

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

October 22, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER - The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. via video teleconference.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state of emergency and Governor Beshear's Executive Orders regarding social distancing, this meeting is being held via teleconference pursuant to Senate Bill 150 (as signed by the Governor on March 30, 2020) and Attorney General Opinion 20-05, and in accordance with KRS 61.826, because it is not feasible to offer a primary physical location for the meeting.

ATTENDANCE - Chair Larry Forester called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. via video teleconference from the Division of Planning, 7th Floor, 101 E. Vine Street, Lexington, KY 40507. Planning Commission Members present via video teleconference were: Ivy Barksdale, Headley Bell, Zach Davis, Anthony de Movellan, Janice Meyer, Bruce Nicol, Frank Penn, Carolyn Plumlee, Graham Pohl, and Bill Wilson. Planning staff members present via video teleconference were Jim Duncan, Director; Traci Wade, Hal Baillie, Lauren Hedge, Stephanie Cunningham, and Debbie Woods. Other staff members present were: Deepika Eyunni, Division of Traffic Engineering; Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering; Captain Greg Lengal, Division of Fire and Emergency Services; and Tracy Jones, Department of Law.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion was made by Ms. Plumlee, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 10-0 (Meyer abstained) to approve minutes of the September 24, 2020 meeting.

III. POSTPONEMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS - No such items were presented at this time.

IV. LAND SUBDIVISION ITEMS - The Subdivision Committee met on Thursday, October 1, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was attended by Commission members: Ivy Barksdale, Headley Bell, Anthony de Movellan, and Jan Meyer. Committee members in attendance were: Deepika Eyunni, Division of Traffic Engineering and Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering. Staff members in attendance were: Traci Wade, Tom Martin, Hal Baillie, Cheryl Galt, Lauren Hedge, Stephanie Cunningham, Allison Morris; Firefighter Embry Beatty, Division of Fire & Emergency Services; and 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.

A. NO DISCUSSION ITEMS – Following requests for postponement or withdrawal, items requiring no discussion will be considered.

Criteria: (1) the Subdivision Committee recommendation is for approval, as listed on this agenda, and
(2) the Petitioner agrees with the Subdivision Committee recommendation and conditions listed on the agenda, and
(3) no discussion of the item is desired by the Commission, and
(4) no person present at this meeting objects to the Commission acting on the matter without discussion, and
(5) the matter does not involve a waiver of the Land Subdivision Regulations.

B. DISCUSSION ITEMS – Following requests for postponement, withdrawal and no discussion items, the remaining items will be considered.

The procedure for these hearings is as follows:

- Staff Report(s), including subcommittee 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 OR 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)
- Commission discusses and/or votes on the plan.

Note: Requests for additional time, stating the basis for the request, must be submitted to The Subdivision Committee no later than two days prior to the meeting. The Chair will announce his/her decision at the outset of the hearing.

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

1. DEVELOPMENT PLANS

- a. PLN-MJDP-20-00060: SAND LAKE AND ESTES PROPERTIES, SECTION 2, LOT 2 (AMD) (11/29/20)* - located at 109 SAND LAKE DR. (A PORTION OF), LEXINGTON, KY.
Council District 7
Project Contact: Barrett Partners, Inc.

Note: The purpose of this amendment is to revise the layout of lots 2, 5 and 6, and show the preliminary subdivision plan for Lot 2.

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

1. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, and storm and sanitary sewers.
2. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
3. Landscape Examiner's approval of landscaping and landscape buffers.
4. Addressing Office's approval of street names and addresses.
5. Urban Forester's approval of tree preservation plan.
6. Bike and Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
7. Division of Fire, Water Control Office's approval of the locations of fire hydrants, fire department connections and fire service features.
8. Division of Waste Management's approval of refuse collection locations.
9. Documentation of Division of Water Quality's approval of the Capacity Assurance Program requirements, prior to plan certification.
10. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
11. Document compliance with Note #14 regarding notice of the public meeting.
12. Discuss timing for construction of pedestrian access from Lake Wales Drive.
13. Denote required landscape buffer area along Lake Wales Drive shall include evergreen trees planted 10' on center with a minimum height of 5' at time of planting.

Staff Presentation - Ms. Hedge stated that the purpose of this amendment is to revise the layout of lots 2, 5 and 6, and show the preliminary subdivision plan for Lot 2. She said that condition #11 is regarding compliance with note #14 for the public notice requirement. There is a 21-day public notice requirement on this property, for property owners that are within 400 feet of the subject property. She said that this condition has been met since notice letters were mailed out on September 30th. In regards to condition #12, she pointed to the area and said that there needs to be more discussion of the timing for construction of the pedestrian access from Lake Wales Drive. She said that this connection was initially required at the time of the zone change and staff anticipates that this will need to be a staircase. She added that condition #13 needs to be denoted on the plan that the landscape buffer area along the Lake Wales Drive will include evergreen trees planted 10 feet on center with a minimum height of 5 feet at time of planting.

Applicant Representation – Richard Murphy, attorney; and Tony Barrett, were present representing the applicant. Mr. Murphy said that this is the Final Development Plan and follow-up to a recent zone change. He said that condition #13 has been noted on the plan. He said in regards to condition #12, they had discussed with the staff that a note will be added that a pedestrian connection will be built prior to the issuance of Certification of Occupancy for lot 6. He added that they are agreeable to the other conditions, with the exception of condition #11, which has been completed.

Commission Questions – Mr. Penn asked when the first Sand Lake case was. Mr. Murphy said that has it been more than ten years ago. Mr. Penn said that he believes that it was 2006. Mr. Murphy said that he may be correct. Mr. Penn added that he is glad this will complete that section.

Mr. Wilson asked if the staff agrees with deleting condition #11. Ms. Hedge affirmed that the condition could be deleted. Ms. Wade added that condition #12 can be changed to "Resolve."

Citizen Comments - There were no audience members present to speak to this request.

Action - A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. Bell, carried 11-0 to approve PLN-MJDP-20-00060: SAND LAKE AND ESTES PROPERTIES, SECTION 2, LOT 2 (AMD), as recommended by the staff, as follows:

1. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, and storm and sanitary sewers.
2. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
3. Landscape Examiner's approval of landscaping and landscape buffers.
4. Addressing Office's approval of street names and addresses.
5. Urban Forester's approval of tree preservation plan.
6. Bike and Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
7. Division of Fire, Water Control Office's approval of the locations of fire hydrants, fire department connections and fire service features.

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

8. Division of Waste Management's approval of refuse collection locations.
9. Documentation of Division of Water Quality's approval of the Capacity Assurance Program requirements, prior to plan certification.
10. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
- ~~11. Document compliance with Note #14 regarding notice of the public meeting.~~
- ~~11.~~ ~~12.~~ Resolve Discuss timing for construction of pedestrian access from Lake Wales Drive.
- ~~12.~~ ~~13.~~ Denote required landscape buffer area along Lake Wales Drive shall include evergreen trees planted 10' on center

V. **ZONING ITEMS** - The Zoning Committee met on Thursday, October 1, 2020, at 1:30 p.m. to review zoning map amendments and Zoning Ordinance text amendments. The meeting was attended by Commission members: Zach Davis, Larry Forester, Bruce Nicol, Graham Pohl, and Bill Wilson. Staff members in attendance were: Traci Wade, Tom Martin, Hal Baillie, Stephanie Cunningham, and Debbie Woods, and 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. **JUBY, LLC (AMD) ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & RAMSEY SULLIVAN PROPERTY (FKA BELMONT INDUSTRIAL PARK TRACT 1) ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. PLN-MAR-20-00002: JUBY, LLC (AMD) (10/22/20)*- an amended petition for a zone map amendment from a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone to a Light Industrial (I-1) zone, for 37.87 net (40.82 gross) acres, from a Professional Office (P-1) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, for 7.98 net (9.12 gross) acres, from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, for 1.69 gross and net acre, and from a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, for 0.82 gross and net acre, for properties located at 2501 and 2701 Spurr Road, and 2710 Sullivans Trace.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2018 Comprehensive Plan, Imagine Lexington, seeks 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. 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.

With this amended application, the petitioner has requested two zone changes for the properties located at 2710 Sullivan Trace, 2701 Spurr Road and 2501 Spurr Road. The first zone change remains the same and is seeking to rezone 2710 Sullivan Trace, 2701 Spurr Road and a portion of 2501 Spurr Road from a Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone to

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

a Light Industrial (I-1) zone. The proposed development includes the creation of four (4) industrial lots. The petitioner has amended their request for the second area of rezoning and is now seeking to rezone the remaining portion of 2501 Spurr Road from a Professional Office (P-1) zone to a Highway Service Business (B-3) zone. The proposed development includes the creation of a retail center and three (3) associated outlots with unspecified businesses. As the application involves two disparate development types and the petitioner has indicated different Place-Types, the review of the application will include a separate discussion of each of the zone changes, followed by a review of how they integrate to the area. A Traffic Impact Study was submitted with the requested zone changes.

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

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

1. The requested Light Industrial (I-1) and Highway Service Business (B-3) zones are not in agreement with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives, for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed development does not provide a context sensitive development (Design Policy #4) that integrates into the established residential character of the area north of Spurr Road.
 - b. The proposed development does not support the integration of neighborhood serving business, and separates itself from the existing development rather than connecting residential uses to commercial uses (Design Policy #12).
 - c. The proposed development does not adequately create positive & safe social interactions in neighborhoods (Theme A, Goal #3.b), including, but not limited to, neighborhoods that are connected for pedestrians & various modes of transportation; Theme D, Goal #1 stresses the need to work to achieve an effective and comprehensive transportation system, one that is safe for all users; and Theme D, Goal #1.d focuses on the need to improve traffic operation strategies.
 - d. The applicant has not reconciled the potential safety concerns along their frontage of Spurr Road to show that the proposed facilities are safe for the proposed uses (D-CO2-1).
 2. There have been no major changes of an economic, physical or social nature within the immediate area, which were not anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Commission and which have substantially altered the basic character of the immediate area.
 3. The applicant has not put forth a justification for why the current zoning is inappropriate and the proposed zoning is appropriate for the subject property. The current Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone remains appropriate, as it provides needed dwelling units within the Urban Service Area and maintains the residential character of the area north of Spurr Road and between the Norfolk Southern Railroad and Georgetown Road. It has been documented within 2017 Fayette County Housing Demand Study that we are in need of additional housing units on vacant land inside the Urban Service Area.
- b. PLN-MJDP-20-00001: RAMSEY SULLIVAN PROPERTY (FKA BELMONT INDUSTRIAL PARK TRACT 1) (10/22/20)* - 2501 & 2701 SPURR RD AND 2710 SULLIVANS TRACE, LEXINGTON, KY.
Project Contact: Strand Associates

Note: The purpose of this development plan is to rezone the property.

Note: The applicant has submitted several plan revisions and met with staff on numerous occasions since the initial recommendation of postponement. Based on those meetings and the newest plan revision received on September 29, 2020, staff offers the following recommendation.

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property B-3 and I-1; 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. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
8. Complete site statistics per Article 21 requirements.
9. Dimension buildings.
10. Denote proposed access to Spurr Road shall be determined at the time of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan and/or Final Development Plan.
11. Denote proposed access to Georgetown Road shall be determined at the time of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan and/or Final Development Plan.
12. Remove proposed access to Spurr Road from B-3 lot at proposed ½ section improvements.
13. Discuss Placebuilder criteria.

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

Staff Zoning Presentation – Mr. Baillie presented the staff report and recommendations for the amended zone change application. He displayed photographs of the subject property and aerial photographs of the general area. He said the applicant is proposing two zone changes to develop a four industrial lots with a retail center and three outlots. The other zone changes are for the right-of-way (ROW) area. He said that the subject property is located at the intersection of Georgetown Road and Spurr Road. He said that the subject property is surrounded by various zone, including Agricultural Rural (A-R), Light Industrial (I-1), Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3), High Density Apartment (R-4), and Professional Office (P-1) zones. He said that there was much discussion among the staff regarding the S-curve along Spurr Road. He said that there have been many accidents at this section over the years and pointed to a berm that had built to protect the school. He said that Mr. Martin will discuss the applicant's proposal for this portion of the roadway in further detail.

Mr. Baillie gave a brief history of the area and said that 165 acres was rezoned from Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to Light Industrial (I-1) zone in 1982. In 2004, it was rezoned from the Light Industrial (I-1) zone to Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3), Neighborhood Business (B-1) and Professional Office (P-1) zones. In 2006, there was another zone change application to remove some of the conditional zoning restrictions, including a sound wall along the Norfolk Southern Railroad.

He said there has been three primary concerns over the course of this application, which are: 1) the location of the industrial land uses abutting residential land uses; 2) the integration of new development with historical development; and 3) the adequacy of infrastructure to support the increase of intensity associated with industrial land uses. He said that the applicant revised their development prior to the October 1, 2020 Committee meetings, to include proposed improvements along the properties road frontage, which partially met the Land Use Subdivision Regulations. He said that the applicant had proposed to separate the west bound traffic at the S-curve.

Mr. Baillie said that for the portion of the subject property, which is proposed to be changed to the Light Industrial, the applicant is seeking to develop under the Industrial and Production Center Place-Type and the Industrial and Production Non-Residential Development Type, which they are associated with the proposed zone. However, the concern is how this proposed zone fits into the existing context of the area. There has been significant modification of the area north of Spurr Road since the zone change in 2004. He said that the focus is the step-down of intensity and the need for buffering to ensure the compatibility of new development. He displayed the proposed development plan, and said that the applicant is proposing to increase the intensity of the land use, and will restrict the ability to integrate that development into the established development. This will not allow integration with the established development, and will create a new separate development. This proposal also does not support the integration of neighborhood serving business, and separates itself from the existing development rather than connecting residential uses to commercial uses.

Mr. Baillie said that the applicant had also stressed the need for land that is available for jobs. However, the applicant has not indicated the types of uses they are seeking to promote. While the applicant has proposed restricting those uses that can be noxious or produce greater nuisances, they have not restricted the site for uses that are low employment generators, like self-storage warehousing or outdoor storage. Furthermore, this area has had extensive industrial development south of Spurr Road, with a clear land use transition between the intensity south of Spurr Road and the residential area north of Spurr Road. There is also a buffer between the intensity that is being proposed at Coldstream Campus, with Georgetown Road.

Mr. Baillie said that the other proposed zone change is for the Corridor Place-Type and the Medium Density Non-Residential/Mixed Use Development Type in a zone that is not recommended for the area. He said that the applicant must meet certain aspects of the Comprehensive Plan to make it fit this Place-Type. He said that the applicant is proposing the Highway Service Business (B-3) zone, which is intended to provide for retail and other uses. He added that special consideration should be given to the relationship of the uses in the zone to the surrounding land uses and to the adequacy of the street system to serve the traffic needs. He said that staff is concerned with the aspect of this integrating into the already established area. The need for neighborhood integration is further supported by Design Policy #12, which states that new development should support neighborhood-level commercial areas. In many neighborhoods developed decades ago, commercial areas were designated to serve as neighborhood focal points. The development of focal points is an element that is regularly supported within the Comprehensive Plan. Within the initial application, the petitioner indicated that they were not able to directly connect or integrate with the neighborhood, which is why the applicant has focused on the traveling public.

Mr. Baillie said that the proposed B-3 zone will increase the availability of retail in the area, but it reduces the availability of it to integrate into the established residential area and removes the ability to add residential development along the corridor. The B-3 and the P-1 zones increase the intensity of vehicular movement throughout the day. However, the P-1 zone allows for a greater mix of commercial, office, and residential uses. He said that the P-1 zone is intended to act as a transition from less intense land uses to more intense land uses.

Mr. Baillie said that while the applicant has focused on the potential gains proposed with their development, there is a significant loss with the proposed shift away from the established residential zoning. The current R-3 zone not only maintains the residential character of the area north of Spurr Road and between the Norfolk Southern Railroad and Georgetown Road, but also allows for the construction of needed dwelling units within the Urban Service Area. It has been documented within the 2017 Fayette County

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

Housing Demand Study that the community is in need of additional housing units on the vacant land inside the Urban Service Area. While this area was planned for industrial uses decades ago, the applicant requested a shift in land use in 2004, which led to the development of residential dwelling units. This also necessitated the expansion of industrial uses elsewhere, like Coldstream Park. To shift again would take away some of the residential gains made with the 2004 zone change and required changes elsewhere. Our community has a consistent demand for residential land to support local economic activity.

Mr. Baillie said that the staff agrees that our current economic situation with the nation, state, and county are difficult. However, the proposed rezoning is not in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan and staff cannot currently recommend approval of the application. He said the staff is recommending disapproval of this rezoning for the following reasons:

1. The requested Light Industrial (I-1) and Highway Service Business (B-3) zones are not in agreement with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives, for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed development does not provide a context sensitive development (Design Policy #4) that integrates into the established residential character of the area north of Spurr Road.
 - b. The proposed development does not support the integration of neighborhood serving business, and separates itself from the existing development rather than connecting residential uses to commercial uses (Design Policy #12).
2. There have been no major changes of an economic, physical or social nature within the immediate area, which were not anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Commission and which have substantially altered the basic character of the immediate area.
3. The applicant has not put forth a justification for why the current zoning is inappropriate and the proposed zoning is appropriate for the subject property. The current Planned Neighborhood Residential (R-3) zone remains appropriate, as it provides the opportunity to construct needed dwelling units within the Urban Service Area and maintains the residential character of the area north of Spurr Road and between the Norfolk Southern Railroad and Georgetown Road. It has been documented within 2017 Fayette County Housing Demand Study that we are in need of additional housing units on vacant land inside the Urban Service Area.

Development Plan Presentation – Mr. Martin presented the preliminary development plan associated with this zone change. He pointed to the Spurr Road area and the extension of Sullivans Trace that will connect with the residential development on the north and will align with Greendale Road to the south. He said that the applicant is proposing various structures on the development plan. He pointed to the proposed B-3 zone and said that the applicant is proposing a 20,000 square foot commercial building and three outlot buildings. He said that the proposed buildings in the I-1 zones are over 456,000 total square feet with 343 parking spaces. He said that there could be some changes to this preliminary development plan, depending upon the end users.

Mr. Martin said that the staff had concern with the residential boundary to the north of the proposed development. He said the applicant is proposing a 25-foot setback with landscaping, and the buildings will be setback 100 feet or more, which does comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. He said that there was also concern with the street infrastructure, including improvements to Spurr Road. He said that the applicant is proposing to complete half-street improvements along their entire frontage along Spurr Road. He said that Sullivans Trace will be constructed to the required Land Subdivision Regulation standards, including traffic calming and signage to discourage industrial traffic from utilizing the local street system. He said that the applicant is proposing detention areas along the western portion of the development and a public space area. He said that parking is proposed along Spurr Road along with a landscape buffer. He then pointed to the S-curve along Spurr Road, which is an inadequate roadway for this type of land use. He said that the applicant is proposing to construct the half-section on their property that will separate the traffic traveling west-bound, which will reduce the number of potential conflicts.

Mr. Martin pointed to the proposed B-3 zone and the location of the buildings, the parking areas, and a detention basin on the north side. He said the applicant is proposing a right-in/right-out from Georgetown Road. This will be contingent upon the State's approval and will be subject to a waiver in the future, because of the spacing between the access point and the Spurr Road intersection. There may be another waiver request for the proposed access onto Spurr Road near the location of the outlots. He added that staff is concerned with the number of drive-through facilities that can be approved on the site because of the traffic impact on the road system and on the intersection of Georgetown Road and Spurr Road.

Mr. Martin said that the staff is recommending the access points to Spurr Road and to Georgetown Road be determined at the time of the Final Development Plan or a Preliminary Subdivision Plan. He said that both of these plans address infrastructure and the timing of the adequate infrastructure is imperative as the property develops. He added that the staff would like the access point located on the S-curve to be removed from the plan, because of its location and potential safety concerns. He said that the Subdivision Committee did recommend approval of this development plan.

Commission Questions – Mr. Pohl asked if there were any discussions regarding the relationship and possible impacts this improvement may have on the Linlee School. Mr. Martin said that the applicant is proposing to align the access point with the school entrance.

Traffic Impact Study – Mr. Emmons summarized the traffic impact study and said that Transportation Planning staff reviews the roadway infrastructure as if the proposed zoning were in place. He said that previously, the Transportation Planning staff recommended disapproval of the proposed uses because the roadway infrastructure was inadequate. The applicant submitted a revised

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

application and development plan and now the Transportation Planning staff is cautiously optimistic that the transportation infrastructure will be adequate for the proposed uses at this time. He said that the proposed right-in/right-out from Georgetown Road and the half-section improvements of the S-curve on Spurr Road will require much further detailed engineering designs at the time of the Final Development Plan. He added that Georgetown Road and Spurr Road are both state roadways and will need to be permitted and approved by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. He said that the Transportation Planning staff doesn't have any further recommendations to add to the development plan.

Mr. Baillie said that within the Google Drive, there were three letters of support submitted for this application.

Commission Questions – Mr. de Movellan asked Mr. Emmons for his opinion on the change of traffic impact from the current zone to the proposed zone. Mr. Emmons said that the amount of traffic is a consideration with large industrial users, but mostly it's the type of traffic that is generated. With any industrial park, there will be an increase of semi-trucks and the concern of them not being able to maneuver through the S-curve. He said that residential and retail have more of an impact on traffic during the peak hours, whereas industrial users have more impact during the day, especially during lunch time and early evenings.

Mr. Pohl asked why only the westbound traffic of Spurr Road is being realigned at the S-curve and not both directions. Mr. Emmons said that the applicant is building their half-section and sometime in the future, the government would build the eastbound direction of Spurr Road.

Applicant Presentation – Mr. Darby Turner and Branden Gross, attorneys; Mike Woolum John Barlow, Julie Barlow, Reese Miller, and Daniel Miller, were present representing the applicant. He thanked the staff for the discussions and the work that has been involved with this proposal. He said that he is pleased with their willingness to formulate creative solutions to difficult problems, with the exception of the final recommendation. In regards to the preliminary development plan, they understand that there is a great deal of work to go. They are in agreement with the staff's recommendations and conditions for the development plan.

Mr. Turner displayed the development plan and said that there is a ten-foot multi-use path that has been created from the Norfolk Southern Railroad to the commercial area, along Spurr Road, which they believe is a significant feature of this proposal. He said that there is an 8-foot path traveling south along Sullivans Trace, which connects to the 10-foot path. This pathway and Sullivans Trace creates the connectivity between the residential and the industrial zones.

Mr. Turner believes that this proposal is in agreement with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan for many of the reasons that staff says that it isn't. He displayed an aerial photo of the subject property and said that there is currently industrial uses located on three sides of the property. He said that the issue is where the boundary line goes for the separation of industrial and the residential uses: where they have it proposed or on Spurr Road, which is a very active collector street. He said that having the two uses abut each other, with buffering, is a significant aspect to this proposal.

Mr. Turner said that they had multiple meetings with the residents, which have resulted in an agreement with the proposed buffering and traffic calming devices and are opposed to further residential development. He added that they have received three letters from neighborhood residents, which consists of 17 properties. He said that these residents are also looking forward to the retail uses. He said that if residential were to be built on this location, there wouldn't be much more connectivity other than Sullivans Trace and the proposed pathway. The residents were adamant that they do not want any integrated connection between them and the industrial property. He said they believe that have satisfied the neighbors, as well as some of the significant infrastructure concerns of the staff. He said they believe that Spurr Road is an industrial corridor and is difficult to blend with a residential corridor in this area. He said that this is a way for particular uses to co-exist with little impact on each other.

Mr. Turner displayed a map of zones and said in regards to the staff's concern of the location of industrial land use abutting a residential land use that there is currently an industrial use to the north of the subject property, which abuts a residential zone. He then pointed to several other areas that also abut residential zones and said that some have minimal buffering or a 4-foot stone wall. He added that this is not an unusual situation and that it has worked very well for these other areas. He said that the context of this property is larger than a sliver of land from Sandersville Road to the Kearney Hills residential area. He said that the context is the Georgetown Road corridor and includes some retail and some B-3 uses, but there are not any commercial services along this corridor to serve residents and employees.

Mr. Turner said in regards to the staff's other concern of integration of new development with historical development, he said that the historical area does not only apply to the residential area to the north, but also to the industrial area to the south and to the east of the subject property. He believes that the integration is already there. He said that Mr. Baillie commented on Design Policy #12, that new development should support neighborhood level commercial uses. Mr. Turner said they disagree and that the Design Policy #12 states to support neighborhood level commercial areas. He continued that "in many neighborhoods developed decades ago, the commercial areas were designated to serve as neighborhood focal points but become poorly utilized or have slowly deteriorated and need additional investment." He added that this is focused on centers in an economically viable location where they can survive, function and thrive. He doesn't believe that a neighborhood business can be supported by the residential area to the north of this property. He said that it needs to be supported by a larger neighborhood area.

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

Mr. Turner then said in regards to Design Policy #4, they believe that something should be complimentary to adjacent neighborhoods and communities. There should be a connection, which there is a road extending through the two uses and a multi-modal path for bicycles and pedestrians. He believes that they are in compliance with this design policy.

Mr. Turner said in response to Mr. Pohl's question pertaining to the S-curve on Spurr Road; that the obligation of the developer is to bring the roadway along their property up to standards, which they have always been in agreement with. He said that the concern is who will complete the other side of the S-curve.

Mr. Turner said that Ray Daniels is on the teleconference to speak about the concern of jobs.

Commission Questions – Ms. Plumlee asked if a sidewalk will be constructed along Spurr Road and what the total acreage of the B-3 zone is. Mr. Baillie said that the total acreage of the B-3 zone is 7.98 net and 9.12 gross acres. Mr. Turner said that a 10-foot multi-use path will be constructed instead of a sidewalk.

Mr. Wilson asked if the applicant had any communication with the Oakwood Neighborhood. Mr. Turner said they did not, because it is not very close to the subject property. He only used that neighborhood as an example of residential and industrial zones co-existing next to each other.

Citizens in Support - Mr. Ray Daniels, Chair of Commerce Lexington, highlighted the letter received from Gina Greathouse. He said "Commerce Lexington works collaboratively with many strategic partners: city and state governments; workforce and minority development organizations; officials in surrounding counties; representatives from our signature equine industry; and the University of Kentucky. Their primary mission is to create new jobs that pay more than prevailing wage, increase the amount of income coming into our community from outside its market area, and create greater capital investment in our community. The strategy is to achieve this in several diversified industries, thereby strengthening our overall economy." He said that the Blue Grass Business Park has 1,688 jobs and demonstrates how light industrial land brings good jobs and capital investment to the City of Lexington. They believe they have demonstrated the Blue Grass Business Park, a light industrial zoned land for strategic economic purposes and demonstrated how essential the site selection process is in finding and keeping skilled workforce. He said that the City of Lexington needs more shovel-ready, light industrial land for the expansion of our existing businesses. He added that currently there are businesses that are looking outside of Lexington, because of the lack of options available to them. He also read that "one of the primary purposes for moving away from the Land Use map was to provide opportunities for innovation and creativity through flexibility and that spirit still remains." They believe that this location is a natural fit and will work as Commerce Lexington has already had requests from companies for information related to their location at this site. He added that Commerce Lexington asked the Planning Commission to address this need, to enable our community to continue to attract new large job creating projects and accommodate the needs of our existing businesses that wish to expand within the Urban Service Area boundary.

Brad Olsen, 2717 Kearney Creek Lane, said that his property abuts the subject property. He said that there had been five neighborhood meetings with the applicant where the buffer and landscape had been negotiated. He asked what was going to be located in his back yard, what the height of the building will be and the setbacks be, how will this impact the privacy of his single-family home, and how will this affect the value of my home. He said that they have worked out many of these concerns with the applicant and he understand what could be built there under the R-3 zone. He said that there were concerns regarding creating a cohesive community and development, which he believes is important. He added that there are still vacant plots in his neighborhood, as well as many other opportunities for single-family and multi-family homes to be built within this subdivision. He said that proposed businesses in the B-3 zone will be convenient and the jobs from the industries are speculative until it is determined what will be there.

Mr. Turner concluded by stating that jobs are extremely important within Fayette County for revenue in the County. He then presented Findings of Fact in favor of the zone changes, as follows:

The requested zone map amendment to the Light Industrial (I-1) and Highway Service Business (B-3) Zones is in compliance with the adopted 2018 Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons.

1. The request meets the provisions of Design Policy #4 - to provide development that is sensitive to the surrounding context. The surrounding context here is a mix of residential and industrial development. It provides a road connection to Spurr Rd for the existing adjacent residential development. It provides a 10-foot intermodal path connection along Spurr Road to the retail and industrial development which ties to the new road connection to the residential. It is sensitive to the adjacent residential neighborhood. After a number of meetings with the residents an agreement was reached to provide additional screening, buffering and land utilization for the adjoining neighbors. The proposed uses are complementary uses in the area providing jobs, retail opportunities and professional service opportunities.
2. The request meets the provisions of Design Policy # 12 - support neighborhood level commercial areas. The proposal is for B-3 zoning but restricted to B-1 uses. The neighborhood is larger in context than simply the adjacent residential area to the north. It includes existing and proposed industrial areas interspersed with neighborhood areas, much the same as requested here. The proposed location and orientation provide encouragement for investment and opportunities for the commercial center to thrive and support the surrounding larger contextual area.

3. The request meets Theme C, the Prosperity Policy and the Livability Policy #9 - creating jobs and prosperity. Industrial/jobs land has been shown to be limited in our community. This zone change to I-1 will increase the availability of jobs land and employment opportunity for the larger neighborhood and community. The B-3 land will also provide additional employment opportunities for those in the larger neighborhood and community.
4. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following use restrictions in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone are recommended via conditional zoning:
 - a. Prohibited Uses:
 - i. Columbariums and crematories;
 - ii. Penal or correctional institutions;
 - iii. Refuse dumps, landfills or incinerators;
 - iv. Grain drying;
 - v. Automobile race tracks;
 - vi. Laundry (excluding self-service laundry), clothes cleaning or dyeing shop;
 - vii. Commercial wood lots;
 - viii. Below-ground storage of any flammable or nonflammable gas or oxidizer in liquid or gaseous form (except for use with automobile and truck service or refueling station or major or minor automobile and truck repair);
 - ix. Concrete mixing and concrete products production; and
 - x. Mining of non-metallic minerals
 - b. These restrictions are appropriate and necessary for the following reasons:
 - i. To reduce the potential impact of allowable industrial uses on the adjacent neighborhood.
 - ii. To reduce the potential impact of allowable industrial uses on the Royal Spring Aquifer Wellhead.
5. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following use restrictions in the Highway Service Business (B-3) are recommended via conditional zoning:
 - a. Prohibited Uses:
 - i. Establishments and lots for the display, rental, sale, and minor repair of farm equipment, contractor equipment, automobiles, motorcycles, trucks, boats, travel trailers, mobile homes, or supplies for such items;
 - ii. Motel or hotel;
 - iii. Indoor amusements, such as billiard or pool halls, dancing halls, skating rinks, miniature golf or putting courses, theaters or bowling alleys;
 - iv. Garden centers;
 - v. Parking structures;
 - vi. Adult arcades, massage parlors, adult bookstores, adult video stores, adult cabarets, adult dancing establishments, adult entertainment establishments, and sexual entertainment centers; and
 - vii. Commissaries for preparation of food for restaurant use.
 - b. These restrictions are appropriate and necessary for the following reasons:
 - i. To reduce the potential impact of allowable highway service business uses on the adjacent neighborhood.
6. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-20-00001: RAMSEY SULLIVAN PROPERTY (FKA BELMONT INDUSTRIAL PARK TRACT 1), prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.

Mr. Turner said that he is available for any questions.

Commission Questions – Mr. Forester asked Mr. Turner if he had submitted the proposed findings to Ms. Jones for her review. Mr. Baillie added that Ms. Jones has received them and is available for discussion.

Ms. Plumlee asked what type of buffering and screening there will be between the neighborhood and this site. Mr. Turner said landscape buffering is being tailored to the individual lots. He displayed a drawing that depicted a 25-foot buffer along most of the single-family homes, a 30-foot buffer near the railroad. He said that depending upon the landowner's desire, there will be a combination of fencing and hedges placed on the south side of the buffer zone.

Mr. Pohl asked for clarification of why the current zoning is inappropriate. Mr. Turner said the statute to support a zone change is to find that it is in compliance with Comprehensive Plan. In the absence of that finding the applicant must find that the current zoning is inappropriate and the proposed zone is appropriate, or the applicant can find that there have been changes in the economic and social nature that were not an option of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that they believe this proposal is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and these are all alternative routes that can be taken. He said that they had submitted a justification for approval based on the Comprehensive Plan.

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

Mr. Bell asked for clarification of the access to the property that is located on the S-curve. Mr. Turner said that is a condition from the staff and they agree to remove it from the development plan.

Mr. Penn asked if this land is now needed for industrial uses and no longer as residential. Mr. Turner said that there is need for large track industrial land. Mr. Penn then said that he is concerned for the residential community to the north. They purchased their properties with the assumption that this land would be residential and now it's going to be industrial. Mr. Turner said that had at least five meetings with those neighbors and went over their proposal and addressed the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Penn said that the issue now is how to create buffering between residential zones and industrial zones. Mr. Turner added that those uses have already been mixed along this corridor and it seems to be working.

Mr. de Movellan asked if there were any citizens opposed to this proposal. Mr. Forester said that he asked and no one came forward.

Staff Rebuttal – Mr. Baillie said that the applicant has worked with the neighborhood in regards to the buffering, and the staff recommends that it be done in a non-variable situation. It is problematic to screen every property differently and buffering should be the same in all areas. He added that if the Planning Commission adds the conditional zoning restrictions that the applicant has submitted, they should not be variable across the site. There can be variation with hedges or fencing. He said that currently there are not any conditional zoning restrictions that have been proposed to lower the height of any industrial structure in this area. He said the maximum height is 75 feet with a 3-to-1 height to yard ratio.

Mr. Baillie said in regards to Mr. Turner's presentation, that he is correct. This is a focus as to where the boundary line should be located for the separation of industrial and the residential zone. He said that staff's perspective is that, a 70-foot right-of-way is a proper buffer between an industrial land use and a residential land use. When these zones abut each other setbacks and buffers become necessary. He said that the current industrial park has a significant setback with a large portion of greenspace in between any parking, building, and the right-of-way.

Mr. Baillie said that the applicant is displaying a lack of cross connectivity to the east-west, on their development plan. There is a separation across the site to the P-1 zoned area. He said the staff agrees that the industrial areas are typically job producing areas; however, it is not a guarantee with no end-user noted.

Commission Discussion – Ms. Plumlee commended the staff for stating their concerns regarding the connectivity issues and the effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Bell said that he would like for the applicant and the staff to meet to work out the concerns of the buffer.

Mr. de Movellan asked for comments from the Zoning Committee members as to why they referred this to the full Planning Commission.

Mr. Forester said that he was undecided and that both parties had made a good presentation with their reasons.

Mr. Nicol said that there were good arguments on both sides and the vote was split at the time. He added that this is going to be a difficult decision, which they are asked to do. He said that employment and residential are both needed for our community.

Mr. Pohl said that the argument for jobs depends on certain facilities being created here.

Mr. Penn said that he also has heard good arguments on both sides. He said that the decision is what the best is for our community at this time. He believes that housing is not needed in this area, at this time, but he is undecided as well. He added that this not the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Forester asked if more prohibited uses should be added.

Mr. Wilson said that the intent of the referral recommendation to the Planning Commission was that the applicant and the staff could come to some general concession. He said that he is also undecided.

Ms. Barksdale asked what the applicant said to the neighborhood to make them feel comfortable that a 70-foot building could be constructed on this property. Mr. Turner said height was discussed with the neighbors. He said that typically industrial use buildings are not multi-story and are as high as they need to be in order for their equipment to be utilized. He added that this issue can be discussed further at the time of the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Baillie said that the average height for industrial use buildings is typically between 45 feet and 60 feet.

Mr. Nicol asked Mr. Baillie if they placed a conditional zoning restriction not allowing self storage units, warehouses, and billboards would that help diminish their concern. Mr. Baillie said that it would help with the low-generating employment sectors, but would not diminish the concern regarding the land uses.

Mr. Bell asked for clarification of the buffering between the industrial and the residential zones. Mr. Baillie referred Mr. Bell to Ms. Jones for legal advice. He then said that the staff would recommend that if the Planning Commission were to apply conditional zoning restrictions that relate to the buffering, to make the buffering distance the same throughout the entire property boundary. Also to state their preference of either a fence, hedge or berm between certain height limits.

Mr. Nicol asked for clarification of the setback of a 75-foot building. Mr. Baillie said that the proposed building would need to be 25 feet away for a building the height of 75 feet. He added that the applicant is exceeding that setback. They are proposing 25 feet for the majority of the boundary and 30 feet for another area, which is including a parking area. Mr. Nicol then asked if they do place buffering requirements on this property will it be associated with the development plan. Mr. Baillie said that it could be added as conditional zoning restrictions, as a development plan note, or as a depiction on the development plan. He added that conditional zoning restrictions are preferred because it requires a zone change process and is recorded on the Certification of Land Use Restriction and is noted within the Ordinance for the zone changes.

Applicant Rebuttal - Mr. Turner said in response to Mr. Nicol's comment that they agree to add self-storage, outdoor storage, and billboards to the restricted uses on the subject property. He also said that they agree to a 25-foot buffer surrounding the entire property.

Commission Discussion - Mr. de Movellan asked the applicant to clarify the buffering distance near the private homes, which would be in response to the citizens' letters. Mr. Turner said that a 25-foot buffer is from Sullivans Trace to Georgetown Road and a 30-foot buffer is on the west side of the property, near the detention basin. Mr. de Movellan then asked the staff to clarify their recommendation of 30 feet for the entire boundary. Mr. Baillie said that staff is recommending 30 feet for all of the neighbors along the northern boundary.

Ms. Plumlee said that she is concerned about the type of jobs this area will offer.

Zoning Action – A motion was made by Ms. Plumlee, seconded by Ms. Meyer, and failed 3-8 (Meyer, Plumlee and Wilson in favor; Barksdale, Bell, de Movellan, Forester, Nicol, Penn, and Pohl opposed; Davis abstained) to disapprove PLN-MAR-20-00002: JUBY, LLC (AMD), for the reasons provided by the staff.

A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. Bell, and carried 11-0 (Davis abstained) to approve PLN-MAR-20-00002: JUBY, LLC (AMD), for the reasons provided by the applicant, with the following conditional zoning restrictions:

4. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following use restrictions in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone are recommended via conditional zoning:
 - a. Prohibited Uses:
 - i. Columbariums and crematories;
 - ii. Penal or correctional institutions;
 - iii. Refuse dumps, landfills or incinerators;
 - iv. Grain drying;
 - v. Automobile race tracks;
 - vi. Laundry (excluding self-service laundry), clothes cleaning or dyeing shop;
 - vii. Commercial wood lots;
 - viii. Below-ground storage of any flammable or nonflammable gas or oxidizer in liquid or gaseous form (except for use with automobile and truck service or refueling station or major or minor automobile and truck repair);
 - ix. Concrete mixing and concrete products production; and
 - x. Mining of non-metallic minerals
 - xi. Outdoor storage
 - xii. Self-storage warehouse
 - xiii. Advertising signs (aka Billboard Signs)
 - b. A 30-foot wide landscape buffer shall be established along the residential zoning boundary. A 6-foot berm or fence shall also be required.
 - c. These restrictions are appropriate and necessary for the following reasons:
 - i. To reduce the potential impact of allowable industrial uses on the adjacent neighborhood.
 - ii. To reduce the potential impact of allowable industrial uses on the Royal Spring Aquifer Wellhead.
5. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following use restrictions in the Highway Service Business (B-3) are recommended via conditional zoning:

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

- a. Prohibited Uses:
 - i. Establishments and lots for the display, rental, sale, and minor repair of farm equipment, contractor equipment, automobiles, motorcycles, trucks, boats, travel trailers, mobile homes, or supplies for such items;
 - ii. Motel or hotel;
 - iii. Indoor amusements, such as billiard or pool halls, dancing halls, skating rinks, miniature golf or putting courses, theaters or bowling alleys;
 - iv. Garden centers;
 - v. Parking structures;
 - vi. Adult arcades, massage parlors, adult bookstores, adult video stores, adult cabarets, adult dancing establishments, adult entertainment establishments, and sexual entertainment centers; and
 - vii. Commissaries for preparation of food for restaurant use.
 - viii. Advertising signs (aka Billboard Signs).
- b. These restrictions are appropriate and necessary for the following reasons:
 - i. To reduce the potential impact of allowable highway service business uses on the adjacent neighborhood.

Development Plan Action – A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. de Movellan, and carried 11-0 (Davis abstained) to approve PLN-MJDP-20-00001: RAMSEY SULLIVAN PROPERTY (FKA BELMONT INDUSTRIAL PARK TRACT 1), with the conditions presented by the staff, as follows:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property B-3 and I-1; 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. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
8. Complete site statistics per Article 21 requirements.
9. Dimension buildings.
10. Denote proposed access to Spurr Road shall be determined at the time of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan and/or Final Development Plan.
11. Denote proposed access to Georgetown Road shall be determined at the time of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan and/or Final Development Plan.
12. Remove proposed access to Spurr Road from B-3 lot at proposed ½ section improvements.
- ~~13. Discuss Placebuilder criteria.~~

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS - The Chair will announce that any item a Commission member would like to present will be heard at this time.

- a. **ADOPTION OF 2021 MEETING & FILING SCHEDULE** - The Chair will announce that the Commission will consider adoption of the "Official Meeting and Filing Schedule for 2021" at this time. Once adopted, the staff will distribute copies of the 2021 schedule for use by the Commission and the general public.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Pohl, seconded by Mr. de Movellan, and carried 11-0 to adopt the 2021 MEETING & FILING SCHEDULE.

- b. **WORK SESSION** – The staff would request the Planning Commission cancel their next Work Session, October 29, 2020.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. de Movellan, seconded by Ms. Plumlee, and carried 11-0 to cancel the October 29, 2020 Work Session.

VII. STAFF ITEMS – Mr. Duncan reminded the Planning Commission has a training scheduled on Friday, October 23 2020. He also said that the Committee meetings will be held next Thursday, November 5th, 2020, via Zoom video teleconference.

VIII. AUDIENCE ITEMS – No such items were presented.

IX. MEETING DATES FOR OCTOBER & NOVEMBER 2020

Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (Phoenix Building).....	October 28, 2020
Work Session, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., via teleconference	October 29, 2020
Subdivision Committee, Thursday, 8:30 a.m., via teleconference.....	November 5, 2020
Zoning Committee, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., via teleconference	November 5, 2020
Subdivision Items Public Meeting , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., via teleconference	November 12, 2020
Zoning Items Public Hearing , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., via teleconference	November 19, 2020

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

Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (Phoenix Building)..... November 25, 2020

- X. **ADJOURNMENT** - There being no further business, Chairman Forester declared the meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

Larry Forester, 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.