

SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORT ON PETITION FOR ZONE MAP AMENDMENT PLN-MAR-25-00013: SCOTTY BAESLER



STAFF REVIEW

In the period following the initial Zoning Committee meeting, the applicant met with staff to discuss the concerns described within the initial staff report and the comments received during the committee meetings. Since that time, the applicant has submitted updated application materials, including a revised development plan, revised open space exhibit, revised tree inventory map, a parking demand mitigation study, and a supplemental letter of justification.

The revisions to the proposed development plan include reorienting the multi-family/parking area relationship, adding a traffic circle, alleyways and a stub street for future connectivity. The updated plan also depicts the buffer area recommended when abutting agriculturally-zoned property.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In the initial staff report, staff requested that the applicant demonstrate how they were in agreement with the following Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

Theme A, Objective #2.b - Respect the context and design features of areas surrounding development projects and develop design standards and guidelines to ensure compatibility with the existing urban form.

Staff noted that the original development plan lacked the 100-foot buffer to agriculturally-zoned properties. The applicant has revised the development plan to depict this buffer, and relocated the industrial structures to meet the setback.

Theme A, Goal #3.d - Improve Lexington's transportation network through ample street and sidewalk connections between new and existing development.

Initially, staff requested additional connections to undeveloped parcels. The revised layout contains stub street connections to both the north and east of the subject properties, as well as increased sidewalk facilities. The revisions also denote changes to the boulevard cross-section to bring the existing roadway into compliance with the roadway recommendations for the Urban Growth Master Plan.

Theme D, Objective #1.a - 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.b - Expand the network of accessible transportation options for residents and commuters, which may include the use of mass transit, bicycles, walkways, ride-sharing, greenways and other strategies.

The Urban Growth Master Plan calls for improvements to Canebrake Drive, which is designated in the Urban Growth Master Plan as a Boulevard street type. These improvements include dedicated protected bike lanes, which were not shown on the cross-section for the initial proposal. The revised layout now includes the missing elements and incorporates the Boulevard street type cross-section.

Theme D, Objective #1.d - Improve traffic operation strategies, traffic calming, and safety for all users.

The Urban Growth Master Plan calls for the inclusion of traffic circles/ roundabouts into the design of projects in order to more effectively and safely manage traffic for each area. In the first iteration, the development's primary intersection with Canebrake Drive did not include this feature. The revised layout now includes a traffic circle on Canebrake Drive which provides access to the residential portion of the development.

Based on the revised justification and development plan, staff finds that the request is in agreement with the



Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as the request will help meet an increase in the demand for housing (Theme A, Goal #1.b and #1.d), develops business and job opportunities (Theme C, Goal #1.a and Goal # 2.a), and incorporates changes in the massing and height of the building in order to transition to the scale of development currently present in the area (Theme A, Goal #2.b).

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

In response to Staff's request for more information as to how the proposed plan met the Comprehensive Plan Policies, the applicant provided a number of examples.

Design policy #1: Utilize a people-first design, ensuring that roadways are moving people efficiently & providing equitable pedestrian infrastructure.

Design Policy #5: Provide pedestrian-friendly street patterns & walkable blocks to create inviting streetscapes.

Design policy #6: Adhere to the recommendations of the Lexington area MPO bike/ Pedestrian Master Plan, adopted in 2018.

The revised layout added the boulevard style cross-section to Canebrake Drive which includes separated travel lanes, parking protected bike lanes and sidewalks. The new plan also lowered the number of pedestrian conflict points in the residential area by adding alley access and reducing the number of curb cuts.

Design policy #3: Multi-family residential developments should comply with the Multi-Family Design Standards in Appendix A.

While the multi-family portion of the development is currently in the preliminary stages, the applicant has stated that the final design will comply with the Multi-Family Design Standards in Appendix A. The applicant's changes to the orientation of the structures locates the buildings along the roadways, and locates parking to the rear. As the applicant has indicated that details regarding the architectural elements of the buildings are not yet available, staff has recommended notation on the development plan that would ensure that these elements are appropriately denoted at the time of the final development plan.

Design policy #8: Provide varied housing choice.

The residential area includes single-family, duplex, quad-plex and multi-family options.

Protection policy #2: Conserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas, including sensitive natural habitats, greenways, wetlands and water bodies.

The proposed development avoids the floodplain near the creek and the tributary along Canebrake Drive, and conserves it as green open space. Additionally, the applicant has conducted a flood study to identify and protect floodplain areas that were not mapped under the existing FEMA maps.

Staff agrees with the applicant's assessment of this proposal in regard to compliance with the Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

The revised plan also addresses several of the Development Criteria of the Placebuilder and the Regulating Plan of the Urban Growth Master Plan previously identified by staff as requiring further clarification.

1. *Regulating Plan Section 1.d: Where development is adjacent to agriculturally zoned land in the*



Rural Service Area.

- i. *Area, a buffer of a minimum of 100 feet, subject to the following (Regulating Plan Section 1.d):*
- ii. *The buffer depth should be measured parallel to the edge of the Rural Service Area.*
- iii. *No principal or accessory building, parking, signage, or driveways should occupy the buffer.*
- iv. *Stub-Streets, Shared-use paths and vegetated open space should be allowed in the buffer.*
- v. *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.*
- vi. *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.*

The applicant added the 100-foot buffer to the development plan, and relocated the proposed structures and parking.

2. *Regulating Plan Section 3.a.4: Curb cuts. No more than one non-alley curb cut should be placed along a given block face; 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.*

The revised site plan reduced the number of curb cuts by adding an alley system to the layout, and consolidating access points for the multi-family residential uses. All single-family and duplex uses now are exclusively accessed from alleyways; however, both the multi-family and the industrial development areas do feature one more curb cut than is allowed.

The intent behind this recommendation of the UGMP was to improve traffic management, and aid in the creation of a grid-type street network that would serve the entire expansion area. In staff's review, the curb cuts' locations between Canebrake Drive, Interstate I-75, existing development, and environmentally sensitive areas are factors that limit the practicality of implementing public roads in these areas. Connectivity to adjoining parcels is being provided elsewhere in the proposal, and providing roadways in place of the access drives in these two areas would provide little additional benefit to the public.

3. *D-PL7-1: Stakeholders should be consulted to discuss site opportunities and constraints prior to submitting an application.*

The applicant has not provided any information relating to their public outreach efforts.

4. *A-DS4-1: A plan for a connected multi-modal network to adjacent neighborhoods, greenspaces, developments and complementary uses should be provided.*

As stated earlier, the revised proposal incorporates the correct cross-section that includes all recommended facilities for Canebrake Drive.

5. *A-DS11-1: Street layouts should provide clear, visible access to neighborhood focused open space and greenspaces; B-RE2-1: Lexington's green infrastructure network, including parks, trails, greenways, or natural areas should be highly visible and accessible.*

The applicant designates several large areas as dedicated open space with pedestrian access for residents and nearby businesses.

6. *B-PR2-1: Impact on environmentally sensitive areas should be minimized within and adjacent to the proposed development site.*

The subject properties include areas of FEMA designated floodplain. Based on the mapping extent that has been provided, it appears that the floodplain for the property has not been entirely mapped. In response to staff's request, the applicant conducted a flood study to demonstrate the extend of the floodplain areas on the properties, and applied the appropriate vegetative buffer and 25' setback.

7. *A-DS3-1: Multi-family residential developments should comply with the Multifamily Design Standards in Appendix A.*

Although the applicant has not submitted any information to demonstrate compliance with the architectural components of the Multi-Family Design Standards, the revised justification letter states that the final design will comply with those standards. These elements will be incorporated into notes on the preliminary development plan, which will be evaluated at time of the Final Development Plan



PARKING DEMAND MITIGATION STUDY

Under the requirements of the Parking and Landscaping Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, all "Significant Developments," or developments with over 5,000 square-feet of building coverage that require a Zoning Map Amendment, shall provide a Parking Demand Mitigation Study for the project that details the following information:

1. Review of national best practices for parking calculations for the project, including the current ITE Manual Parking ranges or the ranges produced by the ITEParkGen Report;
2. The anticipated parking demand for the project;
3. How the anticipated parking demand will be satisfied on-site or off-site;
4. The methods and strategies to be implemented in order to reduce vehicle trips by site users;
5. The methods and strategies to be implemented in order to promote transportation options by site users;
6. The projected mode share by site users from the utilization of the study's strategies.

Within the applicant's review of the parking demand, they have provided specific calculations based on the ITE manual for the proposed residential multi-family use. The development plan shows 349 spaces for the 200 units (168 multi-family and 32 fourplex) which, at 1.745 spaces per unit, is on par with the ITE recommendation of 1.7.

Staff has concerns about the amount of parking shown for the industrial portion of this proposal. While General Light Industrial (1.0 Parking Bay per 1000 SF GFA) and Industrial Park (1.6 Parking Bay per 1000 SF GFA) are permitted uses in the Light Industrial (I-1) zone, General Office Building (2.9 Parking Bay per 1000 SF GFA), Medical-Dental Office Building (4.7 Parking Bay per 1000 SF GFA) and Strip Retail Plaza (5.7 Parking Bay per 1000 SF GFA) are not. The ITE recommended parking levels are much lower for the permitted uses than those for the uses that are not permitted which suggests that the industrial portion of the development proposes more parking than what is necessary. Staff recommends revising the Light Industrial portion of the development plan to reflect the parking rate (1.0 - 1.6 spaces per 1,000 SF GFA) shown in the ITE manual for the uses permitted in this zone.

STAFF RECOMMENDS: APPROVAL, FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:



1. The proposed Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone and Light Industrial (I-1) zone 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 by increasing the number of units and providing a variety of housing types (Theme A, Goal #1.a, #1.b and #1.d).
 - b. The request would create opportunity for business and job growth (Theme C, Goal #2.a).
 - c. The request would improve Lexington's transportation network by providing for pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular improvements that comply with Complete Streets and UGMP standards (Theme A, Goal #3.d; Theme D, Goal #1.a, #1.b, and #1.d).
2. The proposal is in agreement with the Policies of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:
 - a. The request provides a variety of housing types (Design Policy #8).
 - b. By mapping the previously unmapped area, the applicant has taken significant measures to provide adequate spacing from environmentally sensitive areas (Protection Policy #2).
 - c. The proposal provides infrastructure for a variety of transportation modes (Design Policy #1, #5 and #6).
3. The proposal is in compliance with the Urban Growth Master Plan, an adopted element of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
 - a. The request is in agreement with the Land Use element of the plan, which calls for Industrial and Medium-Density Residential Development within this area.
 - b. The request provides 100-foot buffer to properties outside of the Urban Services Area (Regulating Plan Section 1.d).
 - c. The request provides rear access to single-family and duplex residential structures limiting curbcuts (Regulating Plan Section 3.a.4).
 - d. The proposed layout incorporates the Boulevard style roadway improvements to Canebrake Drive (Regulating Plan Section 3.a.1).
4. The justification statement and corollary development plan are in agreement with the Development Criteria of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
 - a. The proposed development meets the criteria for Land Use is located in an area with convenient access to a significant freight network (C-LI9-1) and increases opportunities for industry and special trade employment (C-PS8-1).
 - b. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Transportation, Connectivity, and Walkability, as the request provides connected streets and alleyways for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists (A-DS4-1) and creates a walkable streetscape (A-DS5-2).
 - 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 increases tree canopy (B-RE1-1).
 - d. The proposal meets the criteria for Site Design, as the development orients parking areas to the rear for non-residential and multi-family uses (A-DS7-1) which reduces the number of vehicle/pedestrian conflict points and helps to promote pedestrian-oriented, activated streetscapes (A-DS5-4).
 - e. The plan meets the criteria for Building Form, as the request orients the buildings to maximize connections to the street (A-DS5-3) and is scaled appropriately for the area (A-DS4-2).
5. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-25-00050: CANEBRAKE SUBDIVISION UNIT 1 (BAESLER PROPERTY) prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.