

4. **STAVROFF LAND & DEVELOPMENT, INC ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AND LYNDBURST SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- a. **PLN-MAR-23-00016: STAVROFF LAND & DEVELOPMENT, INC** (12/14/2023)\* – a petition for a zone map amendment from a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone to a Downtown Frame Business (B-2A) zone, for 2.143 net (2.633 gross) acres for property located at 201, 207, 209, 211, 215, 221, 225, 227, 231, and 235 E. Maxwell Street, and 245, 247, and 251 Stone Avenue.

**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.

The petitioner is proposing a six-story, 75-foot tall structure that would contain a lower parking structure, common area courtyards, and associated residential amenities (gym, meeting space, etc.). The proposal would include a total of 250 residential units, with a total bedroom count of 700, and a residential density of 116.65 units per acre. The petitioner proposes a total of 175 on-site parking spaces for the development, with an additional 75 spaces available to rent off-site. The request also calls for maintaining the existing two-story residential structure at 245 Stone Avenue. The petitioner has indicated that this development will be geared toward student housing for those attending the University of Kentucky, but will not be limited to that population.

**The Zoning Committee Recommended: Postponement.**

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

1. The applicant should provide information on how their proposal addresses the following Objective of the Imagine Lexington 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
  - a. 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 (Theme A, Objective #2.b)
2. The zone change application does not provide any information on compliance with the Policies of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan.
3. The zone change application for the subject properties, as proposed, does not completely address the development criteria for zone change within the Downtown Place Type, and the High Density Residential Development Type. The following criteria require further discussion by the applicant to address compliance with the Comprehensive Plan:
  - a. A-DS3-1: Multi-family residential developments should comply with the Multi-family Design Standards in Appendix 1.
    - i. SP.2: Provide as many private, ground level entries to individual units as possible.
    - ii. SP.17: Create streets that are balanced on both sides in massing and building character.
    - iii. OS.8: Provide stormwater detention areas and link to other open spaces and recreational amenities.
    - iv. AD.3: Break up building mass with facade articulation on all sides by using varying roof shapes, exterior wall setback, material, color, building height, and landscaping.
  - b. A-DS4-2: New construction should be at an appropriate scale to respect the context of neighboring structures; however, along major corridors, it should set the future context in accordance with other Imagine Lexington corridor policies and Placebuilder priorities.
  - c. A-DS5-3: Building orientation should maximize connections with the surrounding area and create a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere.
  - d. A-DS5-4: Development should provide a pedestrian-oriented and activated ground level.
  - e. E-ST3-1: Development along major corridors should provide for ride sharing pick up and drop off locations along with considerations for any needed or proposed park and ride functions of the area.
  - f. B-PR7-3 Developments should improve the tree canopy.

- b. **PLN-MJDP-23-00062: THE MAXWELL (LYNDBURST SUBDIVISION)** (12/14/2023)\* - located at 201-235 E. MAXWELL STREET & 245-251 STONE AVENUE, LEXINGTON, KY  
Council District: 3

---

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

Project Contact: Vision Engineering

Note: The purpose of this plan is to depict multi-family residential development with 245 dwelling units, in support of the requested zone change from a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone to a Downtown Frame Business (B-2A) zone.

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council approves the zone change to B-2A; 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 preservation plan.
5. Greenspace planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. United States Postal Service Office's approval of kiosk locations or easement.
7. Revise plan title to match staff report.
8. Denote: The development shall be in substantial compliance with the renderings on file with the Division of Planning.
9. Revise development plan to match submitted exhibit for 245 Stone Avenue.
10. Clarify difference in open space between development plan and submitted exhibit.
11. Revise development plan to graphically match exhibit submitted December 5, 2023, as appropriate.
12. Discuss Placebuilder criteria.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Daniel Crum presented the original and supplemental staff reports and recommendation for the zone change application. He displayed photographs of the subject property and the general area. He stated that the applicant was seeking a zone map amendment from a Medium Density Residential (R-4) zone to a Downtown Frame Business (B-2A) zone, for 2.143 net (2.633 gross) acres for property located at 201, 207, 209, 211, 215, 221, 225, 227, 231, and 235 E. Maxwell Street, and 245, 247, and 251 Stone Avenue. Mr. Crum stated that the applicant is seeking to construct a multi-family residential development with the Downtown Place-Type and the High Density Residential Development Type. Mr. Crum indicated that after reviewing the application, Staff is in agreement with those selections.

Mr. Crum stated that the overwhelming majority of properties in the immediate area is residentially zoned, is directly adjacent to the University of Kentucky, and are not located in an H-1 overlay. Mr. Crum gave a brief history of the area, and indicated that there was an attempted zone change in 2019 to the B-2A that ultimately did not pass, although Staff recommended approval at the time with some conditional zoning restrictions. Additionally Mr. Crum stated that this area was considered to be included in the Aylesford Place H-1 overlay in 1998, but was not included.

Mr. Crum gave a brief overview of the development plan and noted the first floor parking area, access from Easy Maxwell Street to the amenity area, and expanded pedestrian walkways. Mr. Crum stated that the proposed height is 75 feet, and noted the updated change for the removal of a house to allow for the installation of waste facilities.

Mr. Crum compared the initial renderings of the property and the current renderings and stated that Staff's original recommendation for postponement was because Staff wished for the applicant to maximize entrances, make the property more accessible for pedestrians, engage the street frontage, and to create visual compatibility with the neighborhood. Mr. Crum continued, mentioning the goals and objectives that this application meets including the demand for housing, respecting the context and design features of the area, and locating higher density areas along high capacity roads.

Mr. Crum presented the findings of the traffic impact study and stated that the new development would generate 112 new vehicle trips in the morning and 182 trips at night in the peak hour. Additionally, Mr. Crum

---

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

stated that the most significant delay would take place at the intersection of East Maxwell and Lexington Avenue, but concluded that the existing roadway could handle that amount of new traffic.

Mr. Crum indicated that there were conditional zoning restrictions proposed by Staff including the prohibition of sale of automobiles, hotels, wholesale establishments, automobile repair, drive-through facilities, and automobile refueling stations. Mr. Crum stated that Staff also intended to limit automobile service stations in use #vii. Mr. Crum also indicated that the Staff recommends a restriction for a minimum of 93 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Crum concluded his presentation by stating that Staff was recommending approval and based upon the updated supplemental staff report with the following proposed findings.

1. The proposed Downtown Business Frame (B-2A) zone is in agreement with the Imagine Lexington 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives, for the following reasons:
  - a. The proposed rezoning encourages the expansion of housing choices by providing for higher density residential development (Theme A, Goal #1.b).
  - b. By varying the building height and massing along each respective roadway, the request maintains compatibility with existing development in the area (Theme A, Objective #2.b).
  - c. The request encourages positive and safe social interactions by improving the existing pedestrian system, providing new crosswalks across E. Maxwell Street, and reducing vehicular conflict points.
  - d. The request de-emphasizes single-occupancy vehicles by limiting parking on-site and providing for direct multi-modal connections to the University of Kentucky and the greater downtown area (Theme B, Goal #2.d).
2. The proposal is in agreement with the Policies of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:
  - a. The request substantially complies with the Multi-Family Design Standards (Theme A, Design Policy #3).
  - b. The proposal directs increased residential density to one of the city's major corridors (Theme A, Density Policies #1, 2, and 4).
  - c. The development is designed so that the parking areas are not the primary visual component of the site (Theme A, Design Policy #7).
  - d. The request creates walkable streetscapes by incorporating street trees, townhouse units, and articulating the building facade (Theme A, Design Policy #5).
  - e. By limiting the amount of parking provided on-site, the request encourages alternative modes of transportation and promotes walking (Theme B, Sustainability Policy #5).
3. The justification and corollary development plan are in agreement with the Development Criteria of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan.
  - a. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Site Design, Building Form and Location as it demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the Multi-Family Design Standards, creates a defined vertical edge along the corridor and adjoining roadways, mitigates the visual impact of the parking structure, and significantly increases residential density.
  - b. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Transportation and Pedestrian Connectivity, as the proposal provides for an improved pedestrian network, provides a defined vertical edge along all four roadways, provides for improved connections to the University of Kentucky and adjoining neighborhoods, widens and reroutes Hagerman Court, and reduces the number of vehicular access points and curb cuts on E. Maxwell Street.
  - c. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Greenspace and Environmental Health as the request preserves two significant trees along the Stone Avenue, provides for clearly delineated open space, and incorporates street trees along all four frontages to create a walkable streetscape.
4. This recommendation of approval is subject to the following conditional zoning restrictions:
  1. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following uses shall be prohibited:
    - i. Establishments for the display, rental, or sale of automobiles, motorcycles, trucks and boats.
    - ii. Hotels and motels.
    - iii. Wholesale establishments.
    - iv. Minor automobile and truck repair.
    - v. Establishments primarily engaged in the sale of supplies and parts for vehicles and farm equipment
    - vi. Drive-through facilities for sale of goods or products or provision of services otherwise permitted herein.
    - vii. Automobile and vehicle refueling stations, and service stations.
    - viii. Adult entertainment establishments.

---

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

ix. Stadium and exhibition halls.

2. The property shall be developed with a minimum of 93 dwelling units per acre, or 200 dwelling units at this location

These restrictions are necessary and appropriate in order to maintain the character of the E. Maxwell Street corridor, protect the adjoining residential use, as well as meeting the Comprehensive Plan's goal of increasing the density of residential development in and near downtown, and along arterial corridors.

5. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP-23-00062: THE MAXWELL (LYNDHURST SUBDIVISION) 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 Comments and Questions – Mr. Michler stated that he did not think this area fit into the Downtown Place-Type as it was not the urban epicenter of commerce and entertainment. Mr. Michler also inquired about the differences between an R-4 and an R-5 zone. Mr. Crum indicated that the main differences included allowable heights, floor area ratios, and densities.

Mr. Michler asked if there was any discussion from Staff about adding conditions that the applicant would have to add vegetative areas or open space requirements and Mr. Crum stated that there was. Additionally, Mr. Crum noted the applicant's proximity to local parks as well as the walkability to other downtown amenities.

Mr. Michler also asked if it was possible to add open space/green space incentives into this plan and Ms. Wade indicated that it was if the Planning Commission wished to have open space elements on the development plan. Additionally, Mr. Michler wanted to put in the record that the Downtown Master Plan called for 45 feet maximum height in residential areas.

Finally, Mr. Michler asked about the term "underutilized" that Mr. Crum used in his presentation, and what is the reasoning for using that word. Mr. Crum indicated that is reflective on the development pattern as a whole, and showcased the empty parking lot behind the properties to show that the properties were being underutilized. Additionally, Mr. Crum stated that was not meant to besmirch single-family residents at all.

Mr. Nicol asked if there was any contact with the University of Kentucky and what their student housing needs may be and Mr. Crum indicated that the applicant could go into greater detail about that.

Development Plan Presentation – Mr. Tom Martin oriented the Planning Commission to the location and proposed development of the subject property. Mr. Martin stated that the applicant is proposing 275 units and 700 beds and showcased the various open space/greenspace areas around the property. Mr. Martin reiterated the 75 foot height, and mentioned that the height changes around the garage to 45 feet. Additionally, Mr. Martin highlighted the three access points to the garage from Lexington Avenue, Hagerman Court, and Stone Avenue. Mr. Martin also commented that Urban County Council will have to release the public right-of-way on Hagerman Court.

Mr. Martin continued showcasing the aspects of the property and noted the trash compactor in the rear and noted that if this is approved, the applicant would have to detail stormwater solutions, as well as show the 10 foot setback on the final development plan.

Mr. Martin concluded his presentation by stating that Staff was recommending approval of the development plan and could answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Pohl stated that he did not see any offsets in the development plan. Mr. Martin stated that the applicant will have to show that they will comply with that and that generally with 2-D development plans, Staff asks to show that where they can.

Mr. Pohl also asked what the back of the building will look like and Mr. Martin stated that the applicant could address that question.

---

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

Ms. Meyer asked about who makes the decisions on what kind of materials will be used on the property and Mr. Martin indicated that Staff works with the applicant with that because of KRS and what Staff can actually require.

Mr. Michler asked about the location of the trash compactor next to residential properties and Mr. Martin's perspective on moving the compactor to inside the building. Mr. Martin stated that the factors would include the grade change, the height of the parking garage ceiling, and public safety's need to get inside the garage if there is an emergency. He opined that would be a good discussion for a final development plan. Mr. Michler also asked if the current denotation could be removed and discussed at the time of the final development plan and Mr. Martin indicated that it could.

Mr. Michler inquired if 10-15% of open space could be met at this development and Mr. Martin stated he thought it was possible, and worthy of discussion.

Mr. Pohl asked if there was any concern about approving a Downtown Place-Type that is not in the downtown core. Mr. Crum stated that Staff was looking at the whole of the downtown area and gave the example of a recent zone change on Midland as a justification. In that zone change, the Downtown Place-Type was used and Staff and the Planning Commission deemed it appropriate. Additionally, Mr. Crum indicated that there is a B-2A zoned property with the Downtown Place-Type a block away from this property.

Mr. Pohl also asked if this area of College Town will look more like the downtown core or more like Aylesford, and Mr. Crum indicated that Staff cannot predict future development but this area already borders downtown and could possibly get growth pressure from both sides.

Finally, Mr. Pohl asked if there were multi-family design standards that were not being met by the project and Mr. Martin indicated that there was great discussion about the orientation of the building but the applicant had gone to great lengths to meet that as well as pedestrian access.

Applicant Presentation – Mr. Jon Woodall, attorney for the applicant, began by stating that the development has gone through many iterations and with extensive discussions with Staff, is where it is today. Mr. Woodall began by showing a letter from the University of Kentucky that stated that this development would bring much needed housing assistance to the University of Kentucky. Additionally, Mr. Woodall admitted that the initial renderings were made to mirror those of the dormitories and housing on campus.

Mr. Woodall reiterated the information that Mr. Crum and Mr. Martin presented and gave a timeline of the application since July. In meetings with the Aylesford and Transylvania Park neighborhoods, it became clear that the initial renderings were too dorm-like and not architecturally nuanced. Due to those meetings and the committee meetings, the applicant went back to the drawing board, worked with Staff and got to the rendering and development plan that is being presented today.

Mr. Woodall argued that this location bridges the gap between downtown and the University of Kentucky's campus and showcased a portion of the University of Kentucky's Master Plan that stated as such. Mr. Woodall also noted that almost 90% of the properties in this vicinity are either occupied by renters or owned by the university. Mr. Woodall acknowledged that the neighborhood does not want this, but that does not remove the applicant's obligation to fit in. Mr. Woodall stated the intention was to make this property feel like it had a front-porch feel, and less like a dorm.

Mr. Woodall concluded that this process is how the planning process is supposed to be, agreed with Staff's recommendations, and indicated that he could answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Comments and Questions – Ms. Worth asked Mr. Woodall if there were any renderings of what the interior of the property would look like and Mr. Woodall stated that they did not currently have those available.

Mr. Nicol asked what the overall cost and economic impact for a development like this and Mr. Woodall stated that any project like this is over 50 million dollars. Additionally, Mr. Nicol asked for a comparable project and Mr. Woodall stated that The Hub or the university's housing across the street are comparable.

---

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

Mr. Michler asked Mr. Woodall why the trash compactor could not be incorporated inside the property and Mr. Jihad Hallany stated that he thought the location could be discussed at the time of the final development plan and was open to putting it inside the garage.

Additionally, Mr. Michler asked for a best guess on what percentage of the property would include greenspace and would the spaces have some sort gardens. Mr. Hallany indicated that it is currently at around seven percent and that there would be space to grow small gardens.

Mr. Woodall indicated to Mr. Pohl that the back of the building will be constructed of the same material as the front.

Mr. Michler also asked the applicant to expand on the materials that would be used and Mr. Hallany and Mr. Woodall indicated that it would be most hardy board, stone, and brick in keeping with the community.

Citizen Comments – Jessica Winters, attorney for the Aylesford Place Neighborhood Association, opined that the proposed development is not appropriate in this location and is not in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, Ms. Winters indicated that the development was too dense for this neighborhood and that the Downtown Place-Type is not appropriate. Finally, Ms. Winters indicated that the university's housing shortage does not justify the development and should not outweigh the destruction of the Aylesford Place neighborhood.

Zach Leonard, expert witness for Ms. Winters, stated that the homes demolished are architecturally varied and provide enrichment to the neighborhood. Additionally, he stated that the homes, while being poorly kept, still retain a strong foundation and are not beyond repair.

Kathy Reynolds, 138 S. Hanover Street, representing the Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority. She felt that putting an apartment complex in the middle of a residential area made no sense.

David Eggers, 150 Penmoken Park, rents several homes in the area that are used as sober living homes. He opposes the redevelopment because it would hinder the work of their organization.

Johnathan Coleman, Executive Director of The Bluegrass Trust, felt that the demolition of the homes was egregious. He said that Lexington should learn from their past mistakes and save these homes.

Jackson Osborne, The Bluegrass Trust, said that they had reached out through social media with a petition. He read several comments that had been sent in through the petition.

Kate Savage, 619 Columbia Avenue, felt that the University of Kentucky had taken over the area for student housing. She was concerned about the lack of parking, as well.

Wendy McAllister, 225 Stone Road, felt that the proposal did not fit the definition of infill. She displayed several photographs of the corridor which were modified to depict the proposed development. She felt that the height of the proposed building would be too tall. She was also concerned about the preservation of a tree on Stone Road.

Bill Johnston, 171 Old Georgetown Street, displayed an aerial photograph of the area, focusing on the houses that would be removed. He asked the Planning Commission to preserve the houses.

Peggy McAllister, 225 Stone Road, stated that there were not enough parking spaces for the number of people that would be living in the apartments. She displayed pictures of other homes where parking was a problem.

Ginny Daley, Fayette County Neighborhood Council, stated that they supported the concerns of the Aylesford Neighborhood. She said that the area in question was different than the downtown business area.

---

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

John Michler, 415 E. Maxwell Street, felt that the development was out of scale with the existing neighborhood.

Ian Haight, 3767 Winchester Road, read a statement (submitted) by Kevin Benzie, who owns homes on Hagerman Court. He was opposed to the proposal.

Maureen Peters, 276 Lexington Avenue, stated that she was opposed to the proposal because of the historic nature of the buildings being removed. She was concerned that there hasn't been a new traffic study to cover rideshares, and deliveries. She was also concerned that the new structure would block sunlight from her home.

Jim Dickenson, 368 Transylvania Park, felt that the property was not a downtown development area. He said that the additional housing may not even be needed in the future. He said that the new building would have inferior materials compared to the existing homes.

Blake Hall, 36 Richmond Avenue, supported the project. He said that there were multiple examples of seven story buildings in the area. He felt that the homes were old, not historic. He reminded the Commission that nothing changed after the last zone change was denied.

Applicant Rebuttal – Mr. Jon Woodall stated that he understood the opposition from the neighborhood, but the arguments are an empty wagon. Mr. Woodall argued that if this development was not approved, those houses would not be saved or improved, and instead the owner of the property will find another development type to go in its place. Mr. Woodall stated that at the end of the day, this is not an H-1 overlay area and the development is much needed in this area.

Mr. Woodall stated that Staff is correct and this development is an efficient use of a downtown property and an infill development. Mr. Woodall concluded his comments by stating the applicant agrees with Staff's recommendations and conditions.

Citizen Rebuttal – Jessica Winters, attorney for the Aylesford Place Neighborhood Association, reiterated that the application is not in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan and its development criteria. Finally, Ms. Winters concluded her comments by proposing findings for disapproval and urged the Planning Commission disapprove this zone change.

Staff Rebuttal – Mr. Crum began his rebuttal by stating that when looking at historic preservation, Staff tries to see if the properties are indicative of a time and a period that are being preserved and attained anywhere else, and that answer is yes. There are houses very similar to those here, but as the properties are not in the H-1 overlay they could be demolished. Mr. Crum also indicated that the Comprehensive Plan is calling for more density and to provide more housing and this property is doing that while attempting to maintain compatibility in the area. Additionally, Mr. Crum stated that the subject development would increase transportation options and connectivity in this area. Mr. Crum stated that while the property was losing tree canopy in the rear parking lot, several trees would be retained.

Mr. Crum concluded by reiterating that Staff is recommending approval of this zone change at this time.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Michler asked if adult entertainment establishments and stadium and exhibition halls were allowable uses in this proposed zone. Mr. Crum indicated that the adult entertainment establishments have a residential separation requirement and Ms. Wade indicated the stadium and exhibition halls are a principal use in the proposed zone.

Mr. Wilson asked what the recommended number of parking spaces for 700 beds is and Mr. Crum indicated that parking minimums have been eliminated so it is a development by development basis.

Mr. Nicol stated that he thought the short 1,000 feet from downtown made this a great spot for a development like this.

Mr. Michler asked if a parking report was provided for this development and Mr. Crum indicated there was and Staff deemed the number provided appropriate for the development. Ms. Wade also indicated that a parking demand study is not required in the B-2A zone.

Ms. Meyer asked if this property were to stay in the R-4 zone, would the changes come to the Planning Commission and Mr. Martin indicated only if there were multiple structures on one lot. Otherwise it would be reviewed by Building Inspection.

Mr. Owens stated that he thought if this was not approved, you would just see the neighborhood continue to be more rentals in older homes. Further, Mr. Owens indicated he thought it was time to adjust and move forward with the development.

Ms. Worth stated that while she wished there was a "white knight" that would save these historic houses, she thought that this was a much better alternative than the student housing that is currently there.

Mr. Michler stated that he grew up on East Maxwell Street, and he genuinely believes this is a walkable area close to downtown, and he thinks this a great location to live. Mr. Michler thought that finding the right balance between greenspace and density was key and that the developer has come a long way from where they were initially. He said he was going to support this proposal because he wants people to live in this neighborhood.

Mr. Pohl stated that he agreed with Mr. Michler, and added that while he thinks they are getting closer to the context and look of the neighborhood, he does not think the applicant is quite there yet. Additionally, Mr. Pohl mentioned he would like to see a condition that dealt with height of the property facing East Maxwell.

Mr. Owens stated that the thought this was a much better plan from the initial plan in 2019, and should get better at the time of the final development plan.

Action – Mr. Owens made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 9-0 (Davis absent), to approve PLN-MAR-23-00016: STAVROFF LAND & DEVELOPMENT, INC as recommended by Staff, with the 7 recommended zoning restrictions, adding automobile service stations, adult entertainment establishments and stadium and exhibition halls as prohibited uses.

Action – Mr. Owens made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wilson and carried 9-0 (Davis absent), to approve PLN-MJDP-23-00062: THE MAXWELL (LYNDHURST SUBDIVISION) with the revised 11 conditions, deleting condition #11.

---

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