

## Comprehensive Plan public comments

The comments provided in this document were submitted between March 12 and April 16. The comments were gathered via social media and online submission.

1. It is all well & good and I wish it well, but since naming is not a trivial point, AND the Parklands made a big point at RE-NAMING existing parks / areas—why do they get to name the entire south Floyds Fork valley? To the victor goes the naming rights & history.
2. I would like an explanation as to renaming the South Floyds Fork area to the Parklands of Floyds Fork. I live in Fisherville and love the Parklands but this area is much more than a Park and should not be labeled as such. We have North Floyds Fork, why not South Floyds Fork like the name of the South Floyds Fork Vision Study we are undergoing. Who came up with this label and why?
3. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan update presupposes that we allow the west end to shrink by thousands of people while allowing most development to occur in the Parklands area of the county. Under this update it is estimated that the population of downtown will grow by only ~1000 people. This is not sustainable growth. This plan is built on a faulty foundation and will not make our community stronger and wealthier. It suffers from a death by a thousand cuts. Language is included to make everybody happy while not providing a strong vision for where we need to go as a community or how to get there. We can't afford to maintain an urban core that once had 150,000 more residents while growing infrastructure and costs over thousands of acres in the fringes of the community.
4. **(Identical comment submitted by four separate individuals)** As a Louisville resident I am highly concerned about the state of fresh food access in our city. Grocery store closures have left many residents with no convenient option for fresh, affordable groceries. The traditional farmers' market model has failed to thrive in neighborhoods where residents struggle with limited resources. It is essential that the Comprehensive Plan include efforts to combat this injustice. Because corporate grocers and farmers' markets have failed our city's most under-invested communities, I encourage the city to invest in local resources: communities whose ideas and organizers have been written off by power brokers, local nonprofits who are creating innovative solutions for thousands of Louisvillians, and small-scale markets such as Fresh Stop Markets and co-ops. The city should invest directly in these neighborhoods and organizations, giving power and resources to the people affected by food insecurity, as opposed to giving money to outside companies or models that fail to thrive.
5. I am a pedestrian by choice. I use public transit or walk to my destinations. I do not receive any tax deductions for making these sustainable choices while much more affluent citizens receive deductions for buying high-end cars. Meanwhile, in my

neighborhood of Old Louisville there are no places to buy fresh food. As an able-bodied person I can get to the grocery stores further away but this is still an indescribably long, process to execute. I can only imagine how exponentially much more difficult this task is for people with physical handicaps, children to look after, and senior citizens. Even grocery stores and farmers markets do not address the issues faced by many citizens in these neighborhoods. Meanwhile, community run organizations like New Roots have innovated methods which address the myriad problems associated with food apartheid. The city should be investing directly in these programs which proven to have successful solutions to problems the city itself has proven to lack understanding thereof and consequently are not equipped to solve

6. This plan was not developed through a legitimate democratic process and should not be adopted. Up to date drafts were not brought to public review ahead of meetings. Citizen input was ignored and scientific-based contributions from Committee members were also regularly disregarded, which has resulted in poor attention to stormwater management, urban heat island mitigation, and climate change resilience. The public comment period was relegated to SHORT times at the beginning of the meeting before discussion started. It should have been solicited at the beginning middle and end of those meetings because many knowledgeable people were in attendance and had meaningful input to offer after the discussion started. The process was fundamentally flawed by starting with the existing plan as a starting point! Committees developed goals & language that did not find their way into the final plan and I saw Cliff Ashburner facilitate one of the final meetings in an unfair way, not listening to participants or incorporating peoples' concerns. He made executive decisions to alter language in the plan despite months of collaborative processes to develop language. This was not a fair process and he was not a fair facilitator. Citizens' time was wasted as a result and people have lost confidence in the process. One serious concern I have about the plan is that it allows entirely too much development at the outskirts of town and needs to provide more incentives for development downtown, to reduce clearcutting of green spaces in rural areas. It continues Louisville's promiscuity to developers and fails our citizens who DESERVE BETTER. I saw the same failure of democratic leadership in the Paristown Pointe neighborhood where 65% of public comments favored the Underhill proposal and Louisville Metro completely disregarded this input. I am disgusted by this pretense of public engagement and neighbors in Paristown Pointe and the Original Highlands now see how they are being duped by this administration. Anyone who paid attention to the Comprehensive Plan process knows this as well.