

July 1, 2019

Via Hand Delivery Mail

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Planning Commission  
200 East Main Street  
Lexington, Kentucky 40507

Re: 840 Angliana Avenue Zone Change from B-4 to R-5

Dear Commissioners:

Please be advised that I represent F2 Companies, LLC (“F2”). My client desires to rezone approximately 5.57 acres from the Wholesale and Warehouse Business (B-4) zone to the High Rise Apartment (R-5) zone in order to construct a multi-family development on the property. We submit that this proposal is in accord with the recently adopted “Imagine Lexington” 2018 Comprehensive Plan, and request your approval of our request.

The subject property is currently developed as a 200,000 square foot warehouse facility. This warehouse facility covers virtually the entirety of the subject property. To the south of the site, there are several R-4 and R-5 multi-family housing developments. To the east are industrial zoned properties, to the north are small lot warehouse developments and some non-conforming single family housing. To the west are single family homes and the Red Mile racetrack. The site is in relatively close proximity to both the University of Kentucky and the Lexington urban core.

We think our proposed development is highly appropriate for this site and reflects the kind of development needed in the evolving Angliana corridor. Over the last few decades, several sites previously zoned as industrial and warehouse have found new life as multi-family housing developments. Indeed, due to the premier location offering housing options for those that work and study at the University of Kentucky, as well as those seeking housing options near the urban core that permit walking and/or biking to a place of employment, housing has proven to be the most appropriate redevelopment of this area. As you are certainly aware, housing density is a crucial component of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan. Developments of this type are crucial to our long-term success as a community. Further, though the development is dense, it will actually result in less rooftop coverage than the existing warehouse facility.

In sum, we are excited to present this proposal to the Planning Commission for consideration. We think it meets numerous goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, and further complies with relevant standards articulated in the “Placebuilder” included as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

We submit that this proposal comports with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan in the following ways:

### Theme A – Growing Successful Neighborhoods

We submit that this proposal comports with Theme A of the Comprehensive Plan. In reviewing Theme A, we maintain that this development comports with the applicable design policies articulated, and is appropriately dense. We further submit that it meets the following goals and objectives articulated in Theme A:

#### *Expand Housing Choices*

Goal 1 of Theme A of the Comp Plan lists several objectives. Among them is that Lexington should “[a]ccomodate the demand for housing in Lexington responsibly, *prioritizing higher-density* and a mixture of housing types” (emphasis supplied). This proposal emphasizes housing density in a responsible fashion. It provides needed density while not displacing existing residents, and does so in a manner that ensures adequate parking while offering the opportunity for less reliance on personal automobiles.

#### *Support Infill & Redevelopment Through the Urban Service Area as a Strategic Component of Urban Growth*

Goal 2 of Theme A emphasizes that areas for infill and redevelopment should be identified. This site falls within the defined Infill and Redevelopment Area, and replaces an aging, massive structure with modern, safe, dense housing choices. It further respects the context of the existing area, in that it is a development of a similar nature and scope to other developments in this area.

#### *Provide Well-Designed Neighborhoods & Communities*

We believe this proposal addresses two of the objectives of Goal 3 of Theme A in a direct way. First, it will assist with providing various modes of transportation as an option. Because of its location, this site is ideal for individuals who may wish to walk or ride a bike to work or school, as it is in close proximity to the University of Kentucky, the University of Kentucky Medical Center, and the urban core. It is also in close proximity to Lextran Routes 15, 13, 12, and 8, for those that would wish to utilize public transportation. Additionally, by removing a structure that covers nearly the entire site, it gives an opportunity to expand the urban forest in this area.

### Theme B – Protecting the Environment

We also submit that this proposal comports with goals and objectives articulated in Theme B of the Comp Plan.

#### *Reduce Lexington-Fayette County’s Carbon Footprint*

As previously noted, the location of this proposed development is ideally located to reduce the need for reliance upon personal automobiles. This is a key objective of Goal 2 of Theme B.

### Theme D – Improving a Desirable Community

We further submit that this proposal comports with the goals and objectives articulated in Theme D of the Comp Plan.

#### *Work to Achieve an Effective & Comprehensive Transportation System*

We believe this proposal meets several of the objectives of Goal 1 of Theme D. Our development will provide this portion of Angliana Avenue (abutting our development) with curb, gutter, and sidewalks. These are not presently provided on the subject property, and will aid in safe pedestrian movement in the area. Further, it concentrates dense residential development along corridors served by Lextran, which will assist Lextran with more efficient provision of service.

### Theme E – Urban & Rural Balance

Finally, we submit that this proposal meets the goal of safeguarding rural land by providing needed housing units in an appropriately dense manner, thus reducing pressure on the Urban Service Boundary.

#### The Placebuilder

We have further evaluated our proposal under the design criteria in the Placebuilder. In consultation with Planning staff, we submit that this proposal should be evaluated the Second-Tier Urban Place Type, and that the proposed development is appropriate classified as medium density (notwithstanding that it increases the existing permitted density on the site). We submit that this classification is appropriate because of the site's proximity to the urban core, and due to it's location within the Infill and Redevelopment Boundary.

Attached hereto is a color-coded reflection of how we have addressed the design criteria listed in that Placebuilder category. Items highlighted in orange are represented graphically on our amended preliminary development plan; items in yellow are addressed in this letter, and items not highlighted we do not believe are applicable to our proposal.

#### *Standards That Are Applicable to Our Proposal*

*A-DS4-2:* The projects has been designed in manner to place smaller buildings along the edge of the property and to place the larger building in the center of the property.

*A-DS-1:* This proposal places multi-family uses in an area near existing (though nonconforming) single family housing.

*A-DS10-1:* We are utilizing the club house as the focal point for our development. All residential units are in close proximity to the clubhouse.

*A-DN2-1:* This infill proposal would increase residential density.

*A-DN2-2:* As noted above, the project has been designed to place smaller buildings on the edges next to existing structures, and concentrate the more intense buildings in the center of the property.

*A-EQ3-1:* Due to the project design, the transition to the existing (non-conforming) single family residential has reduced conflicts in scale.

*B-SU11-1:* The developer will investigate the appropriateness of the utilization of green infrastructure and will work with staff to identify potential uses.

*C-LI6-1:* The development is near two significant corridors, and provides multi-family housing that is walkable to several commercial and employment sites.

*C-LI7-1:* As above, the development is in a highly walkable/bikable location that provides easy access to community amenities, both within the development (clubhouse) and external to it.

*C-PS10-3:* We have sought to minimize the parking on the site to a level sufficient to be commercial sufficient, but not overparked.

*D-PL7-1:* We have sent letters to adjacent neighbors after learning the neighborhood association has gone defunct, and requested their input.

*E-GR9-4:* This property is presently underutilized, with an aging warehouse that does not appear to be commercially viable in the long term. The use on the site will be intensified, but on a scale of that already existing in the general area.

*A-DS1-1:* The applicant is open to working with Lextran to implement appropriate transit infrastructure.

*A-DS1-2:* As above, the applicant will work with Lextran, and has already been in contact, to discuss the most appropriate provision of mass transit service for the development.

*A-DS4-1:* The proposed development will allow for further completion of the street system, which will aid with pedestrian movements in the area. By providing access to the pedestrian system and street system, multi-modal transportation can be utilized. The applicant will further consult with staff to determine what additional improvements could aid with multi-modal transit.

*A-DS5-2:* The development will seek to provide a vertical edge along Angliana Avenue.

*A-EQ3-2:* This project will be transit-oriented inasmuch as multiple methods of transit will be readily available. Completion of the street system will further provide access to adjacent neighborhoods.

*D-CO1-1:* As above, completion of the street system will support the classification as a second-tier urban, medium density place type.

*D-CO2-1:* We have actively engaged with Lextran to discuss the most appropriate way to provide transit access and will complete the street system.

*D-CO2-2:* As above, completion of the street system will aid in safe access.

*D-SP1-3:* As above, we are committed to working with Lextran for access to the University of Kentucky and downtown, as well as will complete the street system to provide for pedestrian facilities.

*Standards Not Applicable*

*A-DS11-1:* There is no school affiliated with our proposal.

*A-DN3-2:* Angliana is not a commercial center and commercial options have been discouraged at this location.

*A-DN6-1:* This proposal seeks density above and beyond that provided by single-family residential.

*A-EQ7-1:* This proposal does not have a school.

*B-PR9-1:* There are no environmentally sensitive sites in this area.

*C-LI6-2:* This is not a single family development.

*C-PS10-2:* There are no underutilized parking lots in the area to our knowledge.

*D-PL9-1:* There are no historically significant structures on the site.

*D-PL10-1:* We believe this streetscape is already quite active.

*D-SP3-1:* There are no wireless towers as part of this application.

*D-SP3-2:* There are no wireless towers as part of this application.

*D-SP9-1:* This development is not focused on the senior population (though they would be welcome).

*E-GR4-1:* The existing structure on the site is not viable.

*E-GR5-1:* There are no historically significant structures on the property.

*E-GR9-1:* Because of the student and young professional focus of the development, we do not believe live/work units are appropriate.

*E-GR9-3:* The existing character of the area is already largely multi-family residential.

*B-SU4-1:* Greenspace and recreation is available nearby.

*D-CO4-2:* The development is not large enough to contemplate new street construction.

*D-CO5-1:* As above, this is an infill project not creating new streets.

*E-ST3-1:* This development is not located along a major corridor, though we are working with Lextran proactively.

*A-DS4-3:* The entire site is presently developed and there are no natural features.

*A-EQ7-3:* There is an abundance of nearby community open space, including the UK Campus, Addison Park, McConnell Springs, and the Gary Brewer Golf Course.

*B-PR2-1:* Again, the site is currently wholly developed.

*B-PR2-2:* There are no floodplains on this site.

*B-PR2-3:* There are no floodplains on this site.

*B-PR7-1:* There are no existing greenways or stream corridors to connect.

*D-SP2-1:* There is no school site for this project.

*D-SP2-2:* There is no existing greenway network in this area.

*E-GR3-2:* There is no unique geography on the site due to its previous development.

Conclusion

In sum, we submit that our proposal is in accord with the 2018 Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to our continued discussions with staff and the Commission, and request your approval of our request. Of course, if I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Jacob C. Walbourn  
Counsel for F2 Companies

JCW/klm