

Study Review Committee Meeting Summary

June 24, 2014

The meeting was called to order in the Fiscal Court Conference Room at 9:00 a.m.

Attendance:

Voting Members: Kevin Jeffries, Greg King, Mary Ann Smith, Jan Horton and Denia Crosby

Non-Voting Members: None.

Staff: Jim Urban, Brian Davis, Matt Tolar and Amy Alvey

Others: Doreen Carlson

Approval of Minutes:

The Meeting Summary of the May 27, 2014 meeting was reviewed and approved.

Land Development Code Revisions:

- a. **CO-1 Conservation/Residential Zoning District Discussion** - Brian Davis gave a brief overview of the history and purpose of the CO-1 zoning district. Mr. Davis and GIS Manager Matt Tolar presented discussion maps showing the current CO-1 zoning for an area along North Highway 393 near Harrods Creek.

There are currently 5,764 parcels in Oldham County that are currently zoned CO-1. Approximately 1,747 parcels are located within the floodplain A and AE areas with 4,428 parcels abutting watercourses such as rivers, creeks and streams as identified by USGS. There are 971 parcels abutting creeks and streams identified by Kentucky Division of Water. Staff is recommending eliminating the CO-1 zoning and creating an overlay, much like the floodplain overlay, that would follow the watercourses throughout the county and have a 25, 50 or 75 foot buffer. The parcels that were previously CO-1 and outside the buffer area would revert to the other zoning on parcel or become AG-1 agricultural. Permitted Uses in the CO-1 and AG-1 districts are the same so the property would not lose any permitted use rights with the change. The property would gain an additional eight conditional uses but not retain the conditional use opportunity of having a commercial rifle, pistol and skeet range under current regulations.

Mr. Urban stated that by having a watercourse buffer overlay it would assist in protecting waterways and water quality as required under the current MS4 regulations. The current CO-1 zoning doesn't necessarily follow watercourses, floodplains or steep slopes as it had been intended to do. With new technology the watercourse buffer overlay will better accomplish the true intent of the original CO-1 zoning.

Chairman Jefferies emphasized that public communication and education will be key if this moves forward. Discussion followed.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend that staff produce timelines of the approval by the planning commission and legislative bodies and develop procedures for public notification and input. Motion carried with all members voting yes.

- b. **Accessory Dwelling Units**—Brian Davis distributed accessory dwelling unit affidavits from other communities for review and input from the committee. Discussion followed.

Mr. Urban stated that deed restrictions would be addressed at the time a building permit request is made. It would be possible to add language to the application or affidavit regarding compliance with deed restrictions.

Motion was made and seconded to address the issue of accessory dwelling units, request staff to research issues regarding occupancy restrictions, revenue generating ADUs, home occupations in ADUs and define where ADUs are appropriate. Motion carried with all members voting yes.

- c. **Accessory Structures**—Amy Alvey distributed copies of the current regulations regarding accessory structures and example regulations from Placer County. The current regulations state the accessory structure must be subordinate in scale to the principal structure and only one detached accessory structure is allowed. Staff recommends adopting regulations similar to Placer County where the maximum floor area of the accessory structure is based off the gross acreage of the parcel.

Other issue surrounding accessory structures is the regulation of allowing only one detached accessory structure over 120 square feet per parcel. Many people may have a 12'x12' shed and request to build a detached garage or pool house but would not be able to do so under the current regulations. Staff recommends allowing up to two detached accessory structures per parcel which the combined floor area of both accessory structures not exceeding the maximum floor area allowed under the proposed language.

Motion was made and seconded to not define the language “subordinate in scale” under Section 250-030, Item F and directed staff to develop regulations for size and count of accessory structures and present chart and regulations at next meeting. Motion carried with all members voting yes.

The Study Review Committee will plan to meet again on July 22, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.