

**1. SCOTTY BAESLER ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AND CANEBRAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 1 DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

a. **PLN-MAR-25-00013: SCOTTY BAESLER** (11/20/25)\* – a petition for a zone map amendment from Agricultural- Rural (A-R) zone to a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone and a Light Industrial (I-1) for 65.69 net (73.72 gross) acres for properties located at 200, 201, 250, 251, & 301 Canebrake Drive.

**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.

The applicant is seeking to rezone the subject properties from the Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to the Medium Density Residential (R-4) and Light Industrial zones in order to construct an industrial flex space development and a residential development with a variety of housing types, including single-family, duplexes and multi-family structures.

**The Zoning Committee Recommended: Postponement.**

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

1. The letter of justification does not include any substantive discussion of the Urban Growth Master Plan (UGMP) other than the land use element. The applicant should provide a discussion of the aspects of the Master Plan that are being met with this request.
2. The applicant should address the following Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan:
  - a. Respect the context and design features of areas surrounding development projects and develop design standards and guidelines to ensure compatibility with existing urban form (Theme A, Goal #2.b).
  - b. Improve traffic operation strategies, traffic calming, and safety for all users (Theme D, Objective 1.d).
  - c. Implement the Complete Streets policy, prioritizing a pedestrian-first design that also accommodates the needs of bicycle, transit and other vehicles (Theme D, Objective 1.a).
  - d. Expand the network of accessible transportation options for residents and commuters, which may include the use of mass transit, bicycles, walkways, ridesharing, greenways and other strategies (Theme D, Objective 1.b).
3. The letter of justification does not address any of the Policies of the Comprehensive Plan that are being met with this request.
4. The zone change application for the subject property necessitates a Parking Demand Mitigation Study in accordance with Article 16-14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
5. The applicant should provide further information regarding the following Development Criteria:
  - a. Regulating Plan Section 1.d: Where development is adjacent to agriculturally zoned land in the Rural Service Area, a buffer of a minimum of 100 feet, subject to the following (Regulating Plan Section 1.d):
    - i. The buffer depth should be measured parallel to the edge of the Rural Service Area.
    - ii. No principal or accessory building, parking, signage, or driveways should occupy the buffer.
    - iii. Stub Streets, Shared-use paths and vegetated open space should be allowed in the buffer.
    - iv. A maximum length of a stub-street of 15 feet with the remaining length to the boundary of the Urban Service Area dedicated for future roadway construction.
  - b. If the buffer is used to meet open space requirements, it should remain open space unless its loss would not render the development nonconforming with regard to open space requirements.
  - c. Regulating Plan Section 3.a.4: No more than one non-alley curb cut should be placed along a given block face;
  - d. Regulating Plan Section 3.f.1: Single-family and townhouse dwellings should not have vehicular access directly from or across an arterial, collector, boulevard, or shared-use path right-of-way, unless from an alley that is shared by multiple lots

- d. Stakeholders should be consulted to discuss site opportunities and constraints prior to submitting an application.
- e. A-DS4-1: A plan for a connected multi-modal network to adjacent neighborhoods, green spaces, developments and complementary uses should be provided.
- f. A-DS11-1: Street layouts should provide clear, visible access to neighborhood focused open space and green spaces.
- g. B-RE2-1: Lexington's green infrastructure network, including parks, trails, greenways, or natural areas should be highly visible and accessible.
- h. C-LI8-1: Development should enhance a well-connected and activated public realm.
- i. B-PR2-1: Impact on environmentally sensitive areas should be minimized within and adjacent to the proposed development site.
- j. A-DS3-1 Multi-family residential developments should comply with the Multifamily Design Standards in Appendix A.

b. **PLN-MJDP-25-00050: CANE BRAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 1 (BAESLER PROPERTY)** (11/20/25)\* – located at 200, 201, 250, 251, & 301 CANE BRAKE DRIVE, LEXINGTON, KY

Note: The purpose of this plan is to depict flex space and residential development in support of the requested zone changes from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to a Light Industrial (I-1) zone and a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone.

Requirements Not Met:

1. Depict direct pedestrian connection for all buildings to the street. (ZO Art 16-6(a)(3)) (Traffic Engineering)
2. Update Canebrake Drive cross-section as a typical boulevard section and include a protected bike lane. (UGMP pgs. 174 & 189) (Traffic & Planning)
3. Revise intersection of Canebrake Drive and new street to be a roundabout as indicated by the UGMP, p. 181. (Traffic & Planning)
4. All internal walkways shall comply with ZO Art. 16-6(c)(2). (Traffic)
5. Label the centerline of the blueline stream on property as indicated by the Kentucky Geologic Map website. (Environmental Services)
6. Denote: Structures built in areas of alluvial soils will have a foundation and footer detail prepared by a licensed professional engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. (LSR Art. 6-11) (Environmental Services)
7. Denote: No buildings or structures shall be located on any land with a slope greater than 30%. For areas with slopes between 15% and 30%, the provisions of Article 6-11 of the Land Subdivision Regulations shall be applicable. (Environmental Services)
8. Denote: No building permits shall be issued unless and until a final development plan is approved by the Planning Commission. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(17)) (Planning & Engineering)
9. Provide a 15' landscape buffer between the I-1 zone and the adjacent B-5P zones. (ZO Art. 18-3) (Landscape)
10. Dimension access points, driveways, sidewalks, and parking spaces. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(5)) (Planning)
11. Clarify residential unit count in site statistics box. (Planning)
12. Update R-4 zone requirements to reflect the different standards for the single-family and multi-family uses. (Planning)
13. Depict 100-foot Rural Service Area setback. (UGMP pg. 211) (Planning)
14. Depict group residential project yard requirements. (ZO Art. 9) (Planning)
15. Depict all existing and proposed easements. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(10)) (Planning & Engineering)
16. Depict vegetative buffer per ZO Art. 19-7(g) and add Vegetative Buffer Zone maintenance note per SWM 1.4.4. (Engineering)
17. Provide open space exhibit that is in compliance with ZO Art. 20. (Open Space)

Waiver(s) Necessary: None at this time.

Design Considerations: None at this time.

Plan Questions or Concerns:

1. Forward street name suggestions or Addressing Office will assign. (Addressing)

2. Discuss street layout and alley system requirement within UGMP. (Planning)
3. Discuss street connectivity to adjoining tracts. (Planning)
4. Discuss proposed setbacks for single-family residential and duplex uses. (Planning)
5. Discuss extent of floodplain and the need for a flood study. (ZO Art. 19-7(g)) (Planning)
6. Discuss compliance with multi-family guidelines. (Planning)
7. Discuss timing of Note #12 concerning sidewalks and handicap spaces. (Engineering)
8. Discuss how the existing sanitary sewer system will be accessed by the proposed development as well as the availability and capacity for the area. (Engineering)
9. Discuss location of stormwater management areas and who will construct, own, and maintain them. (Engineering)
10. Discuss Placebuilder Criteria. (Planning)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: Postponement. There are questions regarding compliance with the Urban Growth Master Plan.

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to I-1 & 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 open space areas.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
8. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Jeremy Young oriented the Commission to the area of the zone change request on Canebrake Drive, and presented the revised staff report and recommendations for the zone change application. He displayed aerial photo photographs of the subject property and the general area, as well as graphics of the surrounding zoning in the immediate area. He stated that the applicant was seeking a zone map amendment from an Agricultural Rural (A-R) zone to a combination of a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone and a Light Industrial (I-1) zone for over 60 acres within expansion area 4 of the recently adopted Urban Growth Management Plan. Canebrake Drive is planned to connect north to Todds Road.

Mr. Young indicated that the applicant submitted a justification for the zone change utilizing the updated Placebuilder. They propose a New Complete Neighborhood Place-Type, with a Medium Density Residential Development Type associated with the proposed R-4 zone, and Industry and Production Center Place-Type, an Industry and Production Non-residential Development Type associated with the I-1 zone. Mr. Young indicated that the Staff was in agreement with those selections, and that they were supported by the Urban Growth Management Plan and the Flex-Space land use recommendation.

Mr. Young indicated that there were a number of initial concerns about the applicant's submitted materials, including a missing buffer along Rural Service Area boundary, lack of street connectivity and multi-modal infrastructure, lack of traffic calming or traffic management, and too many access points to the residential areas. Mr. Young stated that a revised justification and development plan had been submitted to resolve the issues. Mr. Young stated that the Staff now recommends approval and a revised staff report has been distributed to the Planning Commission. Mr. Young stated that the application meets the goals and objectives of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan, the policies and Placebuilder of the Plan, as well as the land use element and recommendations of the Urban Growth Management Plan. Mr. Young offered to address any questions from the Planning Commission. There were no questions at this time.

Development Plan Presentation – Mr. Daniel Crum oriented the Planning Commission to the location and characteristics of the subject properties along Canebrake Drive. Mr. Crum stated that development plan does reflect improvements to Canebrake Drive, including roadway widening, sidewalks and traffic circles. Mr. Crum identified the industrial areas closest to Athens Boonesboro Road and along the east side of Canebrake Drive, adjacent to the Urban Service Area. The plan depicts numerous speculative buildings of various sizes for industrial and warehouse uses. In addition, he identified the area proposed for residential

land use with various dwelling types, which will be served by public streets including alleys. Mr. Crum stated that the staff provided a revised staff report with a list of requirements not met and conditions of approval for the Planning Commission's consideration based on the revised plan, as follows:

Requirements Not Met:

1. Depict direct pedestrian connection for all buildings to the street. (ZO Art 16-6(a)(3)) (Traffic Engineering)
2. All internal walkways shall comply with ZO Art. 16-6(c)(2). (Traffic)
3. Label the centerline of the blueline stream on property as indicated by the Kentucky Geologic Map website. (Environmental Services)
4. Denote: Structures built in areas of alluvial soils will have a foundation and footer detail prepared by a licensed professional engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. (LSR Art. 6-11) (Environmental Services)
5. Denote: No buildings or structures shall be located on any land with a slope greater than 30%. For areas with slopes between 15% and 30%, the provisions of Article 6-11 of the Land Subdivision Regulations shall be applicable. (Environmental Services)
6. Denote: No building permits shall be issued unless and until a final development plan is approved by the Planning Commission. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(17)) (Planning & Engineering)
7. Dimension access points, driveways, sidewalks, and parking spaces. (ZO Art. 21-6(a)(5)) (Planning)
8. Depict vegetative buffer per ZO Art. 19-7(g) and add Vegetative Buffer Zone maintenance note per SWM 1.4.4. (Engineering)
9. Indicate location of bicycle parking. (Planning)
10. Denote: The Architectural Design Elements in the Multi-Family Design Guidelines shall be addressed at the final development plan stage.
11. Provide property perimeter landscape buffer where I-1 zone adjoins R-4 zone. (ZO Art. 18-2(a)) (Planning)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to I-1 & 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 open space areas.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval if environmentally sensitive areas.
7. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
8. Correct all noted deficiencies listed as "requirements not met" herein.

Mr. Crum concluded by stating the Staff is now recommending approval of the preliminary development plan subject to the granting of the zone change, addressing the corrections and conditions as presented. He offered to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Questions – Mr. Michler asked for Mr. Crum to present the proposed connections from the subject properties to adjoining parcels. Mr. Michler asked for clarification about why there no stub streets or connections into the exiting Blue Sky Activity Center. Mr. Crum stated that stub connections into existing development are not typically depicted because of the limited possibility of such connections occurring. Also, connections are focused on vacant land within the Urban Growth Management Plan. Mr. Michler asked that the Staff continue to pursue connectivity to the greatest extent possible.

Applicant Presentation – Mr. Nick Nicholson, attorney with Stoll Keenon Ogden PLLC, was present representing Former Congressman and Mayor Scotty Baesler and his family. Mr. Rory Kahly and Mr. Al Gross, EA Partners, were also present to answer questions about the development plan. Mr. Nicholson emphasized that the zone change request addressed creating employment opportunities and housing growth, both of which were important reasons for the expansion of the Urban Service Area. He stated that the future land use recommended here was complimentary to the existing uses in the immediate area. Mr. Nicholson stated that the zone change is in agreement with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Growth Management Plan. Mr. Nicholson focused on the topographical changes on the site, which lends

itself to appropriate transitions between the industrial and residential land uses, and protection of the floodplain and its tributaries. Mr. Nicholson reviewed the design details and changes that occurred during the application review process. Mr. Nicholson offered to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Questions – Mr. Penn stated that he understood that this is a conceptual plan that is a bit of a placeholder. He asked how much change would be acceptable before the final plan would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Mr. Nicholson said that the plan had a significant level of detail that should give the Commission comfort that the plan is and will remain in compliance with the adopted plans and Zoning Ordinance regulations. He stated that any waiver would be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a future hearing. Mr. Penn asked how infrastructure would be paid for associated with development on this land since exactions will not be applied to land in the Urban Growth Management Plan (UGMP) area. Mr. Nicholson said that question is currently being evaluated by the administration and that their consultant is expecting to have a presentation in January 2026 to provide a proposed framework. Mr. Penn said he looked forward to hearing more and indicated he would ask this for all developments within the UGMP areas.

Mr. Owens asked for clarification about a presentation in January 2026. Mr. Nicholson indicated that the presentation would be to the Urban County Council. Mr. Duncan stated that a presentation would be forthcoming to the Planning Commission in the next few months.

Public Comment – Chair Davis asked if there was anyone present to speak either in support or against the proposed zone change. There was no comment from the audience, therefore the Chair closed the hearing.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Forester and seconded by Mr. Wilson and carried 8-0 (M. Davis, Nicol and Worth absent) to approve **PLN-MAR-25-00013: SCOTTY BAESLER** for reasons provided by Staff.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Forester and seconded by Mr. Wilson and carried 8-0 (M. Davis, Nicol and Worth absent) to approve **PLN-MJDP-25-00050: CANEBRAKE SUBDIVISION, UNIT 1 (BAESLER PROPERTY)** with the corrections and revised conditions recommended by Staff.