

**MINUTES
URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING ITEMS PUBLIC HEARING**

March 22, 2018

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** - The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd Floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

Planning Commission members present: Bill Wilson, Chair; Headley Bell; Will Berkley; Mike Cravens; Larry Forester; Karen Mundy; Mike Owens; Frank Penn; and Carolyn Richardson. Patrick Brewer and Carolyn Plumlee were absent.

Planning staff members present: Jim Duncan, Director; Traci Wade; Tom Martin; Aliza Tourkow; Cheryl Gallt; Hal Baillie; Jimmy Emmons; Chris Woodall; Chris Taylor; and Debbie Woods. Other staff members present were Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering; Casey Kaucher, Division of Traffic Engineering; Captain Greg Lengal and Captain Joshua Thiel, Division of Fire and Emergency Services; and Tracy Jones and Andrea Brown, Department of Law.

Note: Chair Mr. Wilson announced that Mr. Tom Cooper, former member of the Planning Commission was present in the audience.

- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - The approval of the minutes of the February 22, 2018 meeting were not considered at this time. No action taken.

- III. **POSTPONEMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS** - Requests for postponement and withdrawal were considered at this time.

1. **WINCHESTER 836, LLC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & ARLINGTON WEEKLY PAYMENT LOT & INVESTMENT COMPANY'S ADDITION ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. PLN-MAR-17-00041: WINCHESTER 836, LLC (4/14/18)*- petition for a zone map amendment from a Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone to a High Rise Apartment (R-5) zone, for 0.842 net (1.202 gross) acres, for property located at 1104, 1106, 1186 & 1190-1194 N. Limestone. Dimensional variances are also requested.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan's mission statement is to "provide flexible planning guidance to ensure that development of our community's resources and infrastructure preserves our quality of life, and fosters regional planning and economic development." The mission statement notes that this will be accomplished while protecting the environment, promoting successful, accessible neighborhoods, and preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World.

The subject properties are located within the boundary of the Central Sector Small Area Plan (CSSAP), adopted by the Planning Commission in April 2009, specifically Subarea "D". The CSSAP recommends significant streetscape improvements along North Limestone, retention of North Limestone's unique character as a traditional neighborhood retail corridor, utilization of Best Management Practices for stormwater improvements, preservation of structures with historical and cultural value, and provision of adequate and quality affordable housing.

The petitioner proposes to redevelop the entire site with a multi-family apartment building and associated off-street parking. A total of 36 dwelling units are proposed, for a residential density of 42.8 dwelling units per acre. Dimensional variances are also requested in association with the proposed zone change.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Postponement**: for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reasons:

1. The requested High Rise Apartment (R-5) zone is not in agreement with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, and the Central Sector Small Area Plan (CSSAP), for the following reasons:
 - a. The subject property is located within Sub-Area D of the Central Sector Small Area Plan, and North Limestone has been designated as a "neighborhood connector" corridor within this particular area and a "focus area."
 - b. The Central Sector Small Area Plan, within the recommendations stated for Sub-Area D, establishes the priority of retaining the "unique character of North Limestone as a traditional neighborhood retail corridor" and also indicates a need to upgrade the North Limestone streetscape and building façades.
 - c. The Central Sector Small Area Plan encourages providing affordable housing, utilizing Best Management Practices for stormwater improvements, preservation of structures with historical and cultural value, and offering goods and services for local residents. Although the petitioner indicates their intent to offer affordable housing units within the corridor, they have not provided any documentation in that regard.
 - d. The 2013 and 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives both encourage compact and contiguous development, but such infill or redevelopment project should "respect the context and design features of areas surrounding development projects" (Theme A, Goal #2b).
 - e. The R-5 zone allows a Floor Area Ratio of 1.3, far higher than any of the surrounding land uses, and in stark contrast to the R-1C zoning and single-family homes within the Highlawn neighborhood to the southeast. In addition, the applicant is also requesting a front yard setback variance, and has eliminated the usable open space at ground level, both of which would help to improve the urban fabric and the streetscape along N. Limestone. Instead, the proposed

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

residential structure has very little architectural character, with a mass and scale that does not have a positive impact on the streetscape (based upon rendering provided by the applicant).

2. The proposed R-5 zone is not compatible with the character of N. Limestone, nor the nearby single-family residential neighborhood. The petitioner should consider a development that complies with the existing zoning, which would support the Central Sector Small Area Plan, or a less intense residential zone that would be more compatible with the nearby neighborhoods.
3. There have been no unanticipated changes of an economic, physical, or social nature in the immediate area since the adoption of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan that have significantly changed the basic character of the immediate area.

b. REQUESTED VARIANCE

1. Reduce the number of required parking spaces from 55 to 52.
2. Reduce the required front yard from 20 feet to 10 feet.

The Zoning Committee recommended: **Postponement** for the reasons provided by the staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reasons:

- a. Granting the requested front yard variance may alter the character of the general vicinity, which generally respects a 20-foot setback along the N. Limestone corridor.
 - b. Strict application of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance would require a redesign of the associated preliminary development plan and a potential decrease in the number of dwelling units for this redevelopment project. A postponement will provide an opportunity to reconsider the design of the property to more closely reflect the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
 - c. The staff is not supportive of the requested R-5 zone, which the variances are generally contingent upon. Modification of the requested zone and associated floor area ratio may eliminate the need for both variances on the site.
- c. PLN-MJDP-17-00121: ARLINGTON WEEKLY PAYMENT LOT & INVESTMENT COMPANY'S ADDITION (4/14/18)* - located at 1104, 1106, 1186 AND 1190-1194 N. LIMESTONE. (**Vision Engineering**)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-5; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Denote location of covered bus transit stop.
7. Denote diameter of existing trees within the Tree Inventory information.
8. Denote review by the Royal Spring Aquifer Committee required at Final Development Plan.
9. Denote construction access on plan.
10. Provided the Planning Commission grants the requested variances to reduce the N. Limestone front yard and to reduce the required parking.
11. Denote compliance with Article 15-7 Infill and Redevelopment requirements shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
12. Denote compliance with Central Sector Small Area Plan recommendations shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
13. Denote the ability to meet tree canopy requirements shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
14. Discuss cross-section widths for N. Limestone and Carlisle Avenue.
15. Discuss usable open space requirements and compliance utilizing roof top space.

Petitioner Representation: Matt Carter, representing the petitioner, said that they would like to request a postponement to the April 26, 2018 meeting.

Citizen Comment – There were no citizens present to speak to this application.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Owens, seconded by Ms. Richardson, and carried 9-0 (Brewer and Plumlee absent) for postponement of PLN-MAR-17-00041: WINCHESTER 836, LLC and PLN-MJDP-17-00121: ARLINGTON WEEKLY PAYMENT LOT & INVESTMENT COMPANY'S ADDITION to the April 26, 2018 meeting.

Citizen Comment – There were citizens that spoke after the motion was passed. Chair Wilson stated that he asked if there are any citizens from the public wanting to object to the postponement, no one came forward and the motion had already passed. The citizen stated that they couldn't hear the Planning Commission members. Mr. Wilson asked the Commission if there were any objections to going forward with the hearing. Mr. Penn said that the applicant and the staff are still collaborating on this case and that the citizens could write or email their objections to the staff if they were unable to attend next month. Mr. Martin

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

handed out staff business cards to the citizens for a direct contact. Ms. Wade also stated that the staff receives emails at a general planning mailbox, which can be accessed through our website or at planningmailbox@lexingtonky.gov.

2. OVERBROOK FARM, LLC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & SAMFORD & MCCracken FARMS, UNIT 2 & ALFORD PROPERTY ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. PLN-MAR-18-00002: OVERBROOK FARM, LLC (4/14/18)*- petition for a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to a High Density Apartment (R-4) zone, for 19.34 net (20.79 gross) acres and to Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, for 32.19 net (33.76 gross) acres for property located at 2451 and 2525 Armstrong Mill Road.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan's mission statement is to "provide flexible planning guidance to ensure that development of our community's resources and infrastructure preserves our quality of life, and fosters regional planning and economic development." The mission statement notes that this will be accomplished while protecting the environment, promoting successful, accessible neighborhoods, and preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan has established six themes, with goals and objectives to support each of the themes, which include: Growing Successful Neighborhoods (Theme A), Protecting the Environment (Theme B), Creating Jobs and Prosperity (Theme C), Improving a Desirable Community (Theme D), Maintaining a Balance between Planning for Urban Uses and Safeguarding Rural Land (Theme E) and Implementing the Plan for Lexington-Fayette County (Theme F).

The petitioner proposes to rezone the subject site in order to develop a mix of single-family homes, townhouses, and apartment buildings on 51.53 net acres. A total of 363 dwelling units are proposed, for a residential density of approximately 7 dwelling units per acre. A traffic study was submitted with the requested zone change.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Referral** to the full Commission.

The Staff Recommends: **Postponement**, for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has not demonstrated consideration of Comprehensive Plan recommendations related to the placement of the higher density uses (those within the R-4 zone) along the higher intensity roadway of Armstrong Mill Road.
 2. The applicant has not provided a plan that creates a sense of place, properly locates dwellings with differing densities, has single-loaded streets, and is centered around a neighborhood focal point.
 3. Environmentally sensitive features need to be discussed and possibly better protected, including topography and floodplains.
 4. Placement of a trail within the floodplain around the Armstrong Mill Road tributary needs to be discussed, as this natural feature should be an amenity to all residents of this development. Staff and the applicant need to meet to determine whether this should be a greenway dedicated to LFUCG or if the HOA should maintain ownership.
 5. The ownership and upkeep of the community park needs to be determined. Staff and the applicant need to meet with the Division of Parks and Recreation to determine if LFUCG ownership is advisable or if the HOA should maintain ownership.
- b. PLN-MJDP-18-00008: SAMFORD & MCCracken FARMS, UNIT 2 & ALFORD PROPERTY (4/14/18)* - located at 2451 and 2525 ARMSTRONG MILL RD. (**Vision Engineering**)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-3 & R-4; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas & steep slopes.
7. Bike & Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
8. Denote 25' floodplain setback.
9. Denote no access to Armstrong Mill except for street intersections.
10. Clarify number of townhomes in the site statistics.
11. Provided the Planning Commission grants a waiver to Article 6-8(q)(2)(d) of the Land Subdivision Regulations.
12. Denote connection (entrance) to future Squires Trail shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
13. Discuss capacity of existing pump station.
14. Discuss relocation of proposed multifamily units between floodplain and Armstrong Mill Road.
15. Discuss landscaping adjacent to Armstrong Mill Road.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Petitioner Representation: Nick Nicholson, attorney, said that they would like to request a postponement to the April 26, 2018 meeting.

Citizen Comment – There were no citizens present to speak to this application.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Ms. Mundy, and carried 9-0 (Brewer and Plumlee absent) for postponement of PLN-MAR-18-00002: OVERBROOK FARM, LLC and PLN-MJDP-18-00008: SAMFORD & MCCracken Farms, Unit 2 & Alford Property to the April 26, 2018 meeting.

- IV. **LAND SUBDIVISION ITEMS** - The Subdivision Committee met on Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was attended by Commission members: Karen Mundy, Carolyn Plumlee, and Headley Bell. Committee members in attendance were: Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering; and Casey Kaucher, Division of Traffic Engineering. Staff members in attendance were: Jim Duncan; Traci Wade; Chris Woodall; Tom Martin; Cheryl Gallt; Denise Bullock; Jimmy Emmons; Scott Thompson; Captain Greg Lengal & Captain Joshua Thiel, Division of Fire & Emergency Services; Tracy Jones, Department of Law. The Committee made recommendations on plans as noted.

General Notes

The following automatically apply to all plans listed on this agenda unless a waiver of any specific section is granted by the Planning Commission:

1. All preliminary and final subdivision plans are required to conform to the provisions of Article 5 of the Land Subdivision Regulations.
2. All development plans are required to conform to the provisions of Article 21 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- V. **ZONING ITEMS** - The Zoning Committee met on Thursday, March 1, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. to review zoning map amendments and Zoning Ordinance text amendments. The meeting was attended by Commission members Mike Cravens, Carolyn Richardson, and Bill Wilson. Staff members in attendance were: Traci Wade; Tom Martin; Debbie Woods; Tracy Jones, Department of Law. The Committee members reviewed applications and made recommendations as noted.

A. **ABBREVIATED PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS**

The staff will call for objectors to determine which petitions are eligible for abbreviated hearings.

Abbreviated public hearings will be held on petitions meeting the following criteria:

- The staff has recommended approval of the zone change petition and related plan(s)
- The petitioner concurs with the staff recommendations
- Petitioner waives oral presentation, but may submit written evidence for the record
- There are no objections to the petition

- B. **FULL PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS** - Following abbreviated hearings, the remaining petitions will be considered.

The procedure for these hearings is as follows:

- Staff Reports (30 minute maximum)
- Petitioner's report(s) (30 minute maximum)
- Citizen Comments
 - (a) proponents (10 minute maximum OR 3 minutes each)
 - (b) objectors (30 minute maximum) (3 minutes each)
- Rebuttal & Closing Statements
 - (a) petitioner's comments (5 minute maximum)
 - (b) citizen objectors (5 minute maximum)
 - (c) staff comments (5 minute maximum)
- Hearing closed and Commission votes on zone change petition and related plan(s)

Note: Requests for additional time, stating the basis for the request, must be submitted to the staff no later than two days prior to the hearing. The Chair will announce its decision at the outset of the hearing.

1. **OFF SEASON, LLC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & HINDA HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION, BLK B ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. PLN-MAR-18-00001: OFF SEASON, LLC (4/14/18)*- petition for a zone map amendment from a Single-family Residential (R-1C) zone to a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone, for 2.09 net (2.60 gross) acres, for property located at 3009, 3013 & 3021 Tates Creek Road.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan's mission statement to "provide flexible planning guidance to ensure that development of our community's resources and infrastructure preserves our quality of life, and fosters regional planning and economic development." The mission statement notes that this will be accomplished while protecting the environment, promoting successful, accessible neighborhoods, and preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World.

The petitioner proposes to develop 14 townhouses on the subject properties, and associated off-street parking. The proposed residential density is 6.7 dwelling units per net acre.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval**.The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

1. The Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone is in substantial agreement with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, for the following reasons:
 - a. The Goals and Objectives of the Plan recommend to expand housing choices within the community (Theme A, Goal #1); to support infill and redevelopment (Theme A, Goal #2); and to uphold the Urban Services Area concept by encouraging development of vacant and underutilized properties (Theme E, Goal #1).
 - b. The proposed townhouses (and their associated density) are compatible with the surrounding area, which is encouraged by Theme A, Goal #2. The development is residential in nature, as is the surrounding zoning, and the development will respect the area's context and design features.
 - c. The proposed density is in keeping with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan to encourage infill sites of between two and five acres to develop at or above the average density of the area in which they are built (pg 102).
 - d. The subject site is situated along a minor arterial roadway, with adequate public infrastructure to serve the proposed use, and the higher density development will buffer the established neighborhood from the higher intensity use of the churches along the opposite side of Bates Creek Road.
 - e. The proposed single-family attached dwelling units (townhouses) are compatible with the surrounding residential zoning and land use pattern. The units are of a size that is similar to other residential uses in the immediate area (between 3,000 and 4,000 square feet each), which should not detract from the existing urban form along Bates Creek Road in the immediate vicinity.
 2. The proposed infill and redevelopment of the subject site along the Bates Creek Road corridor is supported by the adopted 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives, including "accommodate the demand for housing in Lexington responsibly, prioritizing higher density and mixture of housing types (Theme A, Goal #1, Obj. b.); and "maximize development on vacant land within the Urban Service Area and promote redevelopment of underutilized land in a manner that enhances existing urban form and/or historic features" (Theme E, Goal #1, Obj. d.).
 3. This recommendation is made subject to the approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-18-00002: Hinda Heights Subdivision, Blk B (Old Stone Townhouses), prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.
- b. PLN-MJDP-18-00002: HINDA HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION, BLK B (4/14/18)* - located at 3009, 3013 and 3021 Bates Creek Road. (**EA Partners**)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property R-3; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Denote: No building permits shall be issued unless and until a final development plan is approved by the Planning Commission.
6. Denote height of townhouses in feet on plan.
7. Denote typical lot size.
8. Denote the internal pedestrian system shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan.
9. Denote: stormwater management shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
10. Denote: The 125' setback shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan.

Staff Presentation - Ms. Wade presented the staff report and recommendations for the zone change. She displayed photographs of the subject property and aerial photographs of the general area. She said the subject property consists of 3 parcels and the applicant wishes to construct 14 townhomes with off-street parking. Two of the parcels are vacant lots and the other lot has a single-family residential structure, which was previously used as a small church. She said that the staff has received a number of correspondence, all of them in opposition of this zone change.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Ms. Wade said that the applicant believes this request is in agreement with 2013 and 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives. The staff agrees with the applicant that the zone change will expand housing choices, near employment and commercial areas; support infill and redevelopment throughout the Urban Service Area; and maintain a balance between planning for urban uses and safeguarding our rural lands while upholding our Urban Service Area concept. She said Chapter 7 of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan regarding infill sites between 2 and 5 acres to develop at or above the average density of the area which they are built. She said the applicant is proposing a density of 6.7 dwelling units per acre. She said the Goals and Objectives of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan are also relevant, specifically regarding prioritizing higher-density and mixture of housing types and to maximize development on vacant land within the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Wade said that the proposed zone change is in agreement with 2013 and 2018 Comprehensive Plan's and the staff recommended approval. She said that the Zoning Committee also recommended approval.

Development Plan Presentation – Mr. Martin presented a rendering of the preliminary development plan associated with the zone change. He said that the development plan depicts access from Bates Creek Road, with an access easement to serve the development. He said the applicant is proposing two banks of townhouses, which will be 2 1/2 stories tall. He said the R-3 zone has a maximum building height of 35 feet, regardless of the type of unit, which is the same for some of the neighboring single-family homes. He said that after concern with the monolithic appearance of a wall in this area, the applicant submitted a revised plan with the buildings approximately 60 feet from the roadway, instead of the platted setback of 125 feet. He said that the access has been fully reviewed and the concern is the right in/right out with respect to the location of the break in the median on Bates Creek Road. He said the residents will be required to make a U-turn to travel into downtown Lexington, and make a U-turn to enter the proposed development when traveling from New Circle Road, just as is required for the lots now.

Mr. Martin said there are the standard sign-off conditions for a preliminary development plan. He said condition #6 concerns denoting height of the townhouses in feet and lot size being proposed. He said in condition #8, the internal pedestrian system should be resolved at the time of the final development plan. Referring to condition #9, Mr. Martin stated that stormwater management will also be resolved at the time of the final development plan. He said that there is currently a basin in front of the Greek Orthodox Church, which will need to be addressed and be resolved at the time of the final development plan. He said that condition #10, the 125-foot setback, shall also be resolved at the time of the final development plan. He added that the developers cannot build off a preliminary development plan; conflicts, such as the setbacks will be highlighted on the final development plan, that they can obtain permits based upon. He said that the Subdivision Committee recommended approval of this plan.

Commission Questions – Mr. Owens asked about the height of the proposed wall/fence. Mr. Martin said that the applicant will need to meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements. Mr. Owens asked what the Ordinance states. Mr. Martin said that it currently states a wall or fence is limited to 4 feet tall in the front yard and 8 feet in the side and rear yards.

Applicant Presentation – Darby Turner, attorney, was present representing the petitioner. He said to Mr. Owens' question that a double-faced brick wall be built around the entire development. He said that it will 4 feet in the front and 4-6 feet on the sides and rear. He said the applicant is in agreement with the staff's recommendations and the conditions. He said this proposal is in compliance with the new 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives. He said that there is discussion in the correspondence that there will be a precedent set. He believes that this direction has already been set by the Long Range Planning staff in the process of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives that this is what the community wanted.

Mr. Turner stated that the applicant is proposing 14 upscale townhouses, which will be approximately 3,000 square feet each with 2 car attached garages, first floor master bedrooms, and a possible basement. He said the intent is not for students, but for a home for empty-nesters.

Mr. Turner said that he has met with residents that are in favor and opposed to this development and has tried to meet with the Neighborhood Association, which had declined to meet with the applicant.

The following citizens were present in opposition to this application:

Peter Sawaya, 3001 Bates Creek Road, represented the Greek Orthodox Church. He doesn't believe Bates Creek Road is a minor arterial roadway and that it is already congested during peak times. He is concerned with the increase of traffic and the possibility of accidents at the intersection of Rebecca Drive. He is concerned about the brick wall. He said that the area currently has large trees with an open landscape and believes that the wall will make it look like an institution. He is also concerned that if the subject property is approved for R-3 zoning then what assurance do they have that the developer will follow the plan in the future.

Steven White, Councilmember At Large with the Glendover Neighborhood Association. He said that they polled approximately 400 residents of the neighborhood, which resulted in 255 residents that opposed, 5 supported and 2 undecided (petition submitted for the record). He was concerned that the residents' personal comments that were sent to the staff were shared with the applicant. He gave a brief history of the subject property and said Bates Creek Road is not the same level as Nicholasville Road

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

or Richmond Road. He is concerned about the precedence the developer is setting and the land will become more valuable as an R-3 zone and what could happen if other residents in the neighborhood sell their homes for development. He is also concerned about the amount of the setback change and was confused about why the applicant did not request an R-1T zone for their development.

Barry Saturday, 3416 Laredo Dr., Candidate for Council in the 4th district and president of Ashwood Townhouses of Laredo Homeowners Association. He believes that this development will erode the character of the area. He said that Lexington does need infill, but he opined that Bates Creek Road meets the character for that. He is concerned with increased stormwater runoff. He said that increasing parking lots will increase stormwater runoff. He said that he believes that this will create a negative buffer along the corridor. He said that higher density on Nicholasville Road fits with that character; it doesn't fit with Bates Creek Road community.

Tom Cooper, 826 Glendover Cove, said that he is concerned with the concentration/density of the proposed development. He said that the R-3 zone is excessive.

James Schrader, 805 Old Dobbin Road, said that he is a proponent of infill, when it is appropriate. He believes that a single-family home with 125-foot setback should be constructed there. He cited the 2018 Comprehensive Plan and said that the Plan is designed to create a vision and strategy that will allow Lexington to grow and prosper while preserving, protecting and enhancing the existing neighborhoods. He said that he doesn't believe this development will preserve, protect or enhance their neighborhood. He quoted Planning Commission member Mr. Cravens who said that he had been driving the corridor for many years and stated that this development doesn't feel right. Mr. Schrader agreed that it doesn't feel like it belongs there either. He said that along the corridor there are only 3 structures that are not single-family homes and they are churches.

Joe Martinolich, 3013 Shirlee Ct., said that he is concerned with the setback of the development and that single-family homes established this neighborhood, so this proposal is out of character. He is also concerned with the safety issue with traffic.

Julie Tatar, 814 Glendover Cove Road, also said that this development doesn't fit the character of this area.

Barry Walling, 3005 Shirlee Ct., said that he is concerned with increased traffic at the intersection of Rebecca Drive. He said that employees from the hospitals use it as a cut through in the neighborhood.

Applicant Rebuttal – Mr. Turner said that he also grew up in the area and things change. He said that the decision was made with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan that things are going to change even more with density and efficiency. He said that these are single-family homes but are built as townhouses, and are in character with the neighborhood. He displayed the Hinda Heights deed restriction document from Mr. Johnson from 1952, which created a covenant that ran with this land, creating the 125-foot setback. He read that these restrictions should "run for a period of 50 years." This document also restricted that only single-family residents could be constructed, but there are three churches in this area now. He said that the 125-foot setback has expired and the importance of the efficient development of land calls for a reduction of this setback. He said that the proposed townhouses are approximately 75 feet away from the roadway. He displayed aerial photographs depicting the different setbacks of buildings along the Bates Creek Road corridor.

Citizen Rebuttal – Mr. Saturday said that Lexington is unique in character and change is inevitable. He said that change needs to make sense and needs to fit into the long term vision of the city. He doesn't believe that this development meets the long term vision for this area.

Mr. Sawaya said that access into the proposed development should either be off Rebecca Drive or in the rear of the site. He believes having the access off of Bates Creek Road is a bad idea.

Jason Redsick, 1909 Bellefonte Dr., said that he is concerned with the 14 townhomes. He also commented that all the citizens present are very passionate about their homes and are here on their own time.

John Douglas, 783 Rebecca Dr., said that he is concerned with the traffic and recalled an accident that occurred a few days ago. He believes that single-family homes should be constructed at this location. He said that approval of this will be setting a precedent.

Tom Reed, 3033 Shirlee Dr., said he is concerned with the flexibility of the R-3 zone. He said that the precedent that the flexibility sets for extending down the corridor of future development is not desirable.

Mr. White said that this property is not 2 acres of land and asked if the calculation of the lot size is valid for the density.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Staff Rebuttal – Ms. Wade said that Mr. Turner is correct, that the Planning Commission did adopt the Goals & Objectives that are different from the past, which is a direction of densification. She said that the community asked for this, the Planning Commission is standing behind it and Urban County Council has also endorsed it. She said that the staff wanted to clarify regarding the density calculation; the staff calculates density based on the total acreage of land that is being proposed for development divided by the number of units being proposed. This is a standard method and is valid.

Mr. Martin clarified that the R-3 zone defaults to the R-1T zone in terms of the lot requirements, and this same development could be proposed as an R-1T zone as long as the lotting requirements were met. He also said that any change in this plan, will go before this Commission again before being constructed.

Commission Question - Ms. Mundy asked Mr. Turner if the neighborhood association refused to meet with him. Mr. Turner said that he asked to meet with the neighborhood association and they responded that they have a meeting set for today. Ms. Mundy said that the townhouses will be between 3,000-3,800 square feet. Mr. Turner said that they will approximately 3,000 square feet, with intent for a basement, but they are unaware if that is feasible at this time. Ms. Mundy asked what the average size of the houses are in this area. Mr. Turner said the houses are 2,000 square feet and greater. Ms. Mundy asked if the lot was surveyed before the data was provided to the staff to prove the correct acreage of the lot. Mr. Turner said the net acreage is 2.09 and the gross is 2.60 acres.

Mr. Cravens asked Mr. Turner if they had tried other scenarios, different zones. Mr. Turner said that the developer considered what all the possibilities could be and saw the product that was most viable for this neighborhood, which was for generous townhouses for people that have nice homes and are considering downsizing.

Mr. Penn asked Mr. Turner, "Why is the R-3 zone being requested and not the R-1T zone?" Mr. Turner said that it has to do with lot coverage regulations. He said that the R-1T zone would have created other issues and they are producing the same product. He stated for the record the applicant's intentions and the reasons why and if a different developer ends up coming back to the Planning Commission with a different development plan, it will be considered as a new application.

Mr. Bell asked what would be the traffic impact near the Greek Orthodox Church. Ms. Kaucher, Division of Traffic Engineering, said they reviewed the preliminary development plan and on final development plan the location of the entrance will most likely be shifted further away from the median cut. She said the traffic generated by this development will be minimal. She said that residential land use doesn't produce the number of trips to meet the threshold to be concerned about traffic. She said the access is a right in/right out and the residents will need to travel to the nearest curb cut to turn around.

Mr. Wilson asked about the cut back and how it will affect the traffic flow. Ms. Kaucher said the access location of the development is currently very close to the median cut, which does encourage the cheat method. She said that shifting the development access adjacent to the Orthodox Church entrance will provide a greater distance for the vehicles and will force them to use Rebecca Drive.

Chairman's Comments – Chairman Wilson stated that the hearing was now "closed," and he opened the floor for discussion. Commission members discussed their thoughts at this time.

Commission Discussion – Ms. Mundy thanked all of the citizens for attending the meeting. She said that she had wished they had met with the applicant to clear up some of their concerns and to clarify issues so that they may have had a better understanding of what is going on. She said that based on the fact that the 2018 Goals & Objectives do implement the desire of more density and moving toward infill and redevelopment, she would be voting to approve this development.

Zoning Action – A motion was made by Ms. Mundy, seconded by Mr. Owens, to approve PLN-MAR-18-00001: OFF SEASON, LLC, for the reasons provided by the staff.

Motion Discussion - Mr. Penn said that if this property was six separate single-family houses, the same issues and concerns would arise. He said that the R-1T zone would not diminish the neighborhood concerns either. He said that at the time of the final development plan, the neighbors will be notified.

Mr. Cravens stated that this is a completely different plan than what was presented to the Zoning Committee on March 1, 2018. He said that the applicant has made many changes.

Mr. Owens said that the word "precedence" was mentioned and said that each application has a different set of circumstances. They look at each of them individually, as an individual application, and the Planning Commission doesn't have precedence setting.

Zoning Action – Motion carried 9-0 (Brewer and Plumlee absent).

Mr. Wilson also thanked members of the community for attending and expressing their concerns.

Development Plan Action – A motion was made by Ms. Mundy, seconded by Mr. Owens, carried 9-0 (Brewer and Plumlee absent) to approve PLN-MJDP-18-00002: HINDA HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION, BLK B, for the reasons provided by the staff.

Note: Planning Commission took a recess at 3:12 p.m. until 3:20 p.m.

2. THE FOUNTAINS AT PALOMAR, LLC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & HOOVER & FORD PHILPOT PROPERTY ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. PLN-MAR-18-00004: THE FOUNTAINS AT PALOMAR, LLC (4/29/18)*- petition for a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Urban (A-U) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, for 12.23 net (15.52 gross) acres, and from a Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, for 4.17 net (5.16 gross) acres, for property located at 3801, 3901 and 3995 Harrodsburg Road.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2018 Comprehensive Plan's mission statement is to "provide flexible yet focused planning guidance to ensure equitable development of our community's resources and infrastructure that enhances our quality of life, and fosters regional planning and economic development." The Plan's mission statement notes that this will be accomplished while protecting the environment, promoting successful, accessible neighborhoods, and preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World.

The 2018 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives were recently adopted in November 2017. The Goals and Objectives encourage a mix of uses, housing types and/or residential densities within the Urban Service Area boundary; promote well-designed neighborhoods and communities; ensure all types of development are environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable to accommodate future growth needs of all residents; emphasize redevelopment of underutilized corridors; promote redevelopment of underutilized land in a manner that enhances existing urban form; support the Complete Streets concept, prioritizing a pedestrian-first design that also accommodates the needs of bicycle, transit and other vehicles; and provision of land for a diverse workforce, with emphasis on success and growth of strategically-targeted employment sectors. In addition, the body of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan reinforces these or similar concepts.

The petitioner proposes a rezoning to Highway Services Business (B-3) zone with conditional zoning restrictions in order to construct a community shopping center with a hotel, and its associated off-street parking areas. A traffic study was submitted with the requested zone change.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: Referral to the full Commission.

The Staff Recommends: Disapproval, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed Highway Services Business (B-3) zone is inappropriate for the subject property for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed zoning category is not compatible with the single-family residential development in the Palomar neighborhood.
 - b. The allowed uses in the B-3 zone, even with the proposed restrictions, are not appropriate along a minor arterial roadway, which is intended as a connector between the major arterial corridors within our community. Generally, uses such as hotels, car washes, major and minor auto repair, automobile sales (even electric autos), etc. should not be located in such close proximity to residential land and are often restricted by the Planning Commission and Council during zone change requests.
 - c. The Highway Services Business (B-3) zone is intended to be located along the highways within our community, which are generally the major arterial roadways. Although Harrodsburg Road is a highway, the traffic counts at this location are that of a minor arterial roadway. Other B-3 locations within the community are either part of a unified plan that supports placemaking (such as Beaumont), or are part of a regional shopping center. The subject property does not satisfy either of these standards.
 - d. The petitioner should consider the B-6P or MU-3 zone for this location, as both would be considered appropriate for the site and offer a wider range of land uses than the proposed B-3 zone. Both of these two zones allow for a more efficient use of the limited land available inside of the Urban Service Area boundary. A B-6P zone already exists across Man O' War Boulevard from the subject site.
2. The proposed development, as depicted, may create a neighborhood business opportunity, but many of the allowed land uses and the building height allowances in a B-3 zone - even considering the restriction offered by the petitioner - would be out of character with the surrounding area and could have a negative impact on the adjoining land uses.
3. The application proposes conditional zoning restrictions that specifically prohibit entertainment type land uses, which is contrary to their justification statement, and does not support the concept of placemaking set out in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. Commercial developments should be offering more entertainment and social connection opportunities, yet the petitioner is proposing to prohibit those uses that would invite the surrounding community to experience the development

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

(carnivals, special events, festivals, and concerts; commercial farm markets and market gardens; indoor amusement, such as bowling alleys, dancing establishments, skating rinks, miniature golf, billiard halls; nightclubs; and athletic facilities).

4. The 2018 Goals and Objectives state that "pedestrian-first design" should be utilized to accommodate the needs of bicycle, transit and other vehicles; and that redevelopment of underutilized land should be maximized in a manner that enhances the existing urban form and/or historic features. The petitioner's corollary development plan, which would be allowed within a B-3 zone, does not meet these recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.
5. There have not been any unanticipated changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area that have substantially altered the basic character of the area since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2013 that would support the requested zone change to a B-3 zone.

- b. PLN-MJDP-18-00012: HOOVER & FORD PHILPOT PROPERTY (4/29/18)* - located at 3801, 3901 & 3955 HARRODSBURG RD. (**GRW Engineering**)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property B-3; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Bike & Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
8. Denote Department of Highway's approval of access (Harrodsburg Road) shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
9. Discuss access to Glade Court.
10. Denote addition of sidewalk to both sides of all service roads shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
11. Denote any proposed patio seating and required parking shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
12. Resolve right in/out and Harrodsburg Road improvements.
13. Discuss spacing of full-signalized access per KYDOT requirements.

Staff Zoning Presentation - Ms. Wade said that the staff had received a number of correspondence, to be entered into the record, both in support and opposition to the proposed zone change. She said that the staff also received two letters submitted, which were distributed to the Planning Commission. Staff said there were 11 in support and 11 in opposition. She said that staff would like to enter the following documents into the record: the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, in total; the 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives; and a slideshow the staff prepared about the Potential of Placemaking in Lexington; these were also distributed to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Wade presented and summarized the staff report on this zone change. She displayed aerial photographs and site photographs of the subject property. She said that the subject property has been partially developed since 1980. The United Methodist Church has been there for 35 years. The Hoover property has a residential structure that had been converted into a restaurant, and it also has additional commercial development on its side. She said the subject property is bordered by the Palomar neighborhood, with single-family homes, on the north and west. She said that the residential structure that houses the restaurant did experience some structural damage and the applicant contends that it can't be rehabilitated and is being proposed to be removed.

Ms. Wade gave a brief history of the subject property. She said the two Hoover properties had a zone change to the B-1 zone in 1998, with conditional zoning restrictions to preserve open space on the site and mandate only one use for the property (restaurant). Another zone change was granted in 2006 to expand the B-1 zone to the rest of the Hoover property in order to build the small commercial development that is on the hill.

Ms. Wade said the applicant is requesting the B-3 zone for the subject property. The applicant is proposing an organic grocery, hotel, pharmacy/retail store, and small retail spaces, and six restaurants. She said that the two tallest building will be located closest to the Palomar neighborhood, which are the hotel and anchor store. The anchor store is proposed to be 45 feet tall and hotel is proposed to be 75 feet tall. She said that Glade Ct. is currently a stub street, which is not proposed to be extended into the development; it is proposed to have a pedestrian connection but no vehicular access. She said the applicant has proposed three access points: one on Man o' War Blvd. and two on Harrodsburg Road.

Ms. Wade said the applicant contends that the 2013 Comprehensive Plan is being met with this application as cited in their justification. She said the applicant contended that the restricted B-3 zone is in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan, they made a list of numerous Goals & Objectives, but didn't provide much information of why it is appropriate or how the request addressed the policies of the Plan. She said the staff reviewed the application referencing the 2013 Comprehensive Plan and the 2018 Goals & Objectives. She quoted the Plan's mission statement, "to provide flexible yet focused planning guidance to ensure equitable development of our community's resources and infrastructure that enhances our quality of life, and fosters

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

regional planning and economic development. This will be accomplished while protecting the environment, promoting successful, accessible neighborhoods, and preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World."

Ms. Wade summarized the five themes from the 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals & Objectives, which are: growing successful neighborhoods; protecting the environment; creating jobs and prosperity; improving a desirable community; and maintaining a balance between Planning for Urban uses and safeguarding rural land. She said the 2013 Comprehensive Plan supports these statements by referencing placemaking, sustainability, and walkability, which are encouraged in every zone change. She said that staff wants sociability, users to be active, and the public to be invited to a place, whether it is a shopping center or a park.

Ms. Wade said that all of the elements of Placemaking need to be present in order for it to work. She said that it will need to be walkable and easy to get to and from, with context-sensitive site development, which will make it responsive to the neighborhood.

Ms. Wade displayed a comparison of shopping centers depicting the open space and the social interaction, along with the entertainment that entice a public to come to the shopping center and stay there. She said the intent of the Highway Service Business (B-3) zone is for retail and other uses that are necessary to the economic vitality of the community. The Comprehensive Plan should be used to determine locations for this zone but also special consideration should be given to relationships of those uses in the zone to the surrounding land uses and verifying that our streets are adequate to accommodate the traffic. She said that the B-3 zone is appropriate along major arterial highways that are auto oriented and non-neighborhood oriented, such as New Circle Road and parts of Nicholasville Road and Richmond Road.

Ms. Wade said the applicant's justification statement only addressed the proposed B-3 zone with one sentence as follows: "Rezoning all of the subject property to a larger unified B-3 zone (vs. B-1) would allow for a rebranding, increased visibility and appropriate utilization of this portion of the Subject Property." She said that the staff doesn't agree that this is the only zoning option and believes that there are other options that more fully support the Comprehensive Plan in terms of zoning, such as the B-6P zone or a mixed-use community zone. She said that the applicant is proposing to locate the two tallest buildings closest to the existing single-family residential neighborhood, and the staff would like them to be located away from the residents, in order to create a land use buffer and not just a landscape buffer. She said that the applicant is proposing to restrict some live entertainment conditions, which the staff believes would be needed to make the commercial center an experience by offering entertainment, special events, live music, farmers markets, and athletic clubs.

Ms. Wade said the staff has met with the applicant numerous times in an attempt to improve this development with little or no response from the applicant. She said the Zoning Committee recommended referral and the staff is recommending disapproval of the requested zone change for this location. Ms. Wade summarized the staff's findings for disapproval.

Development Plan Presentation - Mr. Martin presented a rendering of the preliminary development plan associated with the zone change. He said that the staff reviews the plan for its compliance with the requested zone. He identified the proposed buildings. He said that proposed development is over 214,000 square feet in size, with 631 parking spaces, which the requirement is only 595 spaces. He said this is a typical plan for a B-3 zone, with the orientation and layout being about the individual uses and the parking. He identified the access point off of Man o' War Blvd. to serve the interior of the development. He identified the right-in/right-out and the full access points that are being proposed off of Harrodsburg Road. He also identified the location of Glade Court, which the applicant is proposing only bicycle and pedestrian access.

Mr. Martin said there are standard sign offs and clean up condition for the plan. He said the applicant is proposing an internal sidewalk system. He said the staff had some concerns of the functionality of the sidewalks, and making sure that they would be located on both sides of the service entrances. He stated that this detail could be resolved at the time of the final development plan. He said the applicant needs to define the seating requirements of the restaurants, in order for the staff to determine the parking ratio that will be needed. He said the applicant has agreed to the landscaping along the arterial roadways, which will also be further addressed at the time of the final development plan. He said the staff is recommending certain standards be utilized, such as the same landscaping that is required on Man o' War Boulevard.

Mr. Martin said that the staff stressed the importance of the access into this development. The state will need to approve a new traffic signal on Harrodsburg Road. He said that none of the access points meet the Subdivision Regulations and the applicant will need waivers on the spacing of the access points. He said that Glade Court stubs into the property and staff doesn't believe that opening it will have much of a negative impact on the short distance between Glade Court and Lyon Drive. He said the staff is also concerned about the functionality of Glade Court being a bicycle and pedestrian access, due to the relationship to the loading dock of the grocery store, which needs to be addressed and resolved at the time of the final development plan. He said that the Division of Traffic Engineering has concerns with the right-in/right-out on Harrodsburg Road, because of its proximity to the full access proposed further south on Harrodsburg Road. He said the Subdivision Committee did recommend approval of the proposed plan.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Traffic Study - Jimmy Emmons presented the MPO staff report on the submitted Traffic Impact Study for this zone change. He said that staff was concerned with the applicant's methodology used for this development, which was labeling this as a "mixed-use" area. He said that would allow them to take an internal capture discount of the total amount of traffic that's generated for this development, which is 34% in the overall traffic. He said that in 2017, the Institute of Traffic Engineers adopted the 10th edition of the Trip Generation Methodology to calculate vehicle trips, which the staff referenced. He said areas that have retail, office, and residential have synergy and work best as a "mixed-use" development.

Mr. Emmons said that staff disagreed with the applicant's assumption that this is a mixed-use development; staff categorized it as a shopping center with a hotel. He said that with that category, the staff calculated less traffic generation than the applicant did. He said that the staff can accept that the trip generation numbers that the applicant has proposed for their analysis are reasonable.

Mr. Emmons said the staff is supportive of the right-in/right-out on Man o' War Blvd. He said most of the staff's concerns are associated with the proposed access to Harrodsburg Road. He said Harrodsburg Road is a commuter corridor between downtown Lexington and Jessamine County with approximately 32,000 trips per day. He said the study reviewed transit, pedestrian and bicycle use. He said that in this area, transit is difficult because the northward movement out of this site is going to be problematic for transit to serve this shopping center and the existing Palomar Shopping Centre. He said the walkability for this development is very poor, no matter which method or resource was used to measure the walkability of this proposal.

Mr. Emmons said the staff is also concerned with the signalization, the connectivity, and the spacing and design of this development. He said that the traffic study assumes that there will be a signalized intersection for the development's main entrance. He said that relocating the proposed signal to Palomar Blvd., which is 1,300 feet from the future signalization at Madrone Way, will function better than the proposed 900 feet from Man o' War Blvd. He said the standard for the distance between traffic signals is actually 1,600 feet apart along an arterial roadway, such as Harrodsburg Road.

Mr. Emmons said that the staff is recommending that the primary entrance along Harrodsburg road be a Right-in/right-out, with a median U-turn (also known as a J-turn), which would reduce the left-turn intersection conflicts. He suggested relocating the main entrance closer to the south and closing the median, except for J-turns. He said the staff recommended to remove the right-in/right-out entrance closest to Man o' War Blvd., because it's too close to the intersection and creates more points of conflict. He said that Glade Court should be opened for all uses, even vehicular, because it will allow the Palomar subdivision residents the ability to access this proposed shopping center. He also said that the entrance off of Glade Court into the development is poor because of the movement of the proposed drive-through lane, loading dock of the grocery store, and the traffic entering from Man o' War Blvd.

Commission Questions - Mr. Berkley asked if every entrance and exit into this development will be right-in/right-out under the MPO proposal. Mr. Emmons said that is correct. The left turn movements would be at the J-turns and there will be appropriate breaks in the traffic with the signalization at Man o' War Blvd. He said the Federal Highway Administration has stated that this is a proven safety counter measure for access management on major arterial corridors.

Note - Mr. Forester left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Applicant Presentation - Mr. Bruce Simpson, representing the petitioner, gave a brief history of the subject property. He asked the citizens to stand if they were in support of the development (approximately 18 people stood up). He said that the developer has been working on this project for the past 2 years.

He said that they were mindful of the staff's recommendations, in terms of design. He said that the staff preferred a mini-Summit, which was popular among the staff and the Planning Commission. He said that the Summit was 50 acres and this site is only 12 acres of undeveloped land, with an existing shopping center and restaurant on four acres.

Mr. Simpson said that they had met with the staff five times and took them on a tour of the property and shared their ideas. He said that they had three different design professionals to try to duplicate what the staff preferred, and they vetted it through real estate professionals all around the country. He said they had many good designs; however, after being told by real estate professionals that commercial and residential wouldn't work in this area they made a decision to move forward with the current application.

Note - Mr. Forester returned to meeting 4:38 p.m.

Mr. Simpson said that they have designed a development they believe is very neighborhood friendly. He said that they had four meetings with the neighbors (the associations and private property owners) before filing the application. He said the Board of Directors of Palomar Hills Neighborhood Association adopted a resolution endorsing this development. He said the President of the Glade Homeowners Association is also present at the meeting to endorse this application. He said that they have all but three of the contiguous property owners that have signed agreements in support of the development. He said that they had

found acceptance from the neighborhood just not from the staff, who wants the development to be denser. He said that in order to comply with B-6P zoning, they would have to add 80,000 more square feet to this development.

Mr. Simpson presented photos depicting the sense of place, a community gathering area, and a water feature as a focal point. He said this development will be very walkable with restaurants that have outdoor patios and live entertainment. He said this application is a B-3 zone with restrictions that will basically make it a Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone with the addition of a hotel. He said that they have proposed conditional zoning restrictions for the zone to fit the neighborhood by eliminating the night clubs, special events, parties or concerts. He said the entertainment will be on a low level and located near the water feature, which is away from the residents.

Mr. Simpson believes that their application is in compliance with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. He said that it's located between two major corridors. He said that this property needs a traffic signal and stated there are other areas in the county that have signals at the distances they are requesting. He said they have received approval from the Technical Review Committee and the Subdivision Committee and that this is a long-term review process and these access issues will be worked out at the time of the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Simpson displayed a map of the surrounding properties. The neighbors in support of the development were marked on the map. Mr. Simpson stated many of the supporters are present at this meeting. He said that Ms. Dixon is also present and she has concerns with stormwater runoff onto her property. He displayed a photo of Glade Lane and said that it is only 18 feet wide; and doesn't meet public street standard.

Mr. Simpson said that private agreements were worked out with all but three of the contiguous property owners. He said that each of them are different and needed different assurances concerning the proposal. He said that Ms. Stevens is present and she is concerned about the loading dock of the grocery store. He said that when a designated grocery store is determined, they will be able to define the exact location of the loading dock and the issue may be resolved at the time of the Final Development Plan. He said that there are a few other concerns that will be resolved at the time of the Final Development Plan, such as stormwater drainage systems. He said there will be a management company managing the property.

Mr. Bill Lear, also representing the petitioner, commented on the staff's recommendations. He explained that this property does not allow a development like the Summit. He said that the grocery store is proposed to use four acres of the twelve acre site, leaving only eight acres for other uses. If a multi-story building was proposed, to add density, that would then require a parking structure. He doesn't believe that would work on a property of this size. He questioned the viability of the access plan proposed by the staff.

Mr. Lear said that this is a restricted B-3 zone, and after everything has been removed it is basically a B-1 zone plus a hotel. There will be restrictions for adult uses and massage parlors, auto sales, arcades, etc. He referred to the Proposed Findings of Approval, as follows:

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF APPROVAL FOR A ZONE CHANGE FROM NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (B-1) AND AGRICULTURAL URBAN (A-U) ZONE TO HIGHWAY SERVICE BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE: THE FOUNTAINS OF PALOMAR, LLC

Based on the evidence and testimony presented, the Planning Commission recommends that the application to rezone the property located at 3801, 3901 and 3955 Harrodsburg Road from Neighborhood Business (B-1) to Highway Service Business (B-3) for 4.17 net (5.16 gross) acres and Agricultural Urban (A-U) zone to Highway Service Business (B-3) zone for 12.23 net (15.52 gross) acres be APPROVED because:

1. The request to restricted Highway Service Business (B-3) zoning and associated development plan are in agreement with and supportive of the Comprehensive Plan based upon the following:
 - A. "The ideal structure of a neighborhood is comprised of places to reside, work, shop, learn and play." Comp Plan, p. 38. In this case, the relevant neighborhood is roughly triangular in shape and is bounded by Man o' War Boulevard, Harrodsburg Road, and the Urban Service Area Boundary. This neighborhood currently is entirely residential, consisting of single-family detached housing on a variety of lot sizes and in a variety of price ranges, plus a section of townhouses. The proposed zoning and development will provide places to work, shop, and play in close proximity to the residential uses, but not encroaching on those uses so as to produce negative impacts.
 - B. "...three main qualities attach people to place: social offerings, openness, and aesthetics. As a desirable place to live, Lexington possesses these qualities because of our strong urban form, thriving neighborhood and vibrant commerce." Comp. Plan, p. 84. The proposed zoning and development will add commercial entities offering entertainment, plazas, and meeting places in easy walking distance from nearby residential areas in an open and aesthetically pleasing environment.
 - C. "Infill and redevelopment should help neighborhoods achieve a mix of uses that support and enhance a citizen's daily life." Comp. Plan, p. 101. The proposed development will feature a moderate sized grocery, pharmacy, coffee

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

- shop, sit-down restaurants, small shop retail, and potentially a bank. All of these uses will support and enhance the daily life of Palomar Hills residents and all will be located within a 15-minute walk from the majority of the Palomar Hills residential area.
- D. "Encourage the development of appropriate attractions and supporting uses that promote and enhance tourism." Comp. Pln. p. 6. The proposed hotel will be one of the closest, and in some cases the closest hotel in Fayette County, to Bluegrass Airport, Keeneland, major distilleries located in Bourbon and Anderson counties, several major horse farms that participate in the Horse Country tours program, and the largest church in Central Kentucky. As such, it will provide significant support for all of those attractions for out-of-area visitors.
 - E. "In the best of times, the need for jobs and economic development remains central to community planning efforts." Comp. Plan p. 61. The proposed development will transform vacant agricultural land and underutilized business land into a commercial center with job opportunities and a vital hotel to enhance Lexington's tourism and business travel amenities.
 - F. "Urban development and rural preservation are two sides of the same coin. Urban infill and redevelopment strategies that accommodate growth responsibly, preserve vibrant neighborhoods, and encourage job creation in turn provide safeguards to rural land." Comp. Plan p.96. This well-designed project upholds the Urban Service Area preservation strategy, is appropriate infill, provides a variety of commercial choices which meet several community needs, encourages community interaction through pedestrian connectivity, all while respecting its neighbors with landscaping buffers.
2. The existing Agricultural Urban (A-U) & Neighborhood Business (B-1) zoning is inappropriate and improper and the proposed Highway Business (B-3) zoning is appropriate and proper based upon the following:
- A. The business zoned portion of the property subject to this zone change request struggled for economic survival since this property was rezoned B-1 with much difficulty in maintaining tenants due to poor visibility and access from Harrodsburg Road and not being integrated into a larger retail development with an anchor store. Thus, the Planning Commission deems the existing zoning for this property to be inappropriate.
 - B. The agricultural zoned portion of the property subject to this zone change request is located directly adjacent to a single-family neighborhood and a small shopping center. This portion of the Subject Property is not suitable, desirable or appropriate for agricultural uses and the cost to repair the church to seek subsequent future maintenance has caused the membership of the church to seek alternative locations in the community. As the property is located inside the Urban Service Area and all public facilities and services are able to serve the property for urban use, the Planning Commission deems the existing zoning for this property to be inappropriate.
 - C. Rezoning all of the Subject Property to a larger unified B-3 zone would allow for a rebranding, increased visibility, and appropriate utilization of the Subject Property. The Property is located at the intersection of two of Lexington's premier arterial highway and will provide needed commercial and economic vitality to the surrounding area. As such, the Planning Commission deems the proposed zoning for this property to be appropriate.
3. The request to the restricted Highway Service Business (B-3) zoning and associated development plan are also in agreement with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives. The proposed development is located at the corner of one of Lexington's major intersections that has remained vacant or underutilized for quite some time. This zone change request is an example of strategic growth that will allow the entire area to flourish (Theme A, Goal #2 & #3) with a development that is environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable (Theme E, Goal #1), emphasizes redevelopment of underutilized corridors in a manner that enhances existing urban form (Theme E, Goal #1), emphasizes multi-modal transportation connections (Theme D, Goal #1), and provides additional commercial land for a diverse workforce and uses supporting our tourism and traveling business community (Theme C, Goal #1-2).
4. This recommendation is made subject to the following conditional zoning restrictions:
- 1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - a. Pawn Shops.
 - b. Athletic club facilities.
 - c. Mining of nonmetallic minerals.
 - d. Gasoline pumps available to the public with or without an attendant on site.
 - e. Adult arcades, massage parlors, adult bookstores and adult video stores.
 - f. Nightclubs.
 - g. Establishments and lots for the display, rental, sale, service, repair, minor repair of farm equipment, contractor equipment, automobiles, motorcycles, trucks, boats, travel trailers, mobile homes or supplies for such items, except that there may be permitted an electric car dealership.
 - h. Billiard or pool halls; dancing halls, skating rinks; miniature golf or putting courses and bowling alleys.
 - i. Tattoo parlors.
 - j. Carnivals, special events, festivals and concerts.
 - k. Commercial farm markets and market gardens.
 - l. Self-service laundry.
 - 2. The existing 10-foot tall fence behind the Harrods Village shops shall remain and the screening and buffering provisions for the rest of this subject property shall be as described and depicted on the preliminary development plan.
 - 3. Free-standing signage shall be in accordance with Article 17 of the Zoning Ordinance and shall be limited to the signage shown on and approved by the Planning Commission on the final development plan.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

4. Existing trees bordering the subject property shall be preserved except for deceased or dying trees and those trees which an adjoining owner agrees to be removed.
5. Building height on the site shall be restricted to one story, except for the hotel.

Mr. Lear said that the Palomar neighborhood doesn't have any retail nearby, only across Man o' War Blvd. He said that this development will supply neighborhood supportive retail with a grocery store, pharmacy, a bank, coffee shop, and sit-down restaurants. He said that these will support and enhance daily life. He also referenced the Placemaking handout, and said that three main qualities attach people to place: social offerings; openness; and aesthetics. He believes that Placemaking is what makes the gathering places in our community what they are today. The restaurants and attractions that will be located there will create a gathering spot, which the neighborhood presently needs.

Mr. Lear displayed a photo of the site and said that he walked the neighborhood and subject property. He said that it was 15-minutes from the furthest point. He said that they have met with Scott Thompson, LFUCG Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator, and have consulted an expert from the University of Kentucky.

Mr. Lear said they proposed right-in/right-outs for the access points for this development. He believes that they have designed an access system that will work. He said that opening Glade Lane will be detrimental to the neighborhood. Infill is intended to help an area not hurt it. He said that this street is not a local street and is not meant for vehicular traffic.

Mr. Greg Malone, Caster Organization, said that he has done projects similar to this proposal. He said that his company had developed a project that had a commercial component, an entertainment component, and a residential component. He said that they had developed a multi-story product on a three acre site. He said that it had extremely wide sidewalks for outdoor cafes and restaurants. He said that they had missed the market for this project, and the property value is substantially less than it was purchased for.

Mr. Malone said that this application is different than his project because the developers on this site are familiar with the market and the demand for the area. He said that this design is for the end user.

Mr. Robert Wagner, consultant for the applicant, displayed historical aerial photos of the site. He said that the target tenants for this project all like this site. He said that, as of today, there is one committed restaurant that will be located near the water feature and also a committed hotel on the Man o' War Blvd. corridor. He said the existing commercial development will be "re-fronted" to be more contemporary. He said that in the center of the development, they are proposing an anchor organic grocery store.

Note: Planning Commission took a recess at 5:30 p.m. until 5:45 p.m. to relocate the meeting to the Phoenix Building.

Mr. Wagner presented a video of the development to the Planning Commission. He displayed a photo of the rear of the proposed anchor building and said that they will not have service doors, only fire exits. He said that most of the trees in the current landscape buffer, between the subject property and the neighboring residential, will remain. He displayed a scenario of the right-in/right-out on Man o' War Blvd. He said the community suggested a bicycle/pedestrian access on Glade Lane and he displayed several renderings. He said that the residents have made suggestions as to landscaping and other aesthetics, and the developer has agreed to incorporate these suggestions on their properties. He said that the exact location of the grocery store's loading dock is unknown at this time, and the developer designed it as the worst case scenario. He said that Ms. Stevens is the homeowner behind the grocery store. They have met individually with Ms. Stevens to work out a compromise with her, but have not been able to work anything out.

The following citizens were present in support to this application:

Joe Clabes, Chairman of the Palomar Hills Community Association, said that he submitted a letter of support from the association. He said that he is concerned with opening Glade Lane as it is not designed for vehicular traffic, and they appreciate the extra communication from the developers.

Jay Conne, 2032 Glade Lane, said that he was pleased with the way the developers are cooperating with the community and correcting stormwater issues.

Brad Kerkhoff, 4009 Peppertree Dr., said that Palomar is a very walkable neighborhood. He is also pleased that the developer asked them all what they would like to have in this area.

Donald Bitetow, resident of Rabbit Run, said that he believes this will be a great enhancement to the area, with more restaurants and shopping.

Edmond Miller, 2204 Silvertree Ct., said that he supports this development and would like to keep Glade Lane closed to vehicular traffic.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

Don Holles, 2037 Glade Lane, complimented the developers for their cooperation with the neighborhood.

Ralph Coldiron, 4708 Waterside Ct., believes this developer will deliver what they are proposing.

The following citizens were present in opposition to this application:

Vicki Stevens, 2020 Glade Lane, said that her property is located behind the proposed grocery store and she is concerned with the location of the loading dock and the increased noise and lighting associated with this type of use. She is also concerned with the stormwater runoff. She said that the developer made her an offer of a few accommodations that she believed was insulting. She does not believe that landscaping can mitigate the proposed development for neighbors.

Don Todd, attorney representing several residents from the Palomar and S. Elkhorn neighborhoods. He said the Planning Commission should consider in their deliberations that the developer made negotiations with some of the residents. He distributed the Comprehensive Plan from 1988 and said that this was the beginning of Harrodsburg Road development, which resulted in the Palomar Shopping Centre, located across Man o' War Blvd. from the subject site. He said that the traffic plan was designed for this area to remain residential. He also distributed the Harrodsburg Road Ordinance, which states that there must be 1,600 feet between the access points.

Mr. Todd said that the residents along Glade Lane are not getting what they planned for, a 45-foot building that will be 30 feet from their backyard. He believes that the hotel is out of character in a neighborhood shopping center because it is oriented toward the traveling public and local residents won't be walking there. He said that the 1,600 feet between access points should be maintained, because it is a state highway safety standard and was incorporated in the Ordinance and plans for Harrodsburg Road over 30 years ago.

Donna Dixon, 3905 Palomar Cove Lane, said that she is concerned with stormwater runoff that she believes is the fault of the Hoover/Murray restaurant developers that didn't install a detention pond. She said that the runoff for the entire property enters her property. She said that the applicants have been to her property to assess this issue and was told that they "won't do any more damage."

Joan Ciampi, 2241 Stone Garden Lane, said that she is concerned with the access, point/stub that is toward Syringa Drive. She is concerned with the increase of traffic through the Palomar neighborhood. She is also concerned with the loading docks at the hotel. She said that trash, linen and food is mostly picked up and delivered during the night.

Mary Jo Billitter, 2249 Stone Garden Lane, said that she wasn't surveyed by the developer and was unaware of the meetings. She said that she heard of the meeting by a friend's email. She is concerned with safety and increased traffic. She would rather see a dense residential development here rather than commercial development.

Applicant Rebuttal - Mr. Simpson said they met with the residents and that the residents knew exactly what was being proposed, even before the application was filed. He said that the neighbors are aware that this is the first of many meetings and that the Council will also need to hear the case and the Final Development Plan will come back to the Planning Commission for approval. He said that they told the neighbors that they would be notified of all the subsequent hearings. He said that they had agreements with all the neighbors, except for three; of those agreements, they were all disclosed except for one because they were unsuccessful to solve their concerns.

Mr. Simpson said that Harrodsburg Road has changed significantly since the 1980's and development has intensified. This development has proven to be marketable, needed, and wanted, by the people most closely impacted, with the exception of one resident. He agreed that they have more work to do for Ms. Stevens and he publicly pledged to find that compromise with her. He said that he has never had a zone change in which so many residents have been present in favor of the zone change and stated that they have been treated fairly by the developers.

Citizen Rebuttal - Mr. Todd asked the staff for statistical information regarding the square footage of commercial uses along Harrodsburg Road from New Circle Road to the Fayette-Jessamine county line. Ms. Wade said that outside of the Beaumont Center development, there is approximately 400,000 square feet, plus an estimated 500,000 square feet of commercial use in Beaumont. He said that there was a deal made in the past with the Webbs and questioned whether more commercial business is necessary on this corridor. He said that the citizens that are in support of this development were threatened by the developer, telling them that this area would either be this design or high density housing. He agrees with the staff that the hotel isn't necessary and that the applicant should re-do their entire design of this area to make it more compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff Rebuttal - Mr. Emmons said the planning staff makes their recommendations to the Planning Commission with careful thought. He said that staff knows that these recommendations have real world consequences to the developer and the community-at-large. He distributed an email from Randi Feltner, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, which states that they support the alternate intersection designs being presented at this location and agree with the staff regarding the removal of the right-in/right-out on Harrodsburg Road. He also said that the proposed design is not very walkable. He said that the 5 D's of walkable design were not

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

mentioned: density, design, destination, diversity, and distance. He said that based on behavioral characteristics, most people will only walk 300 feet out of their way to get to a safe crossing. He stated that this is a conceptual design on the development plan and if that's the case they should show the alternative traffic methods that have been proven to be safer on Harrodsburg Road.

Commission Comments – Mr. Berkley said that the applicant isn't denying the alternative access points. Mr. Emmons said that the applicant hasn't incorporated the staff's alternative.

Ms. Wade said the applicant's findings, as proposed to the Planning Commission have some flaws regarding references to the Comprehensive Plan and how it encourages developments that allow people to reside, work, shop, learn and play. The applicant's zone change doesn't address residing, learning, or playing. She said that a restaurant patio is not the type of "placemaking" that should be created. She said the entertainment they are proposing is not encouraging a place that people want to spend time at. She said that a hotel is not in itself tourism, and is not what the Comprehensive Plan is encouraging for the County. She said that service jobs are not the type of jobs that the Comprehensive Plan encourages to be created in this community. She also stated that this development doesn't promote the "walkability" concept of the Comprehensive Plan either.

Applicant Rebuttal – Mr. Simpson said that the proposed findings could be found in the packet that was distributed. He said that the staff wants them to use the B-6P or MU-3 zone requirements. He said that they would if there was a market for those but the research shows that there isn't.

Commission Questions – Ms. Mundy asked if this property has been reported as underutilized land. Ms. Wade said that the staff has categorized the subject property as underutilized, not vacant. Ms. Mundy asked if this could become high density housing with a different zone change. Ms. Wade said that is correct.

Mr. Owens asked about the grocery store in the center, which is displayed on the plan as 35,000 square feet and 45 feet in height. Mr. Wagner said that it is 25 feet in height the rear and will be painted dark green. Mr. Simpson said that is a typo on the development plan. Mr. Owens asked what the height will be in the front of the grocery store. Mr. Wagner said that they haven't identified the user at this time and it could 35-45 feet high with the parapet walls on the front facade. Mr. Owens also asked about relocating the loading dock to another location, so that it would not bother Ms. Stevens. Mr. Simpson said that if that happens, they will notify those neighbors closest to the loading docks and work with them on a compromise.

Mr. Penn said that he has never seen so much discussion of a preliminary development plan associated with a zone change nor has he seen a Memorandum of Understanding with a dollar value in it, to support it. He said that he doesn't want this to paint his vision of what planning looks like, in our community. Mr. Simpson said that they are not paying the neighbors to appear at this hearing. He said that the money was to be spent on landscaping or other improvements. Mr. Simpson said that in Ms. Stevens's case, she was getting offered extra things. Mr. Penn said that there will be a Final Development Plan and the neighbors may not be seeing the same plan as they are today. He said that it is offensive to be debating this as a Final Development Plan today, when there will be another in the future. Mr. Penn said that is concerned with a hotel being proposed in this development and that it is being proposed directly next to the residential neighborhood. He believes that the neighbor agreements were a strong-arm tactic to cover up the zone change.

Mr. Wilson said that the development plan depicts that Glade Lane is 18 feet wide and two vehicles will not be able to pass each other. Mr. Emmons said that Glade Lane was originally approved as an access easement and not a public street. He said that it isn't built to public street standards but it could operate as a road if parking is limited to one side of the street. Mr. Wilson asked if sidewalks will be installed on Glade Lane. Mr. Emmons said that they are present on one side of the street currently.

Ms. Kaucher said that there is a 2002 Ordinance explaining how the neighborhood asked the City to take Glade Lane and Glade Court, as-is, because improving them to standard street width, would have impacted front yards in the neighborhood. She said that this connection would primarily be for the residents only, so that they wouldn't have to drive onto Man o' War Blvd. to enter the shopping center. She said that it won't be used as a short cut, because it won't save any time. She said that Traffic Engineering prefers the connectivity of Glade Lane, for emergencies.

Ms. Richardson asked what would keep the public from using Glade Lane. Ms. Kaucher said that if the traffic wants to use that street, the public is mostly seeking the fastest route and traveling through the narrow streets is not going to gain them any time.

Mr. Wilson said that there are some concerns with the findings that were proposed by the applicant. Ms. Tracy Jones agreed and said that she has reviewed them.

Chair Wilson closed the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Berkley said that he appreciates the neighbors attending and making their opinions known. He believes that this is a good plan, and he doesn't agree with the access points that the staff is proposing. He said that this property has to be looked at by itself, and

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.

that Beaumont is designed the same way, with the B-3 in the front area and the residential in the back. He doesn't believe that Glade Lane should be a vehicular access and that there is a demand for a hotel in this area, with Keeneland and the airport nearby.

Mr. Owens said that with Glade Lane being built as a private street and not built to the current street standards. He said that he has seen many Webb projects and believes that they put their best foot forward and will do everything they can to make it work. He believes that there will be a full intersection shown on the Final Development Plan. He asked if the B-3 is appropriate, if the current zone is appropriate or inappropriate, and have there been any unanticipated changes. All three of these need to be checked for a zone change. He said that Lexington is growing and we need to grow with it and find new ways to develop with new concepts. He stated that it's unusual to have so many citizens come to a public hearing in support of zone changes. He sympathizes with Ms. Stevens but said that at some point in time, this land is going to be developed. Staff clarified that all three findings as mentioned by Mr. Owens are not required, only one.

Ms. Richardson said that the Planning Commission approved the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Goals & Objectives, which are in favor of high density and no expansion of the Urban Service Boundary. She doesn't want the Planning Commission to get so caught up in the "density" that they forget to compromise and that heavy density doesn't fit everywhere. She believes that this development is designed to be a neighborhood facility, which is being protected by the restricted conditional uses. She said that Glade Lane should be left as it is.

Ms. Mundy also thanked the residents for attending this hearing and expressing their concerns. She said that this a preliminary development plan that is being looked at in detail instead of looking at the zone change. She said that things can change at the Final Development Plan. She believes that since this is part of the underutilized property, the zone change is appropriate.

Mr. Penn said that he would have liked more discussion about the zone change and less emphasis on the development plan. He said that he doesn't want what will "work", he wants what is best for Lexington. He said that it isn't the job of the Planning Commission to set someone up to make money; it's their job to approve a zone change and a development plan that helps the City of Lexington and the neighborhoods in the long run.

Mr. Wilson said that he believes the developers have done things right by communicating and working with the community, but he asked if they have done the right thing. He quoted Mr. Simpson as saying that he is willing to work with the community. However, Mr. Simpson did not indicate that he is willing to work with the staff.

Zoning Action – A motion was made by Mr. Berkley, seconded by Mr. Cravens, and carried 5-4 (Bell, Owens, Penn, and Wilson opposed; Brewer and Plumlee absent) to approve PLN- MAR-18-00004: THE FOUNTAINS AT PALOMAR, LLC, based on the following reasons and the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing:

1. The proposed zoning for a restricted Highway Service Business (B-3) zone is in agreement with the 2013 Comprehensive Plan based on the following:
 - a. The proposed development will provide places to work and shop in close proximity to the residential uses.
 - b. The proposed infill and redevelopment will feature a grocery, pharmacy, coffee shop, restaurants, and other retail and commercial uses that can assist in supporting and enhancing the lives of nearby residents.
 - c. The project upholds the Urban Service Area concept by utilizing infill and redevelopment strategies to develop an underutilized site within the Urban Service Area.
2. The Agricultural Urban (A-U) and Neighborhood Business (B-1) zoning is inappropriate as agricultural uses are not appropriate inside the Urban Service Area and the Neighborhood Business (B-1) zoned area has been unsuccessful at this location.
3. This recommendation is made subject to the conditional zoning restrictions proposed by the applicant as follows:
 1. The following uses are prohibited:
 - a. Pawn Shops.
 - b. Athletic club facilities.
 - c. Mining of nonmetallic minerals.
 - d. Gasoline pumps available to the public with or without an attendant on site.
 - e. Adult arcades, massage parlors, adult bookstores and adult video stores.
 - f. Nightclubs.
 - g. Establishments and lots for the display, rental, sale, service, repair, minor repair of farm equipment, contractor equipment, automobiles, motorcycles, trucks, boats, travel trailers, mobile homes or supplies for such items, except that there may be permitted an electric car dealership.
 - h. Billiard or pool halls; dancing halls, skating rinks; miniature golf or putting courses and bowling alleys.
 - i. Tattoo parlors.
 - j. Carnivals, special events, festivals and concerts.
 - k. Commercial farm markets and market gardens.
 - l. Self-service laundry.
 2. The existing 10-foot tall fence behind the Harrods Village shops shall remain and the screening and buffering provisions for the rest of this subject property shall be as described and depicted on the preliminary development plan.

3. Free-standing signage shall be in accordance with Article 17 of the Zoning Ordinance and shall be limited to the signage shown on and approved by the Planning Commission on the final development plan.
4. Existing trees bordering the subject property shall be preserved except for deceased or dying trees and those trees which an adjoining owner agrees to be removed.
5. Building height on the site shall be restricted to one story, except for the hotel.

Development Plan Action – A motion was made by Mr. Berkley, seconded by Mr. Cravens, and carried 5-4 (Bell, Owens, Penn, and Wilson opposed; Brewer and Plumlee absent) to approve MJDP-18-00012: HOOVER & FORD PHILPOT PROPERTY, with the revised conditions provided by the staff, as follows:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property B-3; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Bike & Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
8. Denote Department of Highway's approval of access (Harrodsburg Road) shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
9. Denote addition of sidewalk to both sides of all service roads shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
10. Denote any proposed patio seating and required parking shall be resolved at time of Final Development Plan.
11. Resolve right in/out and Harrodsburg Road improvements.
12. ~~Discuss~~ Resolve pedestrian access to Glade Court at the time of the Final Development Plan.
13. ~~Discuss~~ Resolve spacing of full-signalized access per KYDOT requirements at the time of the Final Development Plan.

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS - No such items were presented.

VII. STAFF ITEMS - No such items were presented.

VIII. AUDIENCE ITEMS - No such items were presented.

IX. MEETING DATES FOR MARCH AND APRIL 2018

Work Session, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 3 rd Floor Phoenix Building (101 East Vine Street).....	March	29, 2018
Subdivision Committee, Thursday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	April	5, 2018
Zoning Committee, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	April	5, 2018
Subdivision and ND-1 Items Public Meeting, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd Floor Council Chambers.....	April	12, 2018
Work Session, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 3 rd Floor Phoenix Building (101 East Vine Street).....	April	19, 2018
Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	April	25, 2018
Zoning Items Public Hearing, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd Floor Council Chambers.....	April	26, 2018

X. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business, Chairman Wilson declared the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

William Wilson, Chair

Carolyn Plumlee, Secretary

Lex TV broadcasts live government meeting coverage, original programming and bulletin board information. You can find us on cable channel 185, view our [live stream](#) and [archived meetings](#) online or watch programming on our [YouTube](#) channel.

Archived videos and minutes can be viewed at <https://www.lexingtonky.gov/public-meetings-videos>

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request, unless agreed to a longer time by the applicant.