

1. ANDERSON BRIDGEWATER, LLC, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & ANDERSON 2 SUBDIVISION (AMD.) ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. MAR 2015-27: ANDERSON BRIDGEWATER, LLC (4/28/16)* – petition for a zone map amendment from an Expansion Area Residential-1 (EAR-1) zone to an Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3) zone, for 12.32 net (12.51 gross) acres, for property located at 425 Chilesburg Road.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan's mission statement is to "provide flexible planning guidance to ensure that development of our community's resources and infrastructure preserves our quality of life, and fosters regional planning and economic development." The mission statement notes that 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 2013 Comprehensive Plan also encourages growing successful neighborhoods (Theme A) by expanding housing choices (Goal #1), supporting infill and redevelopment as a strategic component of growth (Goal #2), and providing well-designed neighborhoods and communities (Goal #3). In addition, the Plan calls for maintenance of the boundaries of the Urban Service Area (Theme E, Goal #3).

The subject property is located within the Expansion Area, more specifically Subarea 2C. The Expansion Area Master Plan recommends Expansion Area Residential-1 future land use for the subject property, with a Special Design Area along Chilesburg Road. The Expansion Area Residential-1 land use would permit a maximum of three dwelling units per gross acre of land.

The petitioner initially proposed a high density residential development with townhouses and a clubhouse in the southern portion of the subject property near Chilesburg Road (17 dwelling units), and an apartment complex in the northern portion of the site (192 dwelling units), for a total of 209 dwelling units and a residential density of 16.71 units per gross acre.

The petitioner has thrice revised their corollary zoning development plan associated with this zone change request since the initial staff review in November 2015. The petitioner proposes development of a combination of single-family, townhouses and multi-family residential buildings, but most recently has reduced the total number of dwelling units from 209 units (and a density of 16.71 dwelling units per gross acre) to 138 units (density of 11.03 dwelling units per gross acre). The portion of the development between the FEMA floodplain and Chilesburg Road is significantly complete, with the exception of a new clubhouse. Within the northern portion of the property, between the FEMA floodplain and the adjoining Andover Hills subdivision, the petitioner now desires to construct a mixture of multi-family residential and townhouses, and five single-family houses along the boundary with the Andover Hills subdivision. A total of 72 apartment units, 61 townhouse units, and five single-family lots are proposed.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: Approval.

The Staff Recommends: Disapproval, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rezoning to an Expansion Area Residential-3 (EAR-3) zone is not in agreement with the Expansion Area Master Plan (for Expansion Area 2C), which is an element of the adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan. High-density residential development was not envisioned for land that adjoined the Urban Service Area boundary at that time (including the subject property), in order to respect the established residential neighborhoods, such as Andover Hills.
 2. An adequate transition between land uses, specifically Andover Hills subdivision and the future Tucker Property development, has not been established to create a well-designed community as recommended by Theme A, Goal #3 of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.
 3. Chilesburg Road, an existing two-lane rural roadway, has been designated by the Expansion Area Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance as a Rural Scenic Roadway, which is not to be improved. The existing roadway is inadequate to handle the proposed increase in residential density and traffic generation at this location.
 4. The proposed development does not meet the Complete Streets concept, which includes the design and use of the right-of-way for cars, bicycles and pedestrians, as recommended by Theme D, Goal #1a. of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, nor does it meet the Community Design Element of the Expansion Area Master Plan.
 5. The site is proposed to have only one way in and one way out, and no stub streets into the adjoining Tucker Property for 138 dwelling units, which does not adequately meet the public safety and access needs of Fayette County citizens.
 6. There have been no unanticipated changes of a physical, social or economic nature within the immediate area since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2013 that would support an EAR-3 zone for the subject property.
- b. ZDP 2015-118: ANDERSON 2 SUBDIVISION (AMD) (4/28/16)* - located at 425 Chilesburg Road.
(Barrett Partners)

Note: The Planning Commission postponed this item at their December 17, 2015; January 28, 2016; and February 25, 2016, meetings. The purpose of this amendment is to change single family development to multi-family residential.

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: Postponement. There are remaining questions regarding the lack of a compliant street termination, compliance with the EAMP Stormwater Master Plan, and the proposed access to the development.

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property EAR-3; 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 parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Denote lot coverage and floor area ratio in site statistics (per Article 21 requirements).
8. Provided the Planning Commission makes a finding that the Final Development Plan complies with the EAMP.
9. Discuss lack of street termination proposed (and need for waiver).
10. Denote the timing of compliance with Article 23A-2(o) of the Zoning Ordinance and note #13.
11. Discuss note #19 and compliance with the EAMP Stormwater Master Plan.
12. Discuss note #20 and potential access to Jacobson Park.
13. Discuss access proposed to the development.
14. Discuss proposed density relative to the transportation infrastructure of Chilesburg Road.

Chairman Comments – Chairman Owens stated at the outset that he and the staff had received requests for additional time from the two attorneys involved in this application. Each was given additional time – 40 minutes, each, but not as much as they had requested. The staff would have 30 minutes for their reports.

Staff Zoning Presentation – Ms. Wade stated that the staff had received 236 letters, 5 emails, and a petition in opposition. She said that most of the letters were dated in March or earlier, and she distributed those items to the Commission.

Ms. Wade presented the staff report on this zone change request, and said that this application is for a rezoning from EAR-1 to EAR-3 for 12.51 acres located on the north side of Chilesburg Road in Expansion Area 2C. Chilesburg Road connects Todds Road to Athens-Boonesboro Road; and Chilesburg Road was physically severed when Hays Boulevard was constructed. Hays Boulevard now provides the primary connection between Todds Road and Athens-Boonesboro Road in this area. Andover Hills subdivision, zoned R-1D, is located to the north of the subject site. Still Meadows subdivision is zoned EAR-1 to the northeast of the subject site. The Gess Property is zoned EAR-1 to the east and southeast of this location, and Hays Boulevard provides the actual zoning boundary between EAR-1 and EAR-2 in this area. Jacobson Park is located to the northwest of this site, and is zoned A-R.

Photographs were presented by Ms. Wade at this time. These included aerial photographs from 2013 that do not show the existing townhouse development at the front of the subject property. One aerial photograph identified mostly single-family residential development to the east and northeast of the subject property. Another photo identified the existing entrance road to the Still Meadow subdivision to the north. Another aerial photo view toward the east of the subject site noted construction in the Gess Property (in the foreground). A ground level view was displayed of the existing entrance to the subject property from Chilesburg Road. Another, looking to the northeast, identified that Chilesburg, designated as a rural scenic roadway intended to protect this area and limit its expansion or improvements, has a rural cross-section of about 16'-21' in width. Another photo identified the new townhomes on the subject property, noting that they met the required 200' setback along Chilesburg Road. A photo identified the existing roadway crossing of the floodplain area on the subject property, and Ms. Wade said that it will require improvement in order to construct the additional dwelling units, as proposed. One photo identified past grading at the rear of the subject property – along the boundary with the Tucker property, which remains agricultural.

Ms. Wade said that the applicant is proposing a mix of different dwelling units on the subject site, for a density of 11.03 dwelling units per gross acre. As mentioned earlier, the front portion of the property has been constructed with 17 townhouses and Bridgewater Way, a public street extending westward from Chilesburg Road. This is the portion of the subject site located between the floodplain and Chilesburg Road. The petitioner is proposing 5 single family lots; 61 townhouse units; and 72 apartment units on the property.

Ms. Wade said that the 1996 Expansion Area Master Plan remains in effect, and Article 23 of the Zoning Ordinance still requires that findings must be made by the Commission that the proposed development meets the requirements of the EAMP. The EAMP included a set of guiding principles for preserving the environment, land use, housing, community design, and the adequacy of public facilities. In all cases, the applicant must demonstrate how their proposed development is in compliance with those guidelines.

At this time, Ms. Wade displayed an EAMP map of Expansion Area 2C. The EAMP recommended Low Density development along rural scenic roads, including along both sides of Chilesburg Road. High density residential development was not envisioned in this area, in order to protect existing low density residential developments located along the previous

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

Urban Service Boundary. The EAMP identified Special Design Areas along such roads, and also Scenic Resource Areas in which density clustering (a maximum of three units on five acres) was made mandatory. The applicant's proposed development plan adheres to the required setback from Chilesburg Road. However, it does not comply with the EAMP's recommended density. This proposal is 100 dwelling units over that recommendation. In addition, the subject property has only one entrance from Chilesburg Road, which was not envisioned to support a high density development. The EAMP indicated in the Community Design element that neighborhoods should be linked by trails, and organized around a series of greenways.

Ms. Wade said that the 2013 Comprehensive Plan includes many principles from the EAMP, including recommendations for context sensitive development, complete streets, and the proper protection of natural resources. She said that the petitioner contends that the proposed rezoning to EAR-3 is in agreement with the 2013 Plan, and that the EAR-3 zone is more appropriate than the existing EAR-1 zoning. She said that high density residential use is proposed adjacent to Jacobson Park, and adjacent to single family development. The petitioner contends that the appropriateness of EAR-3 zoning is based on agreement with 2013 Comp Plan's recommendation for a mix of housing types in new development.

Ms. Wade noted that actual development in the Expansion Area, so far, is below the numbers projected originally by the EAMP. The staff would note that Expansion Area 2c has developed with more than 3,300 units, which is well over its original density projection. The staff is concerned about the current status of Chilesburg Road and its infrastructure inadequacy to handle the additional traffic from the proposed increase in residential density from the subject property. In addition, there are two other undeveloped parcels fronting on Chilesburg Road, both of which are to the northeast of the subject site. Ms. Wade said that the petitioner contends that there is a lack of higher density housing in the area, but staff found over 1,000 multi-family units within a one-mile radius of the subject property, including the Gess and Richardson properties. The staff does not believe that the petitioner's revised proposal addresses the Comp Plan requirements. She displayed a graphic to this effect on the overhead projector at this time.

Ms. Wade said that the staff is recommending disapproval of this rezoning request, for the reasons as listed in the staff report and on the agenda. She said the staff would note that the petitioner has two approved plans for the subject property, which she also displayed on the overhead projector. This indicates that it would be possible to develop the subject property while meeting all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Commission Questions – Ms. Mundy asked about the reference to the two previously approved development plans for the subject site. Ms. Wade said that those were approved by the Commission in 2010 and 2014. Ms. Mundy asked how those plans have more connectivity than the current iteration of this Zoning Development Plan. Ms. Wade replied that that the original version of one of the plans (in 2010) included a proposed connection across the Tucker Property to the north. Ms. Mundy asked if the Staff was contending that those two plans were more appropriate because of their connectivity. She said there was none shown by either plan. Ms. Wade responded that the greater density associated with this proposal is a major concern when viewed in conjunction with lack of connectivity. The proposal to increase the number of dwelling units also has a need for more connectivity to disperse that added traffic.

Ms. Mundy asked if the Division of Fire & Emergency Services was satisfied with the proposed access to be provided to the subject site from Jacobson Park. Ms. Wade replied that the Fire Department agreed to this new access in order to obtain their agreement with the proposed residential density. The Parks Department agreed to this connection in order to conclude their work with the Fire Department. The Park will actually lose a small portion of their disc golf course and possibly other services and facilities. Ms. Mundy said she believed this plan would provide more access to emergency vehicles, which is preferable in this instance.

Mr. Penn asked if Ms. Wade could estimate the density of the two vacant pieces of property that will be developed that must come out onto Chilesburg Road. He was interested in how many units/acre that would be. Ms. Wade replied that they are 10-12 acres in size, each, and noted that 75 more units could be developed on those vacant parcels.

Mr. Cravens said that there were 3,300 units approved in Expansion Area 2c, and he asked what was the maximum number of units that would be allowed. Ms. Wade replied that that would be 4,500 units.

Development Plan Presentation – Mr. Martin presented the staff report on this Amended Preliminary Development Plan, and noted the staff's rendering of that plan on the easel. He said that, for the benefit of the audience, this preliminary development plan, like all others presented to the Commission in conjunction with a zone change request, is reviewed as if the proposed zoning was in place.

Mr. Martin noted the proposed access to the development from Chilesburg Road. He said that there is an existing public street that serves the existing townhouses on the front of the property. That street is proposed to cross the floodplain.

Mr. Martin said that the applicant is proposing some additional townhouses, two apartment buildings, and five single family residential lots in the rear of the property. They are proposing a public street crossing the Tucker Property to the subject site. An emergency access is proposed at the rear of the new development, and is to connect to the adjacent park. Its geometry, pavement depth and other related issues would need to be resolved. The Parks Department would want this emergency access removed as soon as other nearby streets develop.

Mr. Martin reported that some 259 parking spaces are proposed for these 138 (total) dwelling units. Of those, 174 parking spaces are required by the Zoning Ordinance for these units. He referred to a map provided on the overhead projector to highlight the area's street system. He noted on the display areas of good connectivity versus cul-de-sac developments. He said that the staff is concerned about the proposed termination of a public street, in addition to a 1,100-foot long access easement. He said that this easement would connect to public streets, which is unusual. He reported that no waiver request has been made to address this proposed termination of the public street. Parking is proposed to back out onto the easement. This condition is not typically allowed on public streets. He said that the development plan is showing 85 spaces in excess of the minimum requirement, 82 of which are located on the access easement. The staff believes that this street could be made public, or be a private street and meet most of the Subdivision Regulations' requirements.

Mr. Martin said that the staff is concerned about the proposed connection across the Tucker Property, which would allow another means of ingress/egress to the proposed development. The staff does not believe that the petitioner has met the goals of the EAMP with this plan; so the staff has drafted revised conditions to address these concerns. Mr. Martin provided a revised staff report with revised conditions, as follows:

The Staff Recommends: Postponement. The density proposed is three times that recommended by the EAMP.

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

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property EAR-3; 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 parking, circulation, access, and street cross-sections.
4. Urban Forester's approval of tree inventory map.
5. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas.
- ~~7. Denote lot coverage and floor area ratio in site statistics (per Article 21 requirements).~~
- ~~8. Provided the Planning Commission makes a finding that the Final Development Plan complies with the EAMP.~~
- ~~7.9.~~ Discuss lack of street termination proposed (and need for waiver).
- ~~8.40.~~ Denote the timing of compliance with Article 23A-2(o) of the Zoning Ordinance and note #13.
- ~~9.44.~~ Discuss note #19 and Denote: Compliance with the EAMP Stormwater Master Plan shall be reviewed at the time of the Final Development Plan.
- ~~12.~~ Discuss note #20 and potential access to Jacobson Park.
- ~~10.43.~~ Discuss access proposed to the development.
- ~~11.44.~~ Discuss proposed density relative to the transportation infrastructure of Chilesburg Road.

Mr. Martin described condition #9 regarding the floodplain crossing the property, including the EAMP's requirement for manufactured wetlands to be provided in that area.

Commission Questions – Mr. Penn asked if this location is where there is floodplain mitigation from the Sand Lake property. Mr. Martin replied that no mitigation was ever performed from that development in Fayette County. It was intended to be done here; but, instead, the associated funds were paid to the State and designated by the associated agency for another area in the state. Mr. Martin said that the EAMP requires constructed wetlands in the vicinity of the subject property on the Tucker property as well. Mr. Penn said that he recalled that the Sand Lake plans required mitigations for the fill they placed to the rear of their property, because of its proximity to the reservoir.

Chairman Owens asked about the current status of the constructed wetlands. Mr. Martin replied that, typically, they are one of the last features to be completed in a development. Because they are in environmentally sensitive areas, they should not be handled in a piecemeal fashion. Still, most detention basins and similar infrastructure are in place in this area; and some wetlands were required to be placed near the Jacobson Park reservoir.

Traffic Impact Study Presentation – Dr. Harika Suklun presented the staff report on the submitted Traffic Impact Study, although it was not required by the Zoning Ordinance. Only one access to the proposed development is provided to Chilesburg Road, which is classified as a collector street. The latest KYTC traffic count indicated 7,826 average daily trips (ADT) on Chilesburg Road in 2013. After reviewing the TIS, the staff agreed with the report's predicted 23 AM peak trips entering site, and 70 trips exiting the site. In the PM peak, 80 trips would be entering the site, and 48 exiting. She reported that the consultant studied four intersections, including Athens-Boonesboro Road at Hays Boulevard, which has a level of service "F" during the AM peak hour. In summary, the staff found agreement with the report that there would be little impact from proposed development.

Commission Question – Mr. Wilson, referring to the TIS report from Dr. Suklun, said that the report indicates that the staff had inadequate time to review the Impact Study; however, the figures in today's presentation are very precise. Dr. Suklun replied that the staff only had two days to review this TIS, but was able to determine in that time period that the proposed calculations to and from the site in the peak hours were correct.

Petitioner Presentation - Richard Murphy, attorney, was present representing petitioner. He provided a handout of several exhibits to the Commission, in addition to a display-mounted rendering of the zoning development plan. He noted that the petitioner has agreed to pay for a new emergency access to the proposed development via a road through Jacobson Park. In fact, the Fire Department has agreed to the new access through the park.

Mr. Murphy said that the 2013 Comprehensive Plan includes Goals & Objectives about placing higher density residential uses against public parks and greenspace. As such, the petitioner believes this rezoning and development plan implement that recommendation perfectly.

Dennis Anderson, petitioner, said that he held two rather unproductive neighborhood meetings about this request. Many of the residents present were angry about his proposal. He had held productive meetings in the past with neighborhoods that formed committees. In this instance, the opposition's attorney was invited to attend an additional meeting, but did not want to attend. Therefore, Mr. Anderson said he decided to hold an open house at the Hyatt Hotel about this zone change. About 25 Still Meadow residents attended, and approximately 10 were "reasonable" and wanted to view their development plans; 1/4 of the residents were angry and left angry; and about 1/4 did not express their feelings about the proposal. Mr. Anderson said he felt that the open house meeting was more productive than the first meeting. Several residents invited him to their homes; and, once there, he listened to their concerns about not wanting to back up to rental housing. He determined that it would be more appropriate to back up to single family homes where he originally had proposed 17 townhomes.

Mr. Anderson said that he constructed the existing 17 townhomes on the front of the subject property in order to test the market, and to determine the quality of residents and the absorption rate of the units. After constructing them, he found that these types of units were in demand, and the residents occupying these townhomes were of high quality. Mr. Anderson, referring to the development plan rendering, said that the townhouse units will "face front," so that the streetscape will be attractive. The park access they propose will be easy to navigate. The apartment units are to be "stacked and backed," with each building having two front facades. The new townhouse units would have garages facing their private roadway.

Mr. Anderson said that they will have a considerable parking surplus, which could result in their site being "over parked;" but they are still proposing a new private street in order to provide sufficient off-street parking. They wanted to include additional parking because many residents do not park in their garages. The parking lot for the apartments could impair the residents' view of the park, if that parking were placed between the apartment buildings and the park. Instead, from their experience, their residents would prefer to look at the sides of townhomes rather than a parking lot.

Mr. Anderson stated that they do not agree with the proposed fire access to their site from the park. They believe one entrance for their development is preferable. However, he spoke with officials in the Parks Department, and they have agreed to build an access of a sufficient size for emergency vehicles. They believe access should stay as shown on their previous development plans. With single family homes backing to the park, that would cut off access to the park for all but those residents. Their proposed development plan provides access to the park for all residents of the development, including renter-occupied residences.

Mr. Anderson displayed on the overhead projector some information indicating that home ownership peaked in 2004, but that home ownership is no longer the primary goal for many people. The current home ownership rate is down to 63.8%. That decline in rate equals approximately 18,000 new renters in Lexington-Fayette County. Before the Great Recession, too many expensive houses were constructed in this community. In addition to patio homes, which have 40' wide lot sites, there were 135,000 starter homes constructed locally. Post-recession trends include 2000-3000 square-foot homes with two owners' suites for owners and their elderly parents. Along with more renters, more young professionals are choosing not to own homes because it decreases their mobility. As proof of this, web-traffic to the Anderson Communities website increased 288% in 2016 over 2015.

Finally, Mr. Anderson displayed a rendering of the townhouse style proposed in their development. In 2016, post-recession housing choices are different. He said he believed this plan supports those choices better.

Mr. Murphy said that, regarding their development plan, the previous plan submittal included 209 total residential units. Now, that has been decreased by 33% to a total of 138 units. They have also reduced the number of apartments from 192 to 72 – or by about 2/3. The 72 apartments are to be one-bedroom units, and they will be fully sprinkled.

Mr. Murphy said that their development plan includes a proposed connection to the Tucker Property as well as an emergency access to Jacobson Park mentioned earlier. He asked the Commission to note that the petitioner's Townley development won the Mayor's Award, and Townley includes an access easement in order to allow for parking with backing out into the right-of-way. Their plan must also have access easements in order to allow the parking, which is needed. He said that their design details should be worked out at the Final Development Plan stage. Waivers will be requested at that time, and can delineate between public and private roads in their development.

With regard to the Comprehensive Plan recommendation, Mr. Murphy provided a number of verbatim quotes from the Plan, as contained in their exhibit packet handed out to the Commission at the beginning of their presentation. He said they believed renters should also be allowed to enjoy public open space. Since most of Expansion Area has been devel-

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

oped thus far for single family, owner-occupied homes, their proposed development allows for more choice in housing types in the area. If the Expansion Area continues to be developed below the density midpoint, the Urban Service Area will need to be expanded much more quickly than anticipated.

Mr. Murphy noted several Goals and Objectives of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan that are favorable to their proposal. Referring to a photograph of their apartment units, Mr. Murphy said that the problem with relying on the 20-year-old EAMP, is that there is now much more development in the Expansion Area. No longer is low density development adjoining the USA boundary, since there is now an apartment complex approved for development between the subject property and the USA boundary.

Regarding single-entrance communities, Mr. Murphy said there are several other residential communities in the area that have single entrances. Many of those contain more units than their proposal does. Their proposed development meets Fire Department requirements and will provide at least two entrances to the development.

Mr. Murphy provided quotes from MIT and Harvard studies about community involvement of renters, quotes about multi-family developments and about crime rates. He said that the petitioner has been "accused" of providing affordable housing in the proposed development; but, in fact, they are in favor of affordable housing. The average income of residents in the existing townhouse units on the subject property is \$87,000/year. The anticipated rental price of the rest of the units on the subject site will be about \$1,200/month; a criminal background check will be required for all tenants; the units will have electronic keys that cannot be duplicated, and no keys will be given unless the background checks are completed.

Regarding the submitted traffic study, Eddie Mesta, traffic engineer with Integrated Engineering, said his firm prepared the Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Mesta said he accompanied the petitioner to a December neighborhood meeting, and thereafter, did a comprehensive study of the corridor based on the input obtained at the meeting. The study area included traffic counts on December 15, 2015 at four intersections along the Hays Boulevard corridor. He said that the counts were performed from 7-9 am and 2-6 pm, during a time when schools were in session. The weather was sunny and 55 degrees. He reiterated the am and pm peak hour traffic projections from the Traffic Impact Study. The am and pm peak traffic increases equate to one additional car along Chilesburg Road each minute; with the highest projected travel time between 7:30 and 7:45 am. Referring to a graphic from the TIS, the proposed development is projected to increase am peak hour traffic by only 2.5% in this vicinity. At Chilesburg Road/Hays Boulevard, nine additional cars are projected during this period. At the Jouett Creek Drive/Hays Boulevard/Chilesburg Road four-way stop intersection, four cars are projected at the Chilesburg approach. He said that the four-way stop operates at a Level of Service "F" because it is located near Athens-Chilesburg Elementary School. By 8 am, that intersection has cleared.

Mr. Mesta displayed a traffic simulation video graphic on the overhead projector at this time, noting that the Athens-Boonesboro Road/Hays Boulevard intersection is very busy. He said that backups on Hays are due to the amount of traffic on Athens-Boonesboro. He noted that their study took recent Todds Road construction into account. The petitioner believes that the Todds Road widening could help to alleviate traffic on the subject property. In conclusion, Mr. Mesta said that the proposed development would result in only a 10% increase in the roadways' capacity. Finally, he displayed another graphic indicating 11 accidents have occurred in 11 years on Chilesburg Road; and that their proposed development will likely have little impact on Chilesburg Road.

Mr. Murphy emphasized that only a 10% increase of capacity on Chilesburg Road will result, even after construction of the proposed development. He said that their accident numbers compare to those found on Hays Boulevard.

In conclusion, Mr. Murphy said that the petitioner contends that their proposed development would be an outstanding contribution to the housing choices available in this area. Also, they believed strongly that their rezoning proposal was in agreement with 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

Commission Question – Mr. Drake asked, if this rezoning was not approved, what the alternate future uses of this property are. Mr. Anderson replied that he would be allowed to grow weeds. He said they cannot provide access to single family lots through a multi-family development. He added that the adjacent property is challenged, and the adjacent property owner does not want to develop his land at this time. Mr. Drake asked if the property were developed only as single family residential, if it would have to be priced at a higher value to offer a proper return on their investment. Mr. Anderson replied that such a residential development would not make sense.

Citizen Comments in Favor – Barbara Stucker, president of the McConnell's Trace HOA, said that she faced many of the same issues as have been presented today, when this same petitioner proposed to construct townhomes in their neighborhood years ago. She said that those townhomes have not negatively impacted single family detached home prices in their neighborhood; and there have been no incidents with renters in the petitioner's townhomes. In fact, she wished her neighborhood's homeowners were as well behaved as the petitioner's townhouse tenants. She added that there had been no issues with crime - not a single incident. Also, she reported that there had been no increase in traffic, and the worst impacts were actually due to the Leestown Road widening project, although that has now been completed.

Jeff Stidham, owner of Stidham Commercial Partners, Inc., stated that he and his firm have no interest in the proposed development. However, they have worked on similar high-quality, high density residential communities - most recently,

the new apartment community approved in Hamburg, across from Costco. In that instance, a high density apartment development is proposed in a suburban area, like the current application.

Mr. Stidham said that he is also working with the multi-family component of the Fritz Farm development on Nicholasville Road. He said that the Brookings Institute article, shown earlier at this hearing, indicated that population density is becoming more centralized, and high density housing more desirable. In that study, over 51% of respondents currently indicated a desire to rent rather than own their home. He said that many people track the market closely for rental communities, and his company alone serves 13,000 units locally. Of those, 95-97% at least are usually occupied. Also, the walkability and continuity provided by multi-family communities are in demand; and he believed the petitioner's communities are successful.

Commission Question – Mr. Drake asked Mr. Stidham to clarify whether or not the Lexington market is over- or under-built for high density units. Mr. Stidham replied that the land constraints in Fayette County are severe; and that, in his opinion, that sector cannot be overbuilt for rental housing units in higher density communities. He said that home values typically increase near communities such as those in the proposed development. Mr. Drake asked if the rate of demand for such housing is accelerating. Mr. Stidham replied affirmatively.

Note: The Chair declared a Recess at 3:27 PM. The meeting was reconvened, with all members present, at 3:36 PM.

Citizen Comments in Opposition – Tim Sayers, a Still Meadow resident, was present in opposition. He said that his son was in an accident on Andover Creek Drive that was nearly fatal. Andover Creek serves as cut-through in their neighborhood, and its homes have many children in them. His son was on his bike and was started by a car. In his response, he lost control of his bike and hit a tree. Another accident on Chilesburg was in the sharp S-curve near the location of the proposed development. He said he does not believe that the proposed traffic counts presented earlier are accurate. He said he was concerned mostly about cut-through traffic; and that most of the developments Mr. Murphy referred to as "single-entry" are located off arterials, and not accessed off less adequate streets like Chilesburg Road.

Nathan Billings, attorney, was present representing residents of the Still Meadow neighborhood. They contend that the single most important issue at this hearing is the law, and the application of facts to the law. He said that much of land use law involves "grey areas," but a zone change decision is not such an instance. He referenced Mr. Murphy's earlier comment that the EAMP is no longer relevant. Mr. Billings said that many other 20-year-old documents such as the US Constitution, the Kentucky Constitution, the Zoning Ordinance, etc. are all still relevant today, despite their age. The question in this case involves a public policy decision for Lexington-Fayette County.

Mr. Billings said that during the EAMP process, nothing was added to the text of this plan to indicate that it would no longer be relevant in 20 years; rather, it indicated it would be applicable until the Urban Service boundary was changed. He and his clients contend that there are a number of problems with this plan that do not comply with the law. They do not believe that the EAMP should be "gutted" for one applicant, and the impact that decision could have on other parcels in the Expansion Area.

Mr. Billings cited widespread opposition to this rezoning request: 285 persons signed a petition of opposition, some 218 letters were received in opposition to this request, and approximately 100 people are in attendance at this hearing in opposition.

Mr. Billings said that this case also involves a public safety issue. Tim Sayers' son had a gruesome accident due to traffic movement in this area. Providing an additional 259 parking spaces in this development could result in another 250+ cars in the area. As to the ratio of accidents on Chilesburg Road, cited earlier, there is a significantly higher rate of accidents reported on Chilesburg Road than on Hays Boulevard because the traffic flow is so much lower.

Mr. Billings said that, five years ago, Mr. Anderson indicated that the subject property would be developed in a similar manner to the Still Meadow Subdivision. He cited page 62 of the EAMP, which says that there are three core elements of the EAMP – The Future Land Use Element; The Community Design Element; and The Infrastructure Element. A fourth important hallmark of the EAMP is its Implementation chapter. The Implementation chapter states that the Future Land Use, Community Design and Infrastructure Elements represent the "official policy of the LFUCG and all actions by the Urban County Government shall be consistent with these elements." He said that the use of "shall" is mandatory, not permissive, including in a planning context. This means that this zone change and development plan have to be consistent with the EAMP, or else it violates the law.

In 2010, Mr. Billings said that this petitioner filed a zone change to EAR-1 for the subject site, and it was approved by the Planning Commission. Their corollary development plan included a future connection to the Still Meadow neighborhood, via Tucker Crossing Way. Also, a significant floodplain area on the subject site had to be spanned by bridge. At that time, a severe recession was underway.

In 2013, Mr. Billings said that a new development plan was approved for this site - one that eliminated a connection to other areas - and it included single-family lots and townhomes. He noted that this complied with Comp Plan recommendations and the Zoning Ordinance. Although it was approved by the Commission earlier, it was certified (i.e., completed) in September, 2014.

In November, 2015, Mr. Billings said that this applicant filed a zone change request to EAR-3. Since the original development plan was filed at that time, the petitioner has taken neighborhood concerns into consideration; however, he did not listen to residents when they indicated opposition to EAR-3 zoning. He said that there has been only one rezoning from EAR-1 to EAR-2 ever approved. An EAR-2 zone would increase density and allow more economic benefit to the applicant. He and his clients are concerned that the proposed parking coverage could indicate that the petitioner intends to construct one-bedroom apartments or apartments with studios that could serve as additional bedrooms. They are greatly increasing density over the number of dwelling units currently approved for this location. The Planning Commission could apply a conditional zoning limiting the number of units allowable at this location.

Regarding the proposed Jacobson Park access, Mr. Billings said that he has not been able to confirm that the Parks Department is in agreement with this part of the proposal. He and his clients are concerned that the private access could never provide appropriate connectivity. Further, this applicant could force the LFUCG to maintain what is essentially a private bridge. In their view, it should be all public or all private. Jacobson Park has long-term plans to purchase additional property, some with vehicular access from Chilesburg Road. Thus, they are concerned about this plan's effect on that proposal.

Mr. Billings said that the EAMP indicates that land use should be designed to facilitate modes of transportation other than cars; provide for areas of scenic quality; preserve mature woodlands; and achieve minimum residential density; provide affordable housing; create a local street network; be compatible with the rural landscape; and divert traffic away from rural scenic roads. This zone change seeks to gut the density limitations of the EAMP. The Future Land Use Element for Area 2C of the EAMP was envisioned to allow low density (0-3 units/acre) or a medium density (0-6 units/acre) development, and not be a high density (6-18 units/acre) district.

Mr. Billings said that the proposed zone change and development alone will not impact the maximum recommended residential density for Expansion Area 2C, but it could serve as a precedent for future zone changes. He said that there were still 20 acres left to be rezoned, which could result in more than 600 additional residential dwelling units. Regarding the protection of scenic roads, Mr. Billings provided this quote from the EAMP:

"In order to protect rural scenic roads, land within the EAMP, which will only have access by way of a designated rural scenic road, shall be subject to a specific traffic management program which limits the density of on-site development to no more than three (3) dwelling units per five (5) acres."

Mr. Billings said that the Chilesburg area is designated as a Scenic Resource Area. He also said that this density requirement is mandatory, and not permissive.

Regarding the EAMP community design elements, Mr. Billings said that there are nine listed, but none provide for high density residential uses next to greenways. The EAMP requires a maximum of 6 dwelling units per acre in an EAR-2 zone.

Mr. Billings said that when the Commission is reviewing a zone change and the law, an applicant must prove that the proposed zoning is appropriate and the existing zoning is inappropriate, if it is not in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. No statements have been made by the applicant that the existing zoning is inappropriate; and, in fact, the petitioner has agreed in the past that the existing zoning is appropriate.

Mr. Billings said that EAR-1 was determined to be the appropriate zone for the property in 2010. That year, the applicant submitted a letter stating:

"The Comprehensive Plan calls for development in the EAR-1 zoning category, as we are proposing. This proposal is in agreement with the 2007 Comprehensive Plan."

Mr. Billings said Mr. Anderson also acknowledged this at the February 23, 2010 public hearing on the zone change. Mr. Murphy said, at that same meeting:

"Following the addition of the Chilesburg Road right-of-way, the proposed density on the subject property is in agreement with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan."

Mr. Billings contended that the 2007 rezoning of this property continues to be applicable and appropriate.

In 2014, the applicant revised their development plan, and sought to change the number of approved dwelling units, but this did not affect the need for EAR-1 zoning at this location. That development plan was submitted after the recent recession, and at the beginning of the current economic recovery. By not adopting a new land use map, Mr. Billings contended that the 2013 Comp Plan inherently adopted the 2007 map. Mr. Billings said that they contend that the current EAR-1 zone here is not inappropriate. The petitioner cannot indicate that the existing zoning is inappropriate, since he has twice indicated that it is appropriate in the past.

Mr. Billings said another criterion for approving a zone change is that there has been a major change of a physical, social, or economic nature, not anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan that basically altered the character of the area. He said that the staff maintains that there have been no such changes.

Mr. Billings indicated that there are more entry-level buyers in the marketplace now. In fact, a newer Harvard study indicated information provided by petitioner was wrong; or at least, outdated. Mr. Billings said that changes in home sizes are reflections of market forces, rather than significant changes in home buyer preferences. Consequently, the 2014 data suggests the new dynamic may be on the horizon with increasing numbers of entry level buyers entering the marketplace. Today, there are more homebuyers than renters; and this more recent article warned of over-permitting and overbuilding of multi-family units.

Mr. Billings said that a recent Lexington Board of Associate Realtors (LBAR) report indicated that home sales were increasing locally. There are now fewer home owners available in Fayette County due in part, to the 30,000 UK students who live here. He said his clients contend that every facet of this plan, except for the proposed mixture of housing, is against the recommendations of the EAMP. Moreover, several nearby properties could be rezoned, and this request could set precedent, if approved. Approving this request "could strip the EAMP of all importance." They contend that Mr. Murphy's statements regarding the 2013 Comprehensive Plan were erroneous. They were recommendations for new policies, and not applicable to the approval of zone changes. Other statements recommend location of new greenspace, and not the approval of new development. Finally, they contend that not enough evidence has been provided to justify this zone change to EAR-3.

Kif Skidmore, an attorney residing at 3756 Park Ridge Lane, said that she and her husband own a house directly adjacent to the subject property. She is especially worried about the area along her side yard because she found out, when viewing the submitted development plan earlier today, that the proposed fire access would block her view and access to Jacobson Park.

Regarding Mr. Anderson's comments earlier that property would "grow weeds" if this zone change is not approved, Ms. Skidmore said that he proposed a development plan in 2014 that their neighborhood supports. The neighbors are not inflexible, but they do not support EAR-3 zoning. She said that they have always been civil with the petitioner, although she has organized efforts in opposition to his current request. They are not in opposition to the plan based on concerns about affordable housing—they do not believe this development would be good for the park or the neighborhood. She said that our zoning should be "reasonably predictable," but this request has not been.

Ms. Skidmore said that the petitioner's main justification is to provide more density around open greenspace. She said that her family searched for their "forever home" for two years, and the Park's greenspace was a major attraction. But that reason does not justify their opposition to this request. She submitted several photos: one noted Chilesburg Road with storm water runoff covering part of the roadway; another depicted Hays Boulevard with a traffic backup, which happens every day. A photo was provided of Ridge View Drive, with traffic parked on both sides of that street. She said that these photos serve as proof of why high density is inappropriate at this location. When she and her husband purchased their home, they had lived in their previous home for 16 years. When they found this one, they had only one concern, and that was about the undeveloped property nearby. They performed their due diligence, and they obtained a copy of the approved development plan for this vacant parcel. People must rely on the Planning Commission and on the local government to make reasonably predictable zoning decisions. She believed that an EAR-3 zone will negatively impact home prices. She asked that the Commission not discourage users of the park, even though it adjoins her home.

Sean Cunningham, 3777 Ridge View Way, stated that he had three concerns: storm water runoff, traffic safety, and fire prevention. He said that there was considerable runoff that would result from this development, due to the site's topography, and the additional impervious surfaces proposed. He said that there had been no environmental impact statements or studies performed. He said that there are owls in the area, which may also be impacted. He said that this development would generate a great deal of cut-through traffic from those travelling to and from the Athens-Chilesburg Elementary School and the Andover subdivision. There are a number of multi-family housing units already approved in the area, and there is no need for high density land use on the subject property. He said the blind "dogleg" in Chilesburg Road adjacent to the entrance to the subject property is also a safety concern to the addition of residential density on this site.

Anushka Karkelanova, 3760 Park Ridge Lane, stated that her house is located the closest to the subject property. She asked the petitioner what would happen on the property in 2010, when she was shopping for her house. She chose her house because it is close to the park, and it has a good view from her living room. She did not want to see apartments or the parking lot from her living room. She said she was assured at the time of purchase of her home that this property would be developed similar to the Still Meadow subdivision. Ms. Karkelanova was concerned about the potential loss of safety and privacy to her home. In closing, she provided a video of a vehicle travelling along the narrow width of Chilesburg Road, and provided a few notes with her concerns about the traffic patterns in the area.

Carri Lyda Lucier identified herself as a citizen that travels the existing roads in the area. She expressed her concern about the potential for cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. She said that some area residents walk on the "dogleg" on Chilesburg Road, where there are two blind turns. She said that there were, in essence, too many children living in the area to guarantee their future safety from this development.

Ryan Finnell, President of Andover Neighborhood Association's Board of Directors, stated that his group was opposed to the proposed development. He said that he and his group were also concerned about traffic. They do not believe that the results of the submitted traffic study were correct.

Mr. Finnell said they were also concerned about school overcrowding. There are two elementary schools in the area, and they are at 102% and 105% occupancy, respectively. The proposed development could exacerbate this problem. They do not agree that there is a need for additional high density units in the area, as there is a multi-family development 1/4 mile away that has 213 vacant units--more than proposed in this development. He said that they believe the Planning Commission's role is to take into consideration what is best for all citizens. He pointed out a number of citizens present in the audience, all in objection to this rezoning. He asked if the applicant would buy this property if he could not develop as he hoped.

Hank Vincent, a resident of Andover Hill, said he was formerly the President of the Andover Neighborhood Association. He said he was concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the area's traffic flow. The petitioner's information indicates that his developments attract young professionals, couples and retirees. Those demographics literally ensure that there will be two vehicles associated with each of those rental units. He believed each dwelling unit would have two vehicles associated with it -- all of which would add to the difficult traffic situation on Chilesburg Road. He said that this entire proposal is nothing more than wanting to "jam" 100s of rental units on a small piece of land, completely unsuited for it, with no realistic consideration for the impact on a surrounding single family residential area.

John Buckner, 3664 Horsemint Trail, said that his grandson travels by bike to his home from Park Ridge Lane. The location of the subject property's access is the "worst possible" spot for an access, given the S-curves on Chilesburg Road. He believed that the increased density would "be a mess." Mr. Sayer and his son are neighbors, and Mr. Buckner said that he is similarly concerned about his grandson's bicycle travels in this area.

Steve Wilson, 3676 Horsemint Trail, said that Chilesburg Road is very narrow, and when subject to flooding, reduces in width to one lane. Two pickup trucks cannot pass one another on it; and it was not meant for high density developments.

John Palma, 477 Andover Creek, commented on the Traffic Impact Study, and expressed a great deal of skepticism about the study. He said that the petitioner contends that their development will be occupied by young professionals, but the existing townhomes on the subject property have several children as residents. The AM and PM peak hours are also the highest pedestrian traffic times on Chilesburg Road, which will increase the danger to those walking in this area.

Laura Bissett, 3773 Ridge View Way, said that one of the petitioner's points referenced renters as a relatively new housing market; however, she just read an article indicating that Lexington has one of the hottest housing markets in the country. In fact, she said she has a friend living in the Bridgewater development while their new home is being built in the Chilesburg neighborhood. She was concerned that the proposed development would connect to Ridge View Way, which is congested and heavily traveled. She said that road cannot absorb any more traffic.

Chairman's Question – Chairman Owens asked if either the Division of Traffic Engineering or Division of Fire & EMS staff members present had comments about this application.

Casey Kaucher, LFUCG Traffic Engineering, said she had participated in a great deal of discussion about traffic issues. She stated that she had reviewed the submitted TIS, and she agreed that the additional traffic would not impact intersection delays. However, she was concerned about ability of the (essentially) rural cross-section of Chilesburg Road to handle the additional traffic from this development. She stated that the cross-section is currently 16' in width; and if brought up to current standards, it would need to be 40'. Chilesburg Road also has trees right next to the roadway, adding that Traffic Engineering's view is that this is "not a great plan."

Commission Questions – Chairman Owens asked if there were any plans for improvements. Ms. Kaucher said that she cannot cite any that are scheduled, due to the Rural Scenic Roadway designation given Chilesburg Road by the EAMP.

Mr. Penn asked, regarding the proposed access to Jacobson Park, under what type of standards it would be constructed. Capt. Greg Lengal replied that it would need to meet full street standards, and that it must support the weight of a fire vehicle. He said that Jacobson Park holds CSEPP activities, so those park roads have been constructed to support the city's fire trucks. Mr. Penn asked where the proposed street – Bridgewater Way – transitions from public/private/public, and if there was any concern about its construction standards. Capt. Lengal replied that it should be built to public street standards. Mr. Penn asked if the Chilesburg S-curve would pose a problem. Capt. Lengal said that they currently respond to the subject property.

Mr. Wilson asked, regarding access to and from the park, if Fire & EMS will have to go through the front gate of the park. Capt. Lengal replied that, ordinarily, they would use Chilesburg Road as the main access. The park would serve as a secondary means of access. The park is locked at night, but Fire can get access to the park, regardless. The proposed development would result in an access easement some 2000' in length, and Fire & EMS prefers more access points to such a roadway. They are concerned about when future connections would be made to that new facility.

Applicant's Rebuttal – Mr. Murphy said that he did appreciate the discussion today, even though there was some considerable disagreement about how the subject property should be developed. Anderson Communities will provide several amenities, and will provide a different lifestyle choice from that of a single family subdivision with yards. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan discussions, Mr. Murphy said that the Planning Commission's main role is to implement the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Kentucky Supreme Court commented in a decision years ago that the Plan is to be "a guide, and not a straitjacket." The applicant should not be trapped by a Plan that is 20 years old. If the EAMP were to have been followed exactly, this would have prevented construction of the new Cabela's and Costco stores, along with other changes in the Expansion Area. The Planning Commission has the authority to make changes to those plans.

Mr. Murphy said that the petitioner is also concerned about traffic, which is one reason why the LFUCG recently lowered speed limits to 25 mph on local streets. He said that all residents should be adhering to that speed limit. Their proposed connection to the north was included because the LFUCG indicated that the connection was preferable. He did not believe that the park access will be used frequently – only when an emergency occurs and the main entrance is blocked. He said that the road will be developed to the Fire Department's standards. Regarding Chilesburg Road, he said that their proposed plan includes pedestrian accommodations and trail connections from Still Meadow and Andover subdivisions to the park, without requiring residents to walk on Chilesburg Road.

Mr. Murphy said that they also plan to save a significant bur oak tree along the park boundary. They engaged a traffic consultant, even though a traffic impact study was not required. The staff reviewed it and indicated that their study was compliant with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. He concluded by saying that, if the width of Chilesburg Road is a problem, they should be allowed to make improvements, and an amended Zoning Ordinance should be referred to Council to allow them to do so.

Opposition's Rebuttal – First, Mr. Billings said that the development's amenities do not matter when considering a zone change. As to the traffic impact study, this document was provided to the opposition only the day prior to the hearing, and it did not examine the 260 on-site parking spaces – or how future EAR-3 zoning of other parcels could be affected by this decision. Finally, he told the Commission that the supplemental staff report is "on point," and that nothing presented at this hearing is in opposition to those conclusions. He asked the Commission to recommend disapproval of this zone change for the reasons provided by the staff.

Staff Rebuttal – Ms. Wade displayed Article 6-4(d) of the Zoning Ordinance on the overhead projector. She said that the Commission is required to find that this change is either in agreement with Comprehensive Plan, or that the existing zoning is inappropriate and that the proposed zoning is appropriate; or that there has been a change of an economic, physical, or social nature that has altered the basic character of this area. She said that the petitioner has not shown that the existing zoning is inappropriate; and, instead, the existing EAR-1 zoning would allow the same types of housing as is now proposed. She agreed that the Comprehensive Plan is not a straitjacket. However, the main issue associated with this change is about Chilesburg Road. The staff of the Division of Traffic Engineering has plainly stated that Chilesburg Road is unsafe. In 1996, 4,100 acres were planned for residential development in Expansion Area 2, with 13,000 dwelling units anticipated at a density of about 3.2 dwelling units per acre. She said that the density of Expansion Area 2C has exceeded that number, and the density of Expansion Area 2A might also. The development of the other three Expansion Areas has been at lower densities, but the density proposed for the subject property is above those levels. The staff would ask that the Commission consider not just the proposed density, but how residential density is tied to the available infrastructure in the area.

Chairman's Comments – Chairman Owens stated that the hearing was now "closed," and he opened the floor for discussion.

Commission Comments – Mr. Brewer offered his compliments to the citizens present at this hearing. He said that the Commission takes their comments seriously. He said that the attorneys both presented good cases, but he often looks to the professional staff to make unbiased recommendations. He said that the EAMP should guide the Commission's decision. The EAR-1 zoning is appropriate, and he did not see why a "jump" to an EAR-3 zone should be made. Further, he did not support the use of Jacobson Park for any type of access. He said he recognizes the recent changes in the housing market, but he does not support a change to EAR-3. It was difficult for him to vote against the staff recommendation, and he did not hear compelling evidence to do so.

Mr. Wilson said that he also had not heard any compelling evidence to vote against the staff recommendation.

Chairman Owens said that, in his seven years on the Commission, he had learned to like Dennis Anderson's development projects. To him, the quality of the proposed development is not at issue. However, he believed the issues with this application are related to density and Chilesburg Road. He said that while there are statutes in place, he does not believe there has been a significant change in the area. He thanked the citizens that attend for their input.

Zoning Action – A motion was made by Carolyn Plumlee, seconded by Patrick Brewer, and carried 6-5 (Berkley, Cravens, Drake, Mundy, and Richardson opposed to Disapprove MAR 2015-27: ANDERSON BRIDGEWATER, LLC, for the reasons provided by the staff.

Development Plan Action – A motion was made by Carolyn Plumlee, seconded by William Wilson, and carried 11-0 to indefinitely postpone ZDP 2015-118: ANDERSON 2 SUBDIVISION (AMD).