts where the natural ground cover has been disturbed.

A motion was made by Danny Basil and seconded by Candy Wethington to approve the Preliminary and Final Plat for Phase III of Lovers Lane Development for Ken Ford, Applicant/Owner, because the proposed development plan does meet the minimum standards set forth in Section 152 of the Glasgow Development Ordinance and subject to Staff Findings and Recommendations of approval of the proposed development with conditions that adequate soil erosion and sedimentation control measures, shown on the approved plans, be implemented during and after site construction in order to reduce soil erosion and to minimize water quality impacts where the natural ground cover has been disturbed. Motion unanimously carried.

2. **031918-06-G – Preliminary Development Plan – Southside Baptist Church, Applicant/Owners – 5.6 +/- Total Acres – 175 Bishop Lane – Glasgow – Plans prepared by American Engineers.**

The following Staff Findings and Recommendations were presented.

Staff Findings:

1. Currently the subject property is located within an AG (Agricultural) District.
2. The existing tract of land contains 10.242 total acres with 6.0 total acres being disturbed. The majority of the site slopes to the southeast, towards Scottsville Road (US 31-E), see Sheet C-2.0.
3. As shown on Sheet C-3.0 the Applicant is proposing a 14,718 square foot building.
4. Section 158.400(4) of the Glasgow Zoning Ordinance requires a place of public assembly to provide one (1) space for each five seats available at maximum capacity. The minimum required parking spaces is seventy (70); the applicant is providing one hundred ninety five (195) spaces. ADA requirements require six (6) handicap spaces; the applicant is providing eight (8).
5. Sheet C-4.0 is a detailed proposed grading sheet for the development.
 - A. As shown on the plans storm water runoff is to drain to the southeast side of the site, to two proposed retention basins.
 - B. Drainage/Runoff from the western side of development is to be connected to proposed DBIs on the northwest and southwest section of the development

and drain to the proposed retention basin via proposed ditch line. Drainage/Runoff from remaining development to be connected to proposed DBIs on the eastern end of the parking lot and drain via proposed twelve (12") inch CMP to the east into the basins.

- C. The remaining development is to sheet drain to east of the property to the proposed basins.
- D. Sheet C-4.0 also shows the pre and post drainage and runoff calculations show a coefficient increase of 0.22 resulting in the need of the proposed basin.
- 6. A storm water maintenance agreement has been signed with the City of Glasgow Stormwater Coordinator.
- 7. Sheet C-5.0 shows Erosion Control measures implemented during the sites initial development by phasing.
- 8. This site is to be serviced by one (1) proposed fire hydrant to be located two hundred (200') feet from proposed driveway entrance and Bishop Lane, see Sheet C-6.0 for approved Glasgow Fire Department hydrant location.

Staff Recommendation:

It is the Staff's recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Development Plan subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Adequate soil erosion and sedimentation control measures, shown on the approved plans, be implemented during and after site construction in order to reduce soil erosion and to minimize water quality impacts where the natural ground cover has been disturbed.

A motion was made by Rondal Brooks and seconded by Joan Norris to approve the Preliminary Development Plan for Southside Baptist Church, Applicant/Owner, because the proposed development plan does meet the minimum standards set forth in Section 152 of the Glasgow Development Ordinance and subject to Staff Findings and Recommendations of approval of the proposed development with conditions that adequate oil erosion controls be implemented. Motion unanimously carried.

- 3. ***031918-06-G – Preliminary and Final Development Plan – Monticello Bank Company, Applicant/Owners – 0.98 +/- Total Acres – 1434 Happy Valley Road – Glasgow – Plans prepared by Arnold Consulting Engineering Service, Inc.***

The following Staff Findings and Recommendations were presented.

Staff Findings:

1. Currently the subject property is located within a B-2 (General Business) District.
2. The existing tract of land contains 3.46 total acres of which 0.98 acres shall be disturbed. The majority of the site slopes to the southwest, towards Happy Valley Road (KY Highway 90), see Sheet C1. The development is shown in 2 parcels.
3. As shown on Sheet C1.1 the Applicant is showing ten (10) existing shed structures and one (1) existing carport to be demolished as well as the removal of a large asphalt parking lot. The Applicant is further proposing the construction of a 4,420 square foot building.
4. Section 158.400(7) of the Glasgow Zoning Ordinance requires a commercial or office use to provide one (1) space for every three hundred (300') square feet of floor area. The minimum required parking spaces is fifteen (15); the applicant is providing twenty-six (26) spaces. ADA requirements require two (2) handicap spaces; the applicant is providing two (2).
5. Sheet C3 is a detailed proposed grading sheet for the development.
 - A. As shown on the plans storm water runoff is to drain to the northeast side of the site, to an existing retention basin.
 - B. Drainage/Runoff of development is to sheet flow to the east side of asphalt drive then to existing basin via a proposed four (4') foot drainage ditch.
 - C. Sheet C3 also shows the pre and post drainage and runoff calculations show a coefficient increase of 0.17 resulting in the need of the proposed basin.
6. A storm water maintenance agreement has been signed with the City of Glasgow Stormwater Coordinator.
7. Sheet C4 shows Erosion Control measures implemented during the sites initial development by phasing.
8. This site is to be serviced by one (1) fire hydrant existing at the intersection of Happy Valley Road (KY Highway 90) and Western Hills Road.

Staff Recommendation:

It is the Staff's recommendation of approval of the Preliminary and Final Development Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Adequate soil erosion and sedimentation control measures, shown on the approved plans, be implemented during and after site construction in order to reduce soil erosion and to minimize water quality impacts where the natural ground cover has been disturbed.

A motion was made by David Rutherford and seconded by Janis Turner to approve the Preliminary and Final Development Plan for Monticello Bank, Applicant/Owner, because the proposed development plan does meet the minimum standards set forth in Section 152 of the Glasgow Development Ordinance and subject to Staff Findings and Recommendations of approval of the proposed development with conditions that adequate soil erosion controls be implemented. Motion unanimously carried.

IV. SUBDIVISION:

1. ***031918-07-G – Preliminary and Final Plat – Dwayne and Carolyn Diana Pierce – Applicant/Owner – Property located along Hume Way – 10 Lots – 30.391 +/- Total Acres – Glasgow – Plans prepared by Pride Engineering***

The following Staff Findings and Recommendations were presented.

Staff Findings:

1. The proposed development is being divided along proposed road frontage and each lot exceeds the minimum lot size requirements, per Section 502.2.1 and 502.2.2 of the Barren County Subdivision Regulations.
2. All utilities are available to each lot by Glasgow EPB, SCRTC, Windstream and Glasgow Water Company. A 6" water line currently services and is available to each lot. All existing SRCTC, EPB and Transmission lines have been noted with all applicable Right-of-Way easements
3. All tracts shall be serviced by existing fire hydrants and no further hydrants are required. There are four current fire hydrants available to service the subject properties
4. All proposed lots shown must meet all necessary requirements to gain entrance permits for Homewood Boulevard from Kurt Frey, Glasgow Public Works Superintendent.
5. Lots 11 & 12 have current access to Glasgow Sewer. Lots 1-10 all meet minimum lot size requirements set by Barren County Health Dept. for septic service. Lots 13 & 14 do not meet minimum lot size requirements for septic and sewer is not currently available to those lots. Public sewer must be brought to each lot (13 & 14) prior to any construction and conveyance.

Page Eighteen
March 19, 2018

Staff Recommendation:

It is the Staff's recommendation of approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat.

A motion was made by Freddie Button and seconded by Danny Basil to approve the Preliminary and Final Plat for Dwayne and Carolyn Diana Pierce, Applicants/Owners, because the proposed Subdivision does met the minimum standards set forth in the Barren County Subdivision Regulations and subject to Staff Findings and Recommendations of approval of the proposed Final Plat and that there be approval but no recordation of the plan until the sewer is put in place and approved by the City Water Company. Motion unanimously carried.

There being no further business to come before this meeting, upon the motion of Janis Turner, seconded by Forrest Wise, and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 8:52 PM.

JOINT CITY-COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
BARREN COUNTY, KENTUCKY

By: _____
Tommy Gumm, Chairman

ATTEST:

Janis Turner, Secretary-Treasurer