

Rec'd by _____

Date: _____

RECOMMENDATION OF THE
URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OF LEXINGTON AND FAYETTE COUNTY, KENTUCKY

IN RE: PLN-MAR-24-00010: FAYETTE MHC, LP – a petition for a zone map amendment from an Single Family Residential (R-1D) to Mobile Home Park (M-1P), for 16.541 net (16.754) gross acres for property located at 421 Price Road (a portion of).(Council District 2)

Having considered the above matter on **August 22, 2024**, at a Public Hearing, and having voted **7-1** that this Recommendation be submitted to the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Council, the Urban County Planning Commission does hereby recommend **APPROVAL** of this matter for the following reasons:

1. The proposed Mobile Home Park (M-1P) zone is in agreement with the Imagine Lexington 2045 Comprehensive Plan's Goals and Objectives, for the following reasons:
 - a. The request will increase the overall density of the site, which previously contained one single-family residence (Theme A, Goal #1.b).
 - b. The proposal provides housing that addresses demand from low and medium income individuals (Theme a, Goal #5.e).
 - c. The request provides for additional greenspace and new community recreational amenities (Theme A Goal#3.d).
2. The proposal is in agreement with the Policies of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:
 - a. The internal circulation network promotes a pedestrian friendly street pattern design (Theme A, Design Policy #1 and #5).
 - b. The expansion of the existing mobile home park increases density in a manner that is consistent with the low-density residential character of the area (Theme A, Density Policy #2). F
 - c. The request provides housing opportunities for lower and medium income individuals (Theme A, Equity Policy #4).
3. The justification and corollary development plan are in agreement with the Development Criteria of the 2045 Comprehensive Plan.
 - a. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Land Use, as the request increases density by increasing the number of dwelling units on the parcel, (A-DN2-1), and creates a safer, more accessible neighborhood through the expansion of pedestrian facilities and the connection to existing stub
 - b. The proposed rezoning addresses the Transportation and Pedestrian Connectivity Development Criteria, as the proposed development connects existing stub streets (A-DS-13-1) to create additional connectivity for the subject property, as well as the adjoining neighborhood. The proposal provides for accessible connections to the nearby transit stop (A-DS1-2), and creates a dedicated pedestrian network that creates new connections to the local park and educational centers (A-DS10-1).
 - c. The proposed rezoning meets the criteria for Environmental Sustainability and Resiliency, as the development does not impact environmentally sensitive areas (B-PR2-1).
 - d. The request meets the requirements for Site Design, as the request provides an increase in the neighborhood oriented recreational space and amenities (A-DS9-1, D-PL4-1).
 - d. The request meets the criteria for Building Form, as the proposed development utilizes sidewalks and landscaping to provide a development that creates a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere (A- DS5-3).

4. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of PLN-MJDP 24-00043: SUBURBAN POINTE PARK EXPANSION prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.

ATTEST: This 13th day of September, 2024.


Secretary, Jim Duncan

LARRY FORESTER
CHAIR

K.R.S. 100.211(7) requires that the Council take action on this request by November 20, 2024

Note: The corollary development plan, PLN-MJDP-24-00043: SUBURBAN POINTE PARK EXPANSION was approved by the Planning Commission on August 22, 2024 and certified on September 5, 2024.

At the Public Hearing before the Urban County Planning Commission, this petitioner was represented by **Nick Nicholson, attorney**.

OBJECTORS

- Ed Holmes, Planner with EHI Consulting.
- Valerie Logan, 944 Waverly Drive.
- Anne Greene, Erie Road.
- Virgil Covington Jr, 118 Bold Bidder Court.
- Artie Greene, 948 Waverly Drive.

OBJECTIONS

- Stated that not connecting streets could be a strategic choice to preserve the character of the neighborhood. He emphasized the social justice component of planning and the importance of listening to the community about how this project may impact the neighborhood.
- Stated she was speaking on behalf of her mother and father who were one of the original members of the neighborhood. Ms. Logan stated that the neighborhood was not consulted about this project, they do not want it here, and it is not a good idea.
- Stated they have been here for 60 years and are against this development because it will bring in too much noise and traffic. She stated that did not want the stub streets connected.
- Stated that these roads have always been closed, and if the applicant does not need the connections, that he does not want the connections. He concluded by requesting that the Commission allow them be the village that they have always been.
- Stated that this was a community they were trying to protect and that he was against

- Alva Covington.
- Michelle Davis, President of the St. Martin's Village Neighborhood Association, 940 DePorres Avenue.
- Enoch Elliot, 935 Effie Road.
- Scottie Greene, 368 Scottsdale Circle.
- George Brown, State Representative for the 77th district.
- Jacques Wigginton, 442 Elm Street.
- Tina Brooks Warren, 912 DePorres Avenue.
- Patty Draus, 608 Allen Court.
- Tammy Bright, 960 DePorres Avenue.
- connecting the stub streets.
- Stated that her parents moved to St. Martin's Village when she was three years old and they have been thriving ever since. She stated that the neighborhood had not been contacted about the connections and the traffic it would bring, and that she was against the application because of the connections.
- Stated that she has raised three generations of her family in her home and that the neighborhood was like a second family to her. She stated that the stub streets needed to stay closed due to increased traffic and safety concerns.
- Stated that his family moved to the neighborhood in 1956 where they safely rode their bicycles on the neighborhood streets. He stated that he did not want any connections and would want some kind of barrier to protect those streets.
- Stated that her family moved to St. Martin's Village when she was very young and the streets were closed then and were safe, she stated that she did not want to see streets open and to keep St. Martin's Village safe.
- Stated that he did not want the development because of the history of the neighborhood and that this was putting lipstick on a pig.
- Commended Mr. Nicholson for staying true to his word at the neighborhood meeting and not asking for the connections like he said he would. He stated that he wished for a postponement so that a waiver could be adopted and the streets not to be connected.
- Stated she could not even imagine that many units going into that property and is against the proposal.
- Stated that she was concerned that this proposal would have a negative impact on the climate and discussed issues cooling and heating mobile homes, including the high cost. Additionally, she asked what happens to a person if they default on their payments.
- Asked the Planning Commission to be considerate of St. Martin's Village culture and people and that she was against the development.

- Barbara Carsby, 977 St Martin Avenue.
- Rolanda Woolfork, 730 Chiles Avenue.
- Odessa Pope Wells, 424 Tibbs Lane.
- Walt Gaffield, 2001 Bamboo Drive.
- Rosemary Owens, 973 Waverly Drive.
- Juanita Greene, Erie Road.
- Doyle Warren, 912 DePorres Avenue.
- Charles Tuck, former resident of St. Martin’s Village.
- Amy Clark, 628 Kastle Road.
- Stated that connections had no benefits to the neighborhood, and she as concerned about the potential crime that could come with the mobile home park.
- Stated she had concerns about the ducks that go to the pond that is going to be drained because the kids in the neighborhood love them. Additionally, stated she had concerns with a memorial tree that is on the property that will be lost. Lastly, she stated she was concerned about issues the potential residents could have with a mobile home expansion.
- Stated that opening the street would be dangerous and that she did not want this development to happen.
- Stated that he stood with the St. Martin’s Village Neighborhood Association and was against this zone change because it is inconsistent with the Goals and Objective of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Stated that she has been in the neighborhood for 52 years and she opposes the zone change.
- Stated that it did not make sense to open those connections and it would be dangerous.
- Stated that this application will disrupt “The Village” and strongly opposed this zone change.
- Stated that he was against connecting the stub streets and thanked the founding members of the neighborhood for “continuing to carry the torch.”
- Stated she was in opposition because there is not a compelling reason for the zone change, and because homes would not last long. She called for improvements on Price Road.

VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: (7) Barksdale, Johnathon Davis, Nicol, Owens, Pohl, Wilson, and Worth
 NAYS: (1) Michler
 ABSENT: (2) Forester and Zach Davis
 ABSTAINED: (0)
 DISQUALIFIED: (0)

Motion for **APPROVAL** of **PLN-MAR-24-00010** carried.

Enclosures: Application
 Justification
 Legal Description
 Plat
 Development Snapshot
 Staff Reports
 Applicable excerpts of minutes of above meeting