GENERAL INFORMATION: MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST (MAR) APPLICATION

1. ADDRES	S INF	ORMATION (Name,	Address, City/	State/Zip & Ph	IONE NO.)			
APPLICA		Lexington-Fayette Urban County Planning Commission							
			East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky 40507						
PROPER	RTY OV	VNERS:	See Atta	chment	otali 6 bi isabitat nimopos of foligo	inguing the princ	noved, follower	121	
ATTORN	IEV:	LEUCG Den	artment	of Law	NO balinos, eresto esexence excesse	striette formente	via nette digue tah Musik he	18 1 A	
netigobi		G Department of Law ast Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky 40507							
2. ADDRES	SS OF	APPLICANT'S	S PROP	ERTY (Please	attach Legal	Description)	groval is made su	m3 en).	
to laygrees	a to poit	Commission ac	rise, any	mento (F-1) otnem	edoud eut Beuozi	County Council n	6–352 Glendale	n9 t	
212-353, 35	7 & 36	1 Hillsboro Av	enue: 21	12–329 Larch L	ane: 1519–16	In Old Leestow	n Road (odd ad	e Avenue; Idresses only):	
310-331 Lec	ona Dri	ve; 1456-165	0 Meado	owthorpe Avenu	ue; 1541 & 154	5 Penrod Drive	: 215–267 Pep	per Drive; 209–340	
Taylor Drive,	and 1	442-1509 Tov	vnley Dr	ive	Development Pla	ed on the Zoning	note shall be place	1 A . E	
_ Mr. Rose	th quid	In expect wine		oning Ordinance	de 6-4(c) of the 2	sporty (under Arti	proved for this pro	QE .	
3. ZONING	, USE	& ACREAGE	OF APP	LICANT'S PROPERTY (Use attachment, if needed					
Existing Zoning Use				Requested				Acreage	
R-1C & B-1	Singl	e Family Resi	dential	Zoning ND-1 Overlay		Jse ily Residential,	Net	Gross	
y Briewer, spende	Duplexes, & Residential			IND-1 Overlay		Multi-Family	113.87 ±	150.90 ±	
4 SUPPOI	INDIN	G PROPERTY	/ 70NII	IC & LICE	in some and an electronic strains on the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of	beign srewith a light	idnen soG nasa	ient is Ci	
Proper		GPHOPEHI	r, ZUNII	Use			come to this bear	Zoning	
				ight-of-Way; Light Industrial			I-1		
East Warehouses				gire of truy, Eight industrial			1-1 2 M2T DMO+ 2 HMW C		
				ential & Commercial			R-4, P-1, B-1 & B-3		
				l, Multi-Family Residential &Townley Park			R-1C, R-1T, R-4, P-1, B-1 & B-3		
5. EXISTIN	G CON	IDITIONS	nos yens	YOU SHARE OF THE	The process, s.	AC TOWN TO	A CONTROLL OF THE STATE OF	,,	
			nite on thi	is property that w	ill be removed if	this application i	in approved?	☐ YES ☒ NO	
Are there any existing dwelling units on this property that will be removed if this application is approved? Have any such dwelling units been present on the subject property in the past 12 months?							s approved?	TURNED DISTRICT	
FELLI 12 (124) - 1961	21 -112	E RESIDENCE OF THE	211.75.156.15.4	OLD DIED DISCOLURA	AT A BUILDING GROVE	median income	official water was an appearance	☐ YES 🖾 NO	
If yes, how	el of asses of the f	☐ YES ☐ NO							
			atement o	outlining any efforts to be undertaken to assist thos			ise	978 BAR LINE THE BAR STATE	
residents in	n obtair	ing alternative	housing.			and it decolor the	lealm/lio0/mm of	Units	
6. URBAN	SERVI	CES STATUS	(Indica	ite whether ev	isting or how	to be provide	a ti to eno tetti b	Wednesdew AVE	
	Roads		Existi			Developer	Other	Within the area to	
	Storm Sewers		Existi		constructed by	Developer [xisting and not planned	
Sanitary Sewers		bevisoes bu			constructed by	☐ Developer ☐		dual Septic Systems	
Curb/Gutter/Sidewalks			Existi		constructed by	☐ Developer [kisting and not planned	
Refuse Co	ollection								
Utilities	27122034		Electri	ic 🛛 Gas	⊠ Water ⊠	Phone 🛛 Cat	ole	Ast Lettinol Star	
PECODI	DE VO	UD HIOTIELS	8.30 a.m	. Planging Dyla	92 QT21 119 J	421 X108 23112 924	astions. Mc Ows	LO molesimmoo	
	BE YU	DR JUSTIFIC	ATION	FOR REQUES	TED CHANGE	(Please provi	de attachment	.) are transpoor	
This is in.	🔼	n agreement w	ith the Co	omp. Plan 🔲 mo	re appropriate tr	an the existing z	coning ∐ due to u	unanticipated changes	
B. APPLICA	ANT/O	WNER SIGNS	THIS C	ERTIFICATIO	N Salate I-da	GANAPA SKARN	that, if 138 post	Meranaven (ma)	
I do here	by cert	ify that to the	best of r	ny knowledge a	and belief, all a	pplication mate	erials are herew	ith submitted, and	
the inform	nation	they contain is	s true ar	d accurate.	7/.	0111.	thapiast to about	or letavo y all y	
PLANNIN	NG CO	MMISSION S	ECRETA	ARY	Mustor	Dr Jung	DA	TE 12/16/2011	
and a company of	7 171 161	LOSSILL STATE	must eith	ior acon Servicin				//	

- surrounding residential neighbors. The proposed reuse of this site, in its current configuration, will not create a necessity for additional screening and landscaping.
- b. Approval of the landscape variances will not result in an unreasonable circumvention of the Zoning Ordinance.
- c. The special circumstance that applies to the subject properties that serves to justify the variances is the proposed reuse of the existing development. In order to provide the required landscaping, existing pavement will need to be removed, thus reconfiguring the parking lot to accommodate both the parking and the landscape buffers.
- d. Strict application of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance would create an unnecessary hardship to the applicant, and would likely lead to an inferior buffer since new vegetation would supplant mature screening material.
- e. The circumstances surrounding this request are not the result of actions taken by the applicant since the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance.

The approval is made subject to the following conditions:

- Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property to P-1; otherwise, any Commission action of approval of this variance is null and void.
- Should the property be rezoned, it shall be developed in accordance with the approved Development Plan, unless amended by a future Development Plan approved by the Commission, or as a Minor Amendment permitted under Article 21-7 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- A note shall be placed on the Zoning Development Plan indicating the variances that the Planning Commission has approved for this property (under Article 6-4(c) of the Zoning Ordinance).
- 4. Prior to any construction or erection of signs, the applicant shall obtain the necessary permits.
- The landscape variances are subject to the adaptive reuse of the existing parking lot. If the open space areas (playgrounds) are to be paved for parking, then the standard landscaping and screening required by the Zoning Ordinance shall apply.

<u>Development Plan Action</u>: A motion was made by Mr. Owens, seconded by Mr. Penn, and carried 7-0 (Beatty, Brewer, Paulsen, and Roche-Phillips absent) to approve ZDP 2011-69, subject to the 13 conditions as listed on the agenda.

<u>Commission Comment</u>: Mr. Owens stated that he appreciated the residents' concerns about the rezoning. He said that he had come to this hearing with one opinion about this request; but, after hearing about the petitioner's efforts to maintain the subject properties and protect the character of the neighborhood, he had changed his mind.

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS

A. <u>MEADOWTHORPE NEIGHBORHOOD ZONE CHANGE INITIATION REQUEST</u> – petition request received from residents of the Meadowthorpe neighborhood for Planning Commission initiation of an ND-1 overlay zone.

The Zoning Committee made no recommendation on this request.

Ms. Wade briefly oriented the Commission to the location of the Meadowthorpe neighborhood, noting that it is to the north of Leestown Road, inside New Circle Road; to the northwest of Price Road and the Lexington Cemetery; and across from the Townley Park shopping and residential area. She said that the Meadowthorpe Neighborhood Association had been going through the initial phases of the ND-1 process for some time, and they have now requested Planning Commission initiation of an ND-1 overlay zone. The neighborhood association has completed the required petition and design study, copies of which were distributed to the Commission members.

Ms. Wade stated that one of the requirements of the ND-1 application process is a postcard mailing to each of the properties within the area proposed for the overlay zone. The Planning staff mailed notice letters and postcards to all of the just over 480 properties in the neighborhood earlier this month, and they received 239 postcards back, or just less than half. Of the 239 postcards returned, 198 of them, or 82.8% were in favor of the proposed ND-1 zoning; 37 responses, or 15.5%, were opposed; and four respondents expressed no opinion. Ms. Wade noted that the Commission had received copies of the seven proposed design guidelines, which were also sent to the property owners along with the notice letter and postcard mailing. She added that the staff had received one letter in opposition to the initiation, which was circulated to the Commission members for their review.

<u>Commission Questions</u>: Mr. Owens asked how many mailed postcards had been returned. Ms. Wade answered that the staff received 239 postcards. Mr. Owens asked how many had been mailed out, to which Ms. Wade replied that 484 postcards had been sent.

Mr. Cravens said that, if 198 postcards in favor of ND-1 zoning were received, that represents less than half of the total number of residences. Ms. Wade replied that the Planning Commission only needs to consider the number of postcards that were returned. The staff informs the neighborhood association at the outset that the count provided to the Planning Commission will only take into consideration the postcards that are returned. Ms. Wade noted that the neighborhood association had to make several rounds of resident contacts in order to notify homeowners and distribute the petition, so there might be some apathy with the initial postcard mailing.

^{* -} Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

Neighborhood Presentation: Coleman Bush, 324 Pelican Lane, thanked the staff and the Planning Commission for their assistance during the three-year process that brought the Meadowthorpe Neighborhood Association to this point. He said that, during the hearing for the previous zone change, Ms. Wade had referred to the Goals of the Comprehensive Plan, some of which include preserving and protecting older neighborhoods. The Planning Commission has demonstrated their support for preserving older neighborhoods by approving ND-1 overlay zoning for the Chevy Chase and Montclair neighborhoods.

Mr. Bush stated that the residents of the Meadowthorpe neighborhood believe that it is unquestionably worth preserving. The neighborhood was established in 1949, and has not undergone many of the unfavorable changes that were experienced by the Chevy Chase and Montclair neighborhoods. Meadowthorpe is characterized by medium-sized brick or stone houses, with little siding; consistent setbacks; and an appealing appearance. Mr. Bush said that Meadowthorpe was first occupied by the "greatest generation," and serves as an example of the beliefs and ideals of that period in the country's history; and, as such, is worthy of preserving.

With regard to the postcard mailing, Mr. Bush stated that the staff is not required to send follow-up postcards; but the neighborhood association had followed up on that mailing several times, with both resident and non-resident property owners. There was a 77.3% response rate for the petition, which was just a bit higher than the response to the Chevy Chase ND-1 petition. The neighborhood association is proposing seven standards, and they gave each property owner the opportunity to offer their opinion separately on each standard.

Mr. Bush said, in conclusion, that he believes that Meadowthorpe is at the perfect point in its life cycle to apply ND-1 zoning, unlike Montclair, where unfavorable changes had already occurred. He said that the neighborhood association had drafted the following goals for the ND-1 process:

- "To protect against the degradation of Meadowthorpe, a special place of aesthetic and cultural significance in Lexington;
- To encourage the preservation of Meadowthorpe's original structures through adaptive rehabilitation when necessary;
- When adaptive rehabilitation is necessary or desirable, to encourage construction that will lead to continuation, conservation, and improvement in a manner appropriate to the scale and physical character of the original buildings;
- To foster civic pride in Meadowthorpe as a community and as an exemplary subdivision of the post-World War II era."

Commission Questions: Mr. Penn stated that he hopes that the Meadowthorpe Neighborhood Association intends to continue the work that they have done up to this point, since initiation is just the first step in the rezoning process. He said that several of the Planning Commission members had been through the ND-1 process before, and had found that the property owners who did not respond to the postcard mailing might have questions about the effect of the rezoning on their property rights. Mr. Penn encouraged the neighborhood association to continue their discussions with property owners, so that everyone will be aware of the intent of the process. He added that there had been questions about the validity of some ND-1 petitions; and the neighborhood association must make a commitment to the process, since initiation of ND-1 zoning is no guarantee that the rezoning will actually occur. Mr. Bush stated that the neighborhood association would make that commitment.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 5-2 (Blanton and Cravens opposed; Beatty, Brewer, Paulsen, and Roche-Phillips absent) to initiate the Meadowthorpe neighborhood ND-1 overlay zoning as requested by the Meadowthorpe Neighborhood Association.

B. <u>ADOPTION OF THE OFFICIAL MEETING & FILING SCHEDULE FOR 2012</u> – Mr. Sallee presented the recommended Official Meeting and Filing Schedule for 2012, and requested that the Commission consider its adoption.

Action: A motion was made by Ms. Blanton, seconded by Mr. Wilson, and carried 7-0 (Beatty, Brewer, Paulsen, and Roche-Phillips absent) to adopt the Official Meeting and Filing Schedule for 2012, as presented by the staff.

- VII. <u>STAFF ITEMS</u> No such items were presented.
- VIII. <u>AUDIENCE ITEMS</u> No such items were presented.
- IX. MEETING DATES FOR NOVEMBER, 2011

X. ADJOURNMENT

Revised 11/28/11 wls To be considered by PC on 12/8/11 TLW/TWBJR/BS/src

^{* -} Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

