

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

March 26, 2026

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** - Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd Floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky
- II. **ATTENDANCE** – Planning Commission members present were Zach Davis, Ivy Barksdale, Robin Michler, William Wilson, Larry Forester, Judy Worth, and Bruce Nicol. Planning staff members present were Jim Duncan, Traci Wade, Jeremy Young, Chris Chaney, Cheryl Gallt, Chris Taylor, James Mills, Hal Baillie, Ben Wolford, and Paula Owens. Other staff present were Tracy Jones and Brittany Smith, Department of Law; David Filiatreau, Division of Traffic Engineering; Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering; and Embry Beatty, Division of Fire and Emergency Services.
- III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion was made by Ms. Worth, seconded by Mr. Forester and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), for the approval of minutes from the February 12, 2026 and February 26, 2026, public hearings.
- IV. **POSTPONEMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS** - Requests for postponement and withdrawal were considered at this time.
- A. **PLN-MAR-25-00017: LEGACY TRAIL, LLC** (3/26/26)* – a petition for a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Urban (A-U) zone to a Corridor Business (B-3) zone for 12.64 net (13.77 gross) acres for property located at 1170 Newtown Pike.
- Applicant Representation - Attorney Lauren Nichols was present to represent the applicant. She requested a two-month postponement to the May 28, 2026 public hearing. She reassured the Commission that this would be the last postponement of the project.
- Action - Mr. Wilson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Forester, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent) to postpone **PLN-MAR-25-00017: LEGACY TRAIL, LLC** and the associated development plan to the May 28, 2026, meeting.
- B. **PLN-ZOTA-24-00006: REVISIONS TO ARTICLE 23A-10 FOR THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (ED) ZONE** – a text amendment to modify the Economic Development (ED) zone.
- Applicant Representation - Attorney Lauren Nichols was present to represent the applicant. She requested a one-month postponement to the April 23, 2026 public hearing.
- Action - Mr. Forester made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis) to postpone **PLN-ZOTA-24-00006: REVISIONS TO ARTICLE 23A-10 FOR THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (ED) ZONE** to the April 23, 2026 meeting.
- C. **PLN-MAR-25-00015: BALL HOMES, INC.** (3/26/26)* – a petition for a zone map amendment from Agricultural-Rural (A-R) zone to an Expansion Area Residential (EAR-2) zone for 12.35 net (12.54 gross) acres for property located at 451 Chilesburg Road.
- Applicant Representation - Attorney Nick Nicholson was present to represent the applicant. He requested indefinite postponement.
- Action – Ms. Worth made a motion, seconded by Mr. Forester, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), to indefinitely postpone **PLN-MAR-25-00015: BALL HOMES, INC.**
- V. **LAND SUBDIVISION ITEMS** - The Subdivision Committee met on Thursday, March 5, 2026 at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was attended by Commission members Frank, Penn, Mike Owens, and Judy Worth. Other Committee members present were Vaughan Adkins, Division of Engineering; and David Filiatreau, Division of Traffic Engineering. Staff members in attendance were Traci Wade, Daniel Crum, Chris Chaney, Cheryl Gallt, Paula

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

Owens; Firefighter Embry Beatty, Division of Fire and 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.

VI. ZONING ITEMS - The Zoning Committee met on Thursday, March 5, 2026 1:30 p.m. to review zoning map amendments and Zoning Ordinance text amendments. The meeting was attended by Commission members Zach Davis, Johnathon Davis, Larry Forester, Molly Davis, Bruce Nicol, and William Wilson. Staff members present were Traci Wade, Daniel Crum, Jeremy Young, Chris Chaney, Ryelle Browning, Ben Wolford; Tracy Jones and Brittany Smith, Department of Law.

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. HILLPOINTE, LLC MAP AMMENDMENT REQUEST AND WHITE FARM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. **PLN-MAR-26-00002: HILLPOINTE, LLC** (5/3/26)* – a petition for a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Urban (A-U) zone to a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone for 38.998 net (39.148 gross) acres for property located at 3515 Richmond Road (a portion of).

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2045 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

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

preserving the unique Bluegrass landscape that has made Lexington-Fayette County the Horse Capital of the World.

Note: The petitioner is proposing to construct 118 single-family townhouse units and 480 multi-family units for a density of approximately 15.3 units per acre.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Postponement**.

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

1. The applicant should provide further information on the following Policies of the Comprehensive Plan:
 - a. Design policy #5: Provide pedestrian-friendly street patterns & walkable blocks to create inviting streetscapes.
 - b. Design policy #3: Multi-family residential developments should comply with the Multi-Family Design Standards in Appendix A.
 - c. Design Policy #9: Provide neighborhood-focused open spaces or parks within walking distance of residential uses.
 - d. Sustainability policy #4: Reduce and mitigate negative environmental impacts of impervious surfaces and vehicle use areas.
2. The applicant should provide further information on the following Development Criteria:
 - a. A-DS13-1 Stub streets should be connected.
 - b. D-CO5-1 Streets should be designed with shorter block lengths, narrower widths, and traffic calming features.
 - c. B-SU4-1 Development should minimize and/or mitigate impervious surfaces.
 - d. C-PS10-2 Over-parking of new developments should be avoided.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Jeremy Young oriented the Commission with the area of the zone change request on a portion of the White Farm, which has frontage on Richmond Road. He explained that the applicant is seeking to construct 118 single-family townhouse units and 480 multi-family units. Mr. Young shared aerial images of the subject property and emphasized the importance of the connection this project would create between Palumbo Drive and Dabney Drive.

Mr. Young clarified that the applicant submitted an updated development plan which made changes to increase the walkability of the project by adding traffic calming measures.

Mr. Young indicated that the staff now recommended **Approval** in accordance with the reasons listed below:

1. The proposed Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone is in agreement with the Imagine Lexington 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives for the following reasons:
 - a. The request will help meet an increase in the demand for housing and provide a variety of housing options (Theme A, Goal #1.a, #1.b and #1.d; Theme A, Goal #2.b).
 - b. The request increased residential density on an underutilized parcel (Theme A, Goal #2.a and #2.d).
 - c. The proposed pedestrian connections and open space amenities of the design align with the environmental and quality of life components of the Comprehensive Plan (Theme B, Goal #2.d; Theme D, Goal #1.a).
2. The requested Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone is in agreement with the 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Policies, for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposal increases residential density while still being sensitive to the surrounding context and connecting into the adjacent developed properties (Design Policy #4; Density Policy #1 and #2).
 - b. The request will provide additional housing options for this area (Design Policy #8).
 - c. The request is intended to meet the demand for a variety of income levels (Equity Policy #3).

3. The justification and corollary development plan are in agreement with the Development Criteria of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
 - a. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Land Use, as the request increases residential density in a compact development(A-DN2-1; B-SU3-1).
 - b. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Transportation, Connectivity, and Walkability as it creates a pedestrian connection between two existing residential developments (A-DS5-1; A-DS4- 1).
 - c. The request meets the criteria for Environmental Sustainability and Resiliency, as the request does not impact any environmentally sensitive areas (B-PR-2-1), and minimizes impact on adjacent development through the use of buffering elements (B-PR3-1).
 - d. The proposal meets the criteria for Site Design, as the development improves pedestrian connectivity in the area (C-LI8-1), and provides for programmed open space (D-PL4-1).
 - e. The plan meets the criteria for Building Form, as it meets the Multi-Family Design Standards (A-DS3-1) is scaled to respect the context of neighboring structures (A-DS4-2) and minimizes significant contrasts in scale, massing and design (A-DN2-2).
 4. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-26-00012: WHITE FARM, 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-26-00012: WHITE FARM** (5/3/26)* – located at 3515 RICHMOND ROAD, LEXINGTON, KY
Council District: 7
Project Contact: CMW, Inc.

Note: The purpose of this plan is to depict the development of 16 multi-family buildings, 117 townhomes, parking, circulation, and a public street, in support of the requested zone change from an Agricultural Urban (A-U) zone to a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone.

Requirements Not Met:

1. Dimension all driveways and walkways. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(5)) (Planning & Engineering)
2. Provide dumpster enclosure and concrete pad specifications that comply with the DSG. (Waste Management)
3. Provide open space exhibit and include open space requirements in the site statistics as a percentage. (ZO Art. 20-3) (Open Space)
4. The plan is creating a block length of greater than 1000'. Revision will be necessary. (LSR 6-4(a)) (Traffic)
5. Traffic calming measures shall be integrated into all existing and proposed street designs to improve public safety, ensure safe operating speeds, and facilitate context sensitive design that results in a safe multi-modal street network. (LSR 6-9) (Traffic)
6. Depict easements for stormwater controls. (Engineering)
7. Correct spelling error in cross-section D-D. (Planning)
8. Depict appropriate termination of a private street (cross-section E-E) on both sides of Dabney Drive. (Planning)
9. Depict appropriate collector cross-section for Dabney Drive. (Planning)

Waiver(s) Necessary:

1. LSR 6-4(a) and Exhibits 6-1 & 6-3 - Street cross-section and block length.
2. LSR 6-8(b) and 6-8(f) - Termination of a street.

Design Considerations:

1. See all Accela comments provided by the Division of Engineering.
2. Dumpster enclosure (close to building #9) might need to be adjusted for the truck to service. (Waste Management)
3. One parking spot (close to building #1) will need to be striped off for no parking. (Waste Management)
4. Townhome units will require 4 street names to be submitted to Office of Addressing for approval. (Addressing)

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

5. All pedestrian crossings wider than 24' will need to be raised crossings. All sidewalks will need to be dimensioned at 5' in width and 7' in width where adjacent to parking stalls. Bicycle parking will need to be distributed accordance with ZO Art. 16-12. Please use a table to allocate the parking per multi-family unit. (Bike/Ped)
6. A sanitary sewer analysis is needed to evaluate the additional flow on the existing system. (DWQ-Sanitary)
7. No Parking will be allowed on the 26' drive aisle throughout the development. (Fire)
8. Move sidewalk back off of the curb to ensure construction of ADA pathway with so many driveways. (Traffic)
9. Cross-section D-D is not exactly like the standard, but it appears to be in general agreement with the drive lane width, and improved pedestrian access. If the cross-section doesn't match the standard a waiver will be required. (Engineering)
10. OPSS fee/Privilege fees are required. (Engineering)

Plan Questions or Concerns:

1. Discuss potential for creating private streets in townhome area. (Planning)
2. Discuss need for waiver at time of PSP/FDP for street cross-sections. (Planning)
3. Will townhomes front internal driveways? (Planning & Engineering)
4. When would the future park sidewalk connection be made? (Traffic)
5. Will the townhome street be built to access easement standards or street standards? (Traffic)
6. Discuss the need for a sewer line extension and location of connection. (Engineering)
7. Is the proposed horizontal alignment of the proposed Dabney Dr. extension compliant with LFUCG Engineering technical manuals and Land Subdivision Regulations? (Engineering)
8. Discuss how the storm would outfall. (Engineering)
9. Have the basins shown been sized for this development yet? Is it deep enough to collect this entire development? (Engineering)
10. Discuss the proposal for stormwater management, quality and quantity? (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(9)) (Engineering)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Postponement**. There are questions regarding parking, streets, and circulation.

Should the plan be approved, the following requirements should be considered:

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to 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 street cross-sections and access.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Open Space planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Provided the Planning Commission grants the requested waiver for street cross-section, block length, and termination of a street.
8. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Chris Chaney referenced the updated development plan to orient the Commission with the layout of the proposed development. He explained the configuration of the townhomes and multi-family units and clarified how the through-street would connect Palumbo Drive to Dabney Drive.

Mr. Chaney explained to the Commission that the original development plan would have needed multiple waivers, but the changes made within the revised development plan would allow the project to move forward without any. He also indicated that before the plan is finalized, the applicant will need to provide additional information regarding parking spaces and street names.

Mr. Chaney presented a revised staff report which included the following requirements and conditions:

Requirements Not Met:

1. Provide dumpster enclosure and concrete pad specifications that comply with the DSG. (Waste Management)
2. Provide open space exhibit and include open space requirements in the site statistics as a percentage. (ZO Art. 20-3) (Open Space)
3. Depict easements for stormwater controls. (Engineering)

Waiver(s) Necessary – None at this time.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to 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 street cross-sections and access.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Open Space planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Provided the Planning Commission grants the requested waiver for street cross-section, block length, and termination of a street.
8. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Mr. Chaney concluded by stating that the staff now recommends approval of the preliminary development plan. He offered to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Questions – Mr. Michler sought clarification regarding the development's lack of connectivity.

Mr. Chaney explained that the roads within the proposed development were proposed as private roads and would only need access to Richmond Road if they were proposed as public.

Ms. Traci Wade, Planning Manager, added that since that section of the proposed development borders an LFUCG owned park, currently operating as a golf course, there isn't currently a reason to stub to the development with a public street.

Staff Presentation – Mr. James Mills, Transportation Planning, presented a traffic impact study to the Commission. He shared data pertaining to average annual daily traffic along Richmond Road, Man O' War Boulevard, and other surrounding residential streets. Mr. Mills said that the study found that the proposed development would have low traffic impact, and the new connection of Palumbo Drive to Dabney Drive would alleviate some traffic on Richmond Road and Man O' War Boulevard.

Due to the data found, Mr. Mills indicated that a newly proposed RCUT (Restricted Crossing U-Turn) at the intersection of Richmond Road and Yorkshire Boulevard could alter the findings of this study.

Commission Questions – Ms. Worth asked Mr. Mills to clarify the timeline for the proposed RCUT.

Mr. Mills stated that, according to the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the RCUT is slated to be completed in June, 2026.

Applicant Presentation – Attorney Nick Nicholson introduced the Pamela Thompson, Director of External Affairs with Hillpointe LLC, to the Commission. Ms. Thompson oriented the Commission with Hillpointe LLC and stated that they are the number one developer of workforce housing in the United States. She shared renderings of the proposed designs for both their townhomes and multi-family buildings.

Mr. Nicholson suggested that during the final development phase, the applicant will most likely request a waiver to narrow the Dabney Drive extension.

Citizen Comments – Harsha Wijesiri, Andover Estates, acknowledged the need for housing in Lexington, but expressed concerns with the development's impact on traffic on Dabney Drive. He also requested a secondary look at the proposed detention basins to make sure neighboring properties wouldn't be flooded. Lastly, he encouraged the Commission to consider an effort to maintain a natural green space near the back of the development.

Action – Mr. Forester made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nicol, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), to approve **PLN-MAR-26-00002: HILLPOINTE, LLC** for the reasons given by staff in the revised staff report.

Action – Mr. Forester made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nicol, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), to approve **PLN-MJDP-26-00012: WHITE FARM**, with the revised conditions presented by staff.

2. **4184 TODDS, LLC MAP AMMENDMENT REQUEST AND CROSSROADS CHURCH (LOT 3) DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. **PLN-MAR-26-00003: 4184 TODDS, LLC** (5/3/26)* – a petition for a zone map amendment from an Expansion Area Residential-1 (EAR-1) zone and Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to an Expansion Area Residential-2 (EAR-2) zone and Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone for 2.33 net (2.77 gross) acres for property located at 4184 Todds Road.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2045 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.

Note: The petitioner is proposing to construct 20 townhomes on 2.33 acres. The applicant's proposal results in a total residential density of approximately 8.6 dwelling units per net acre.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Postponement.**

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

1. The applicant should provide information addressing the Community Design Element of the 1996 Expansion Area Master Plan.
2. The applicant should address the lots that exceed the maximum size for the proposed zone.
3. The applicant should provide further information on the following development criteria: a. A-DS5-3: Building orientation should maximize connections with the street and create a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Young oriented the Commission with the area of the zone change request located at 4184 Todds Road. He stated that the applicant is seeking to rezone the subject property in order to construct 20 single-family townhouse units. Mr. Young explained the proposed development in adjacent to the Urban Service Area, and used aerial images to show surrounding buildings, including Crossroads Church and explained the relationship with the new Urban Growth Management Plan.

Mr. Young expressed initial concerns by Staff pertaining to lot size, and compliance with the 1996 Expansion Area Master Plan, but stated that the applicant had submitted revised development plans addressing these issues.

Mr. Young indicated that the staff now recommended **Approval** in accordance with the reasons listed below:

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

1. The proposed Expansion Area Residential-2 (EAR-2) zone is in agreement with the 1996 Expansion Area Master Plan, for the following reasons:
 - a. The request provides additional variety in residential options within the area (Community Design Element #5).
 - b. The request expands an existing network of interconnected residential uses (Community Design Element #4).
 - c. Due to the expansion of the Urban Service Boundary in 2024, the development is no longer adjacent to the Rural Service Area (Community Design Element #7), therefore, a higher density will not impact the agricultural land use in the area.
2. The proposed Expansion Area Residential-2 (EAR-2) and Medium Density Residential (R-4) zones are in agreement with the Imagine Lexington 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives for the following reasons:
 - a. The request will help meet an increase in the demand for housing and provide a variety of housing options (Theme A, Goal #1.a, #1.b and #1.d; Theme A, Goal #2.b).
 - b. The request increases residential density on an underutilized parcel (Theme A, Goal #2.a and #2.d).
 - c. The proposed pedestrian connections and open space amenities of the design align with the environmental and quality of life components of the Comprehensive Plan (Theme B, Goal #2.d; Theme D, Goal #1.a).
 - d. The development will maximize utility of the development while maintaining the character of adjacent development (Theme E, Goal #1.e).
3. The requested Medium Expansion Area Residential-2 (EAR-2) and Medium Density Residential (R-4) zones are in agreement with the 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Policies, for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposal increases residential density while still being sensitive to the surrounding context and connecting into the adjacent developed properties (Design Policy #4; Density Policy #1 and #2).
 - b. The request responds to the context of the corridor, providing additional density and intensity (Design Policy #4; Density Policy #1 and #2).
 - c. By locating the parking internally, within parking structures, the proposed development enhances walkability and bikeability (Design Policy #7).
 - d. The request will provide additional housing options for this area, which is predominately characterized by single-family detached structures or multi-family housing (Design Policy #8).
4. The justification and corollary development plan are in agreement with the Development Criteria of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
 - a. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Land Use, as the request increases residential density in a compact development (A-DN2-1; B-SU3-1).
 - b. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Transportation, Connectivity, and Walkability as it creates a pedestrian connection between existing residential development and future development (A-DS5-1; A-DS4-1).
 - c. The request meets the criteria for Environmental Sustainability and Resiliency, as the request does not impact any environmentally sensitive areas (B-PR-2-1), and minimizes impact on adjacent development through the use of buffering elements (B-PR3-1).
 - d. The proposal meets the criteria for Site Design, as the development improves pedestrian connectivity in the area (C-LI8-1), and provides for programmed open space (D-PL4-1).
 - e. The plan meets the criteria for Building Form, as it scaled to respect the context of neighboring structures (A-DS4-2) and minimizes significant contrasts in scale, massing and design (A-DN2-2).
5. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-26-00007: CROSSROADS CHURCH (LOT 3), prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.

Commission Questions – Mr. Michler noted that it was uncharacteristic to request a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone change alongside a preliminary development plan for townhomes and questioned the reasoning behind the decision.

Mr. Young clarified that the decision was made to blend the existing Expansion Area Residential (EAR) zone with the proposed density that the applicant was trying to achieve through the project. He stated that the R-4 zone allows a smaller lot size necessary for the development to facilitate its design.

- b. **PLN-MJDP-26-00007: CROSSROADS CHURCH (LOT 3)** (5/3/26)* – located at 4184 TODDS ROAD, LEXINGTON, KY
Council District: 12
Project Contact: EA Partners

Note: The purpose of this plan is to depict the construction of 20 townhomes and associated parking, in support of the requested zone change from an Expansion Area-1 (EAR-1) zone and Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to an Expansion Area-2 (EAR-2) zone and Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone.

Requirements Not Met:

1. Denote: All buildings, paving, signs, fences, walls, and retaining walls that are depicted, described, or required on this development plan shall require a separate review and building permit from the Division of Building Inspection prior to construction. (ZO Art. 21(b)(1)) (Building Inspection)
2. Denote: No building permits shall be issued unless and until a final development plan is approved by the Planning Commission. (ZO Art 21-6(b)&(c))
3. Addition of street cross-section for existing and proposed access easement. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(6)) (Planning & Engineering)
4. Remove proposed property boundaries for Group Residential (ZO Art. 9-4 & Art. 8-1(f)) (Planning)
5. Denote the front and rear of the townhomes. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(8)) (Planning)
6. Denote maintenance for common area, access easement, parking and stormwater. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(6)) (Planning & Engineering)
7. Label landscape buffer areas for zone-to-zone, VUA, and perimeter. (ZO Art. 18-3) (Landscape Planning)
8. Provide open space exhibit that includes open space for group residential, and include open space requirements in the site statistics as a percentage. (ZO Art 20-2(b) & 3) (Open Space & Planning)
9. Continue roadway improvements to Todds Road similar to the previously developed apartment lot. (Traffic)
10. Provide a Tree Inventory Map as a separate document with all required information. (ZO Art. 26-4(b)) (Urban Forester)
11. Add purpose note for the amendment to the development plan. (ZO Art. 21-7(d)(2)) (Engineering)
12. Depict all existing and proposed easements. (ZO 21-6 (a)(10) (Engineering)
13. Label the proposed access easements for the access to the townhouse properties. (Engineering)

Design Considerations:

1. See all Accela comments provided by the Division of Engineering.
2. The Garden Estates pump station, that you will most likely connect to, is private. (DWQ-Sanitary)

Plan Questions or Concerns:

1. Discuss 20' side yard between buildings. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(8)) (Planning)
2. Discuss sewer connection to commercial. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(10)) (Planning & Engineering)
3. Discuss improvements to Todds Road for curb, gutter, and sidewalk. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(6)) (Planning)
4. Is a dumpster planned for this location? (Waste Management)
5. Discuss frontage and access to right-of-way. (Planning & Traffic)
6. Are the driveways supposed to be access easements? (Engineering)
7. Is a sanitary sewer tap available for each proposed lot? (Engineering)
8. What is the proposal for stormwater management? (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(9) & SWM 1.5.6) (Engineering)
9. Discuss Placebuilder criteria.

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Postponement**. The depicted lotting and sewer do not meet the Zoning Ordinance and Land Subdivision Regulations.

Should the plan be approved, the following requirements should be considered:

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to EAR-2 and R-4; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, and storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Open Space planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Staff Presentation – Ms. Cheryl Gallt oriented the Commission with the revised development plan. She emphasized the requirement for open space had changed due to the revised plan from the applicant which placed each townhome on an individual lot and provided shared open space within the development.

Ms. Gallt presented a revised staff report which included the following requirements and conditions:

Requirements Not Met:

1. Addition of street cross-section for proposed access easement across the development. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(6)) (Planning & Engineering)
2. Provide open space exhibit that includes open space for group residential, and include open space requirements in the site statistics as a percentage. (ZO Art 20-2(b) & 3) (Open Space & Planning)
3. Label the proposed access easements for the access to the townhouse properties. (Engineering)
4. Addition of missing information on adjacent property.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to EAR-2 and R-4; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, and storm and sanitary sewers, and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Open Space planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Ms. Gallt concluded by stating that the staff now recommended approval. She offered to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Applicant Presentation – Attorney Wes Harned, council for the applicant, thanked the staff for their effort to most appropriately develop an underutilized and unique plot of land. He stated he agrees with the staff's new recommendation of approval.

Rory Kahly, EA Partners, reiterated that the reason the open space plan was not a requirement was due to the type of development, and the usage number of units being less than 25.

Commission Questions – Mr. Wilson sought clarification about what kind of community engagement the applicant participated in and what kind of feedback they received.

Mr. Harned explained that Crossroads Church allowed them a space to host a community meeting, but only one person attended.

Mr. Michler expressed concerns about the backs of the homes facing Todds Road.

Mr. Kahly stated that the project was intended to be an interior development, and that the mailboxes and dumpsters were all located within the center of the project.

Mr. Harned added that the orientation of the development created a sense of community.

Mr. Michler acknowledged that the proposed development made sense for its location but would like to see future projects facing public roads.

Ms. Worth requested that the applicant maintain as much of the tree canopy as possible.

Staff Comments – Ms. Wade added that half of the townhomes depicted in the development plan have frontage on a public street (Todds Road). She stated that the other half of the townhomes will have frontage on an access easement, and that is often an accepted design solution. She noted that staff agrees that residential frontage facing the corridor is positive as opposed to the backyards of housing.

Ms. Worth suggested to Mr. Michler that he introduce the topic of public road residential frontage at a future work session.

Action – Mr. Wilson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Worth, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), to approve **PLN-MAR-26-00003: 4184 TODDS, LLC** based upon the findings presented by staff.

Action – Mr. Wilson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Worth, and carried 7-0 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, and M. Davis absent), to approve **PLN-MJDP-26-00007: CROSSROADS CHURCH (LOT 3)**, with the revised conditions provided by staff.

Note: Mr. Forester left the meeting at 2:08pm.

VII. COMMISSION ITEMS

- A. **LEXINGTON'S PRESERVATION AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM** – a public hearing to addend the 2023 Comprehensive Plan: Imagine Lexington 2045 by incorporating Lexington's Preservation and Growth Management Program (LPGMP).

Staff Presentation – Hal Baillie, Long Range Planning Manager, presented the Commission with a review of completed objectives from the Imagine Lexington 2045 Plan and introduced the final step of the process, which is to incorporate the Urban County Council's input, and adopt a new process to review the Urban Services area and add that program as an amendment to the elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Baillie emphasized the importance of adopting a data-driven program that would allow the Planning Staff to make better, more informed recommendations when addressing Lexington's growth needs while allowing the Comprehensive Plan to have a broader focus.

Commission Questions – Mr. Wilson sought clarification as to who makes the final decision in adopting Lexington's Preservation and Growth Management Program (LPGMP).

Mr. Baillie explained that the Urban County Council makes the final decision on whether Lexington will expand the Urban Service Area, as for where and how, that decision is made by the Planning Commission. He added that this process will only begin when data indicates that there is a lack of residential land within the Urban Service Area.

Mr. Michler expressed concern with the formula provided by staff, stating he believed that if the formula and proposal were adopted into the Comprehensive Plan, they would push Lexington further away from its goals, rather than closer. He referenced a past data-driven process concerning parking minimums, and attributed Lexington's over development of parking lots to it. He likened this process to that of the past plan and reiterated his reservations.

Mr. Baillie reassured the Commission that they would have first review of any future implementation through the Comprehensive Plan, and a secondary review through the Growth Trends Report.

Mr. Nicol stated that he believed a data-driven approach to Lexington's growth is exactly how the staff should proceed and thanked Mr. Baillie for his efforts in creating the proposed plan.

Ms. Worth asked Mr. Michler if he was satisfied with Mr. Baillie's response to his concerns. Mr. Michler admitted that he was not and clarified that he could not support a formula that he believed was not focused on Lexington's future goals and objectives.

Action – Mr. Nicol made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 5-1 (Penn, Owens, J. Davis, Forester, and M. Davis absent, Michler opposed), to approve **Lexington's Preservation and Growth Management Program (LPGMP)** as an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan 2045 for the reasons given by staff.

Mr. Duncan thanked the Commission and reminded them that Committee meetings would take place on Thursday, April 2nd, at 8:30am (Subdivision) and 1:30 pm (Zoning).

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

Zach Davis, Chair

Robin Michler, Secretary

TW/DC/JY/CC/BW