

### **3. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

During the development of the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*, one of the most important aspects of the planning process was the communication with and input received from local citizens through a series of public information workshops. Upon completion of draft recommendations, an Open House public meeting is scheduled to get final comments.

Prior to each of the public workshops and the Open House public meeting, over 100 notices were mailed to persons and organizations identified as stakeholders with an interest in the project. Legal notices were also placed in the newspaper, and flyers were distributed or posted at public buildings and other locations throughout the city.

In addition to the public meetings, meetings were also held with the governing bodies of the City of Shelbyville and Shelby County, and presentations were made to the Triple S Planning Commission to get feedback and approval.

The following describes these public involvement activities and how they fit into the overall plan development process:

#### **A. Public Information Workshops**

To better engage the citizens of the area, three public information workshops were held to:

- Provide an open environment to share information on the development of the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*; and
- Provide opportunities for the public to provide input and help guide the development of the Plan.

Input received from these workshops helped to identify key issues and develop land use and transportation alternatives. Following are summaries of the first two public workshops.

#### **Public Information Workshop 1**

A public information workshop was held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on Tuesday, May 23, 2006, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. EDT. As attendees entered the meeting room, they were asked to write their names and contact information on a sign-in sheet. According to the sign-in sheets, 74 persons attended the workshop, including staff and members of the Triple S Planning Commission. Also in attendance were a representative of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and staff from the consultants working on the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*.

At this meeting, the following were presented:

- A brief discussion of the purpose of the meeting;
- Background, project description, and construction schedule for the Bypass; and
- An overview of the project scope and the overall goals of the Plan.

Following these presentations, the attendees were separated into smaller “breakout session” groups and were asked to respond to the following questions:

- What are the advantages of the new Shelbyville Bypass?
- What are the disadvantages of the new Shelbyville Bypass?
- What are the opportunities created by the new Shelbyville Bypass?
- What are the concerns about the new Shelbyville Bypass?

Each of the breakout groups then appointed a representative to present the responses to these questions to all of the attendees. From this, some common themes and issues were identified for use in the development of land use and transportation alternatives, as shown in the lists of actual workshop comments below for each of the questions:

The advantages of the Shelbyville Bypass are ...

- Move traffic efficiently
- Reduce traffic on interior roads
- Economic development possibilities (US 60 to railroad as per comprehensive plan)
- Improve access to park
- Increase property values
- Absolutely none
- Decreased congestion on US 60/Main/Washington
- Better access to Industrial parks
- Provides opportunity to create parkway if properly landscaped and zoned (e.g., Paris Pike)
- Conservation Easement opportunities
- Improved access for emergency services
- Improved access to Clear Creek Park
- If done correctly, it will move traffic
- Faster for emergency services if it remains a true by-pass
- Will re-route truck traffic
- We will not have to widen country roads
- Improve drainage

Disadvantages of the Shelbyville Bypass are ...

- Development increases the need for traffic
- Potential of harming existing infrastructure
- Increased taxes
- Taxes increased – development and growth should pay for itself
- Commercialization of rural property and over growth
- Safety issues/school traffic
- Loss of reinvestment of downtown
- Destruction to environment

- Speed limit
- Noise pollution
- Limited access points/stoplights at 53/55/60
- Merge on and off
- Change in zoning laws
- Damages to existing homes from blasting
- Commercial development would hurt downtown and existing shopping centers
- Loss of green space
- Will not be a by-pass
- Too many entrances
- Too much development
- If developed, lose downtown revitalization
- If regulations not adhered to, lose visual and environmental integrity
- Noise pollution to park area if developed
- Development outside of by-pass
- Pressure to develop

Opportunities created by the Shelbyville Bypass are ...

- Less congestion on US 60
- Increase access to Industrial park
- Easier access to I-64
- Upgrade county roads
- Potential for better planned residential/commercial development
- Increased industrial/commercial businesses
- Smart growth
- Easy access
- More revenue
- Remain a bypass
- Reduce large trucks going through downtown
- Move traffic
- Preservation of green space
- Emergency vehicles will have faster access
- Public safety
- Relieve downtown congestion
- Less pollution in downtown
- Enhance the economic opportunities for existing industrial parks
- Enhance downtown events
- Providing green space to the outside of the Bypass
- Potential park/environmental education areas
- Faster access to east Shelbyville
- Help eliminate truck traffic and pollution to historic downtown
- Keep as natural and professional, visual restriction (e.g., lighting and buildings)

My concerns about the Shelbyville Bypass are ...

- Potential loss of business downtown along US 60 (example – Somerset, Elizabethtown)
- Urban sprawl/unchecked development
- Ruins a good farm/consumption of agricultural land
- Continued appreciation for Clear Creek
- Amount of traffic increased on Burks Branch and at both ends of the Bypass
- Decrease in heritage tourism
- Auto emissions/pollution
- Create a “New Circle Road”
- Landscaping – visually appealing throughout
- Reduce economic activity downtown
- Safety at intersections
- Development north of bypass (presence or absence)
- Proper landscaping
- Will the outside (north) remain agriculture?
- How will it affect traffic on current roads?
- Will you follow the goals and objectives set forth in the comprehensive plan?
- Would there be any consideration to buffering for sound and other aesthetics (lights, landscaping, etc.)?
- Will the city grow from the inside out?
- It will take away our “small town”
- Is there going to be an overpass over the railroad?

After the meeting, these concerns and questions were categorized and summarized as follows:

### **Traffic Access and Congestion**

#### **Pros:**

- More efficient movement of traffic
- Reduction of traffic congestion and truck traffic on interior roads (US 60/Main/Washington)
- Improved access for Clear Creek Park, industrial parks, emergency services, I-64, and East Shelbyville

#### **Cons:**

- New development increases traffic (e.g., Burks Branch Road at both ends of bypass)
- Safety issues with intersections, school traffic, merging on and off, and speed limits
- Numerous access points and the traffic signals at KY 53, KY 55, and US 60

#### **Questions:**

- How will it affect traffic on current roads?
- Is there going to be an overpass over the railroad?
- Will it be a true bypass?
- Where will access points be?

## **Economic and Residential Development**

### **Pros:**

- Increased property values
- Increased opportunity for industrial and commercial businesses (including existing industrial park)
- Opportunity for smart growth/better planned residential/commercial development

### **Cons:**

- Urban sprawl and unchecked development
- Tax increases (development and growth should pay for itself)
- Potential loss of downtown revitalization/reinvestment, downtown businesses, and heritage tourism
- Damage to existing homes (from blasting) and infrastructure

### **Questions:**

- Will the goals and objectives set forth in the comprehensive plan be followed?
- Will there be a change in zoning laws?
- Will the city grow from inside out?
- Will the Bypass take away our “small town?”

## **Environment, Parks, and Green Space**

### **Pros:**

- Conservation easement opportunities
- Provides opportunity to create parkway (if properly landscaped and zoned)
- Reduced pollution downtown
- Potential park and environmental education areas

### **Cons:**

- If regulations are not followed, potential loss of visual and environmental integrity
- Environmental destruction (consumption of agricultural land and green space)
- Emissions and noise pollution from automobiles

### **Questions:**

- Will the outside (north) remain agricultural or be developed?
- Would there be any consideration to buffering for sound and other aesthetics?
- Will there be a continued appreciation for Clear Creek Park?

## **Public Information Workshop 2**

A second public information workshop was held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. EDT. As attendees entered the meeting room, previous attendees signed a special sign-in sheet with their names already affixed, and new attendees were asked to write their names and contact information on a sign-in sheet. According to the sign-in sheets, 54 persons attended the workshop, including staff and members of the Triple S Planning Commission. Also in attendance were staff members from the consultants working on the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*.

At this meeting, the following were presented:

- A brief discussion of the purpose of the meeting;
- The summary of the concerns and questions raised at the first public meeting;
- A review of the Bypass project, including an overview of the roadway geometrics, the railroad crossing, access points, and location of traffic signals;
- Population projections for Shelbyville and Shelby County;
- An overview of environmental issues, including floodplains, wetlands, and historic sites;
- A discussion of relevant information from the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations;
- A presentation on existing and future traffic on the Bypass and other major roads and streets;
- Information on the relationship of land use and traffic, including a handout showing examples of trips generated by selected land use activities; and
- A review of existing land use in the Comprehensive Plan and the actual existing land use based on field reviews.

Following the presentations, the attendees were separated into smaller “breakout session” groups and were asked to develop and present a color-coded future land use map for the study area using designated land use categories. In addition, they were asked to present their desires for landscape buffers, setbacks, entrances, connecting roads, service streets, frontage roads, traffic signals, and signing.

Each of the groups then appointed a representative to present input from the working sessions. The work maps were collected to be used for the development of alternative land use scenarios for the Bypass Corridor.

Based on public input at this meeting, the following comments were also received on needs, plans, and policies for the Bypass Corridor area:

#### **Lighting and Signage**

- Full cut-off lighting at intersections, industrial, and commercial areas (no lighting to leak into surrounding areas.)
- No lighting (except at intersections)
- Signage
  - Restrict style
  - Restrict height
  - Restrict lighting
  - Restrict location
- Agricultural area needs no lighting

#### **Buffering**

- Evergreen buffering along bypass to block any light leaks (mix hardwoods and evergreens: Winter Honeysuckle would be a good example)
- Noise buffers (trees and shrubs)

- Clear Creek buffer
  - 100 feet from FEMA flood plain limit
  - 1000 feet perpendicular to bypass
- No excessive water runoff
- Scenic Corridor along entire bypass
  - Building setbacks
  - Landscape buffer mandatory

### **Development**

- Recognize ways to do low density development outside of the boundary to Scott's Station Road
- Develop outward from downtown, not the Bypass.
- High access intersections
  - Commercial/retail/offices
  - Buffer these uses
  - Step down density
- Develop inside bypass first
- Development should pay for itself
- Landscaping
- Proximity of development to bypass – how close?

A discussion of the third and final public information workshop is presented later in this chapter.

## **B. Meeting with Mayor and City Council**

Prior to the third Public Information Workshop, a special meeting was held with the Shelbyville Mayor Tom Hardesty and the members of the Shelbyville City Council at 6:30 p.m. EDT on Monday, August 14, 2006, at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of the subject study and to get input on land use and transportation issues in the Shelbyville Bypass Corridor. In addition to the Mayor and City Council members, the Chairman of the Triple S Planning Commission, the City/County Planner, two Planning Commission members, and three members of the consultant team were present.

At the meeting with the Mayor and City Council, the project consultants presented the following:

- Maps of the study area and location of the Bypass on (1) an existing land use map and (2) an environmental footprint map;
- A brief description of the roadway design and the location of the possible access points on the Bypass;
- A brief progress report on the work done through July; and
- A summary of input received from the first two public information workshops.

After the presentations, the Mayor and City Council members provided input on transportation and land use issues and controls that they felt should be considered for

the Bypass Corridor. During the discussion, the following issues were generally felt to be the consensus of the City:

- Concentrations of commercial and industrial development should be located in the first section of the Bypass from Shelbyville Road/Midland Trail (US 60) to the railroad on the west side of the City.
- Development along the rest of the Bypass (from the railroad to Eminence Pike east of the city) should be low-density residential, with perhaps a neighborhood commercial area at or near the intersection with Smithfield Road (KY 53).
- Development should occur inside the Bypass before being allowed to occur outside the Bypass, i.e., development outside the Bypass should be discouraged.
  - If possible, development should occur from west to east along the Bypass, leaving the section near Eminence Pike (KY 55) on the east as the last section to be developed.
  - The Plan should be presented in phases, showing how development should occur at intervals of 5 years, 10 years, and beyond.
- All development along the Bypass should be set back with a landscaped buffer zone to enhance the visual aesthetics along the Bypass.
  - Aesthetics should also be considered in the signage and lighting allowed for development along the Bypass.
- The number of access points should be kept to a minimum for any development.
  - A connection should be allowed from the Bypass into the school property south of the Bypass on Smithfield Road (KY 53).
  - Burks Branch Road should be protected as a park access road, so development standards should be consistent with that purpose (e.g., no commercial development should be allowed inside the Bypass).

### **C. Meeting with County Judge-Executive and Fiscal Court**

Prior to the third Public Information Workshop, a special meeting was also held with County Judge-Executive Rob Rothenburger and members of the Fiscal Court at 6:30 p.m. EDT on Tuesday, August 22, 2006, at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status of the subject study and to get input on land use and transportation issues in the Shelbyville Bypass Corridor. Two of the magistrates were absent. In addition to the Fiscal Court members, the Chairman of the Triple S Planning Commission, the City/County Planner, and two members of the project consultant team were present. Some members of the public were also present.

At the meeting with the Fiscal Court, the project consultants presented the following:

- Maps of the study area and location of the Bypass on (1) an existing land use map and (2) an environmental footprint map;
- A brief description of the roadway design and the location of the possible access points on the Bypass;
- A brief progress report on the work done through July; and
- A summary of input received from the first two public information workshops.

After the presentations, the County Judge-Executive and Fiscal Court members provided input on transportation and land use issues and controls that they felt should be considered for the Bypass Corridor. During the discussion, the following issues were raised:

- One fiscal court member stated that no development should be allowed along the Bypass north of the railroad.
- A fiscal court member asked why the Environmental Footprint Map didn't include the conservation district from the Shelby County Future Land Use Map. It was explained that the map was meant to present existing conditions and not zoning. Also, the information on the map is to show available environmental information from existing sources such as FEMA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, EPA, etc.
- It was mentioned that land along bypass should be kept as green space.
- The Inter-local Agreement between the City and County was discussed. One fiscal court member said that the land outside the Bypass should not be subject to development per the Inter-local Agreement. The consultants need to review the Inter-local Agreement for restrictions to development previously agreed upon by county and city.
- Judge Rothenburger asked if the consultants had reviewed comments for the 16 zoning meetings for the existing comprehensive plan. They had not, since those meetings were not specifically about the Bypass; however, the final product, the Comprehensive Plan, was reviewed. The consultant suggested that a community vision statement be developed the next time the comprehensive plan was updated.
- It was mentioned that the watershed should be considered in the proposed land uses.
- It was mentioned that the area north of the Bypass should remain green space.
- It was mentioned that 12 acres have been designated as a park behind Town and Country Subdivision. The consultants were asked if they consulted with the Parks and Recreation Director. The consultants have not, but they do have a copy of the parks map and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.
- Someone asked whom the consultant team had met with previously. The group was advised that the economic/community development specialist met with the Shelby County Industrial and Development Foundation and the Shelby County Tourism Commission. An attendee raised a concern that the development specialist did not meet with the Fiscal Court about economic development. The concern was that a homebuilder has a controlling interest on the Shelby County Industrial and Development Foundation.

#### **D. Final Public Information Workshop**

The third and final public information workshop was held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on Thursday, September 7, 2006, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. EDT. Upon entering the meeting room, previous attendees signed a special sign-in sheet with their names already affixed, and new attendees were asked to write their names and contact information on a sign-in sheet. According to the sign-in sheets, 52 persons attended the workshop, including staff and members of the Triple S Planning

Commission. Also in attendance were staff members from the consultants working on the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*.

At this meeting, the following were presented:

- A brief discussion of the purpose of the meeting;
- A brief review of the plan development activities to date;
- Presentation of transportation alternatives related to the Bypass Corridor;
- A presentation on economic development issues for Shelbyville and Shelby County; and
- Presentation of four alternative land use scenarios for the Bypass Corridor.

Following each of the last three presentations, the attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

At the end of the meeting, attendees were asked to vote on which of the four land use scenario alternatives was preferred.

Further discussions on the input and how it was used in the Bypass Plan development process are included in Chapters 7 and 8.

## **E. Meetings with Planning Commission**

The consultant project team was given the opportunity to be on the meeting agenda of the Triple S Planning Commission on two occasions:

- First, to present transportation and land use alternatives and to get input before finalizing Plan recommendations; and
- Second, to review and/or approve the draft recommendations.

### **Planning Commission Meeting 1**

The first meeting was held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on Tuesday, September 19, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. EDT. At this meeting, the following were presented to the Planning Commission:

- A brief review of the plan development activities to date;
- Presentation of transportation alternatives related to the Bypass Corridor, including a few new alternatives not presented at the September 7th public meeting (new alternatives based on public meeting input, review of the Comprehensive Plan, and a follow-up field review of the study area); and
- Presentation of four alternative land use scenarios for the Bypass Corridor.

After the presentations, the members of the Planning Commission asked questions and provided input on the alternatives. The following issues were raised:

- If additional access points are allowed for new development, a developer would be required to provide a traffic impact study and turning lanes.
- The land use plan should be presented as a 5-year, 10-year, etc., plan to show how development should occur over time.

## Planning Commission Meeting 2

The second meeting was also held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on Tuesday, November 17, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. EDT. Prior to the meeting, Planning Commission members and staff were provided with a draft of the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*. At this meeting, comments were received on the findings and recommendations and on the Plan document, as follows:

- Provide a timeline for the various land use scenarios.
- Clarify that any access directly from the Bypass to new development should be a “boulevard” type design.
- Provide information or examples for standards that should be used for signing, lighting, buffers, landscaping, streets/roadways, etc.

With the understanding that requested revisions would be made to the findings and recommendations and Plan document, the *Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan* was approved for presentation at an open house public meeting.

## F. Final Public Meeting

The final public involvement event was an “open house” public meeting. The meeting was held at the Stratton Community Center in downtown Shelbyville on December ??, 2006, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. EST. At this meeting, the Triple S Planning Commission presented the findings and recommendations of the ***Shelbyville Bypass Corridor Land Use Management Plan*** and invited comments from attendees. Following are key comments from the Open House public meeting:

1. Change apartments on US 60 to Commercial Use
2. More area for residential development – possible low density along north side of bypass
3. Conservation area on Holloway Farm should be re-evaluated – it can be used for residential development, i.e., new treatment plant on creek or pump stations to existing sewer system
4. Light residential development on north side
5. Look at areas for cluster housing 1 to 2 acre tracts with large residential agricultural tracts 20 to 30 acres minimums
6. Like the proposed plan that has been worked up.
7. There should be a buffer (feeder roads) paralleling the bypass. The access points should be kept to an absolute minimum (4-5) at most! Overall the plan for the bypass looks good.
8. Until residential properties (zoned but not developed) are built out, and current housing shows movement toward being filled, there should be no more expansion for housing. Within the city, there is ample room for more without any new. The plan looks good for on into the future.
9. Is all of the Holloway Farm in the flood plain? Can't some of this be used for a nice quality residential development?
10. Correct Ag Color on the Legend

11. More land should be devoted to residential, commercial and industrial development. Recognizing that Shelby County is going to continue to grow and given this bypass corridor's location near the City of Shelbyville, this land seems very appropriate to meet the growing needs of Shelby County now and in the future. Areas that are currently designated in the study as Agriculture/Open space should be designated as Future Farm Districts to take into account the demand for residential growth in this county in the future. To designate this land in this study as Agriculture/Open Space is limited in scope at best. Also, it is my understanding that Kentucky Utilities has infrastructure in place to provide gas and electric service to this area and sewer and water service should be available as well. Given the common stated objective of some to "Preserve the rural character" of Shelby County this seems like the logical way to do so! (by designating the majority of this land as Residential, Commercial, and Industrial)
12. I agree with the above comments. Take advantage of the current infrastructure.
13. As a concerned property owner and business owner of Shelbyville, I think additional low residential areas are needed along the northern side of the bypass. In order to keep our business and other businesses growing and not forced to leave is new growth, which is required to keep from being stagnant. The areas adjacent to the bypass from Harrington Mill to LaGrange would be ideal for low residential. Sewers are available in this watershed for future expansion and also could tie Mill Creek into the bypass. For some reason, people think there is abundant land available for future low residential when, in reality, there is currently not enough after the next few years to keep the local economy growing and attracting new business such as sit-down restaurants and additional quality shopping (better than Wal-Mart). The Painted Stone Farm should also be re-examined to promote future low density residential. I can't see this land being environmentally sensitive since it is being extensively farmed now. There are measures available that can keep on-site contaminants from entering the watersheds.
14. We are the planners and developers of our future. Once land is paved, it is changed forever. We have the responsibility and the ability to make the proper decisions for the future of our land. Keep this in mind when deciding where our next Wal-Mart (etc.) will be or if it is needed at all.
15. Figure 8-7 appears to meet the needed plan.
16. The plan seems to be a fair use of all property and land involved.
17. Bowman Brothers farm owner – The sewer should run out to whoever needs it. Should be able to build commercial and industrial all along the bypass.
18. Owner of a parcel of recommended park land on KY 55 (zoned parks and recreation) is unhappy that the land has zoned as such because the park will never have enough money to buy the property and he is stuck with a parcel of land he can do nothing with.
19. Label site of new schools on map.
20. Property suggested for "neighborhood commercial" is too large and could be used for something more than just a convenient type store with gas as was understood. Could have a neighborhood furniture store which would compete with downtown, or a neighborhood carpet store; or it could be a strip mall which would compete with downtown.

21. Minimize access to the Bypass so it remains a Bypass, not a commercial street that kills the downtown of Shelbyville.
22. Reduce the Commercial Area! Make it truly a Bypass, not a new area of strip malls and ugly signs. We need an east – west connector road, not more big-box stores.
23. Limit the number of access point on Bypass
24. Limit commercial development to US 60 end only.
25. Keep the bypass a bypass and limit a chain reaction of businesses.
26. Be open minded to responsible growth
27. More low density residential on north side of bypass from Harrington Mill to LaGrange Road.
28. More Commercial
29. Maintain an active traffic model/plan for the area – plug-in new development into model.
30. Less commercial the better – stick to area at US 60
31. Please develop bicycle/walking paths
32. Provide area for neighborhood commercial north of bypass at KY 53 intersection