

ORDINANCE NO. 050 - 2025

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE 8-20 OF THE LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE, RELATING TO THE CORRIDOR BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE, TO REMOVE THE MINIMUM BUILDING LOT COVERAGE REQUIREMENT.

WHEREAS, the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Planning Commission considered at a public hearing on May 22, 2025 a text amendment to Article 8-20 of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Zoning Ordinance, relating to the Corridor Business (B-3) zone, to remove the thirty percent (30%) minimum building lot coverage requirement; said Commission recommending approval of the text amendment by a vote of 6-5; and

WHEREAS, this Council agrees with the recommendation of the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the recommendation of the Planning Commission is attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT:

Section 1 – That Article 8-20(l) of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Zoning Ordinance be and hereby is amended to delete subsection 1 and renumber subsequent subsections, to read as follows:

Article 8-20: Corridor Business (B-3) Zone

[...]

(l) Lot Coverage

1. Outdoor storage and sales lot coverage: Maximum fifty (50%) of all paved areas.

[...]

Section 2 – That this ordinance shall become effective on the date of its passage.

PASSED URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL: July 1, 2025



MAYOR

ATTEST:



CLERK OF URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL

PUBLISHED: July 11, 2025-1t
0621-25:TWJ:4933-6666-0686, v.1

Rec'd by _____

Date: _____

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

IN RE: PLN-ZOTA-25-00002: LOT COVERAGE IN THE CORRIDOR BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE – a text amendment to amend the 30% lot coverage requirement in the B-3 zone.

Having considered the above matter on May 22, 2025, at a Public Hearing, and having voted 6-5 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 text amendment allows for greater flexibility in meeting the requirements of the Corridor Business (B-3) zone, while remaining consistent with the intent of the zone.
2. The proposed text amendment provides for a minimum threshold of utilization that is in agreement with the following adopted goals, objectives, policies contained within *Imagine Lexington 2045 for the following reasons:*
 - a. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective d: Emphasize redevelopment of underutilized corridors
 - b. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective e: Maximize development on vacant land within the Urban Service Area and promote redevelopment of underutilized land in a manner that enhances existing urban form and/or historic features.

Jim Duncan by Traci Wade **LARRY FORESTER**
Secretary, Jim Duncan CHAIR

At the Public Hearing before the Urban County Planning Commission, this petitioner was represented by **Chris Taylor, Deputy Director of the Division of Planning.**

OBJECTORS

- Amy Clark, 628 Kastle Road

OBJECTIONS

- Stated she thought this should be postponed because it needed more work.

VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

AYES:	(6)	Barksdale, J. Davis, Z. Davis, Forester, Nicol, and Wilson,
NAYS:	(5)	M. Davis, Michler, Owens, Penn, Worth
ABSENT:	(0)	
ABSTAINED:	(0)	
DISQUALIFIED:	(0)	

Motion for APPROVAL of PLN-ZOTA-25-00002 carried.

Enclosures: Initiation
Staff Report and Staff Alternative Text.
Planning Commission recommended text
Applicable excerpts of minutes of above meeting

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. J. Davis and carried 7-1-1(Z. Davis absent) (Owens opposed)(Michler abstained) to approve PLN-MAR-22-00016: REALTY UNLIMITED BLUEGRASS, LLC for reasons provided by Staff.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. J. Davis and carried 7-1-1(Z. Davis absent) (Owens opposed)(Michler abstained) to approve PLN-MJDP-22-00059: HIGBEE MILL COURT, LOT 11 with the nine conditions recommended by Staff.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMEMENDMENTS

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS - The Chair will announce that any item a Commission member would like to present will be heard at this time.

A. **INITIATION OF A ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT** - The staff will request Commission initiation of a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to address House Bill 443, which created a new section of KRS Chapter 100 to require local laws dealing with subdivision plats and development plans be set out by objective standards and applied ministerially. The Commission will hold a public hearing in March 2025.

Staff Presentation – Ms. Traci Wade presented an initiation request for a new text amendment to address House Bill 443 which sets out to require objective standards for subdivision plants and development plans. Ms. Wade indicated that the text amendment would affect Articles 1, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 21, 23, and 28. Ms. Wade stated that the biggest change would deal with Article 21 dealing with development plans and would update the plan review process to reflect a ministerial role for review of development plans.

Ms. Wade stated that she anticipated mailings would go out in February and the application would be in front of the Planning Commission in March. Ms. Wade concluded by stating she could answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Comments and Questions – Ms. Worth asked if there was a description of at what point applications are sent to the zoning subcommittee. Ms. Wade stated that the process of the zoning subcommittee should not be affected but she would double check in Article 6 if there would be any substantive changes.

Mr. Penn asked about the process that this text amendment will go through and if it will have public review. Ms. Wade indicated that it would have public review and at this point there was draft language that will go through the regular process of review and public input and would be sending notice to the neighborhood associations.

Mr. Nicol stated that he thought that we are facing a problem with our corridor business and proposed an amendment to the proposed text amendment that would investigate changes into the corridor business zone and the B-3 zone and remove minimum lot coverage requirements. Mr. Nicol argued that removing the requirement would increase economic vitality and more potential B-3 parcels would be used.

Mr. Penn stated that he did not think it was the time for new amendments because the Planning Commission had not had ample opportunity to look over this text yet. Mr. Nicol stated that the Planning Commission had until July 1st to look into this and thought it was worth looking into and have the community give input through the process.

Ms. Tracy Jones, Department of Law, clarified that the Planning Commission could take Mr. Nicol's ~~recommendation~~ into account, but the recommendation of approval or disapproval would come in March in order to get to the Council before July 1st.

Mr. Michler asked that since this text amendment is dealing with HB 443, which asks for more specificity, is the minimum lot coverage requirement already specific enough. Ms. Wade indicated that Mr. Michler was correct and that the current proposed Staff text does not change any of the specific measurable requirements of any of the zones.

Mr. Nicol clarified that he just wanted to take the opportunity while they were discussing this text amendment to fix problems that he sees in the Ordinance. Ms. Wade stated she understood, but this text amendment was for things that needed to be changed in order to be in compliance with HB 443.

Mr. Owens stated that he agreed with Ms. Wade and what Mr. Nicol is suggesting should come separately from this text amendment.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Penn and seconded by Ms. Worth and carried 9-0 (Z. Davis absent) to initiate a text amendment to address House Bill 443, which created a new section of KRS Chapter 100 to require local laws dealing with subdivision plats and development plans be set out by objective standards and applied ministerially.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Nicol and seconded by Ms. Barksdale to initiate a text amendment to amend Article 8, Section 8-20, to remove the minimum lot coverage in the B-3 zone.

Discussion – Mr. Owens stated that he wished to give the Staff a chance to look into the subject first before initiating a text amendment.

Mr. Michler stated he thought the Planning Commission had just gone through a large text amendment that dealt with increased utilization of land and wanted to give the process more time to evaluate until the Planning Commission moved on to this proposed text amendment.

Mr. Nicol stated that he was not asking for the Planning Commission to vote on this, he was asking to initiate a text amendment that they could then consider what he is proposing.

Ms. Worth asked if they moved forward with this, if they would have an opportunity to think this through before it went to the public comment. Ms. Wade indicated that was the case and there was no time limit.

Action – The motion carried 5-4 (Michler, Wilson, Owens, and J. Davis opposed) (Z. Davis absent) to initiate a text amendment to amend Article 8, Section 8-20, to remove the minimum lot coverage in the B-3 zone.

VII. STAFF ITEMS

VIII. AUDIENCE ITEMS – Citizens may bring a planning related matter before the Commission at this time for general discussion or future action. Items that will NOT be heard are those requiring the Commission's formal action, such as zoning items for early rehearing, map or text amendments; subdivision or development plans, etc. These last mentioned items must be filed in advance of this meeting in conformance with the adopted filing schedule.

IX. MEETING DATES FOR January and February 2025

Subdivision Committee, Thursday, 8:30 a.m., in 3 rd Floor Conf Room, Phoenix Building	February 6, 2025
Zoning Committee, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., in 3 rd Floor Conf Room, Phoenix Building	February 6, 2025
Subdivision Items Public Hearing , Thursday, 1:30 p.m. in Council Chambers, 2 nd Floor, Gov't Center.....	February 13, 2025
Work Session, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., in 3 rd Floor Conf Room, Phoenix Building	February 20, 2025
Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., in 3 rd Floor Conf Room, Phoenix Building.....	February 26, 2025
Zoning Items Public Hearing , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., in Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, Gov't Center.....	February 27, 2025

Larry Forester, Chair

Robin Michler, Secretary

TW/DC/RS-1/24/25

Article 8-20: Corridor Business (B-3) Zone

...

Lot, Yard, and Height Requirements. (See Articles 3 and 15 for additional regulations.)

- (f) Minimum Lot Size. No limitation.
- (g) Minimum Lot Frontage. Forty (40) feet.
- (h) Minimum Front Yard. Ten (10) feet. Maximum front yard for corner lots. Twenty (20) feet.
- (i) Minimum Each Side Yard. No limitation, except as provided in Subsection (o) of this section.
- (j) Minimum Rear Yard. (10) feet.
- (k) Minimum Open Space. See Article 20 for open space regulations (except as modified in Subsection (o) of this section).
- (l) Lot Coverage.
 - 1. ~~Building lot coverage: Minimum thirty percent (30%) of total lot area, except where multiple lots are depicted on an approved Final Development Plan. The minimum building lot coverage in such cases shall be thirty (30%) percent of the approved area of all lots depicted.~~
 - 2. Outdoor storage and sales lot coverage: Maximum fifty percent (50%) of all paved areas.
- (m) Maximum Height of Building. Seventy-five (75) feet, except where a side or rear yard abuts a Professional Office or a Residential zone, then a 3:1 height to yard ratio.
- (n) Off-Street Parking. (See Articles 16 and 18 for additional parking regulations.)
No minimum requirements.

**STAFF REPORT ON PETITION FOR ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT****PLN-ZOTA-25-00002: AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 8 CORRIDOR BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE**

APPLICANT: Urban County Planning Commission

PROPOSED TEXT: SEE ATTACHED (Note: **Red** text indicates a change to the existing Zoning Ordinance; **Blue** text indicates the staff alternative text; text stricken through indicates a deletion.)

STAFF REVIEW:

On January 30, 2025, the Urban County Planning Commission initiated a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. With their action, the Planning Commission provided language that would remove lot coverage requirements in the Corridor Business (B-3) zone. The following report reviews the proposed Planning Commission regulation change and makes a staff recommendation to modify the proposed text amendment.

TEXT AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

The proposed text initiated by the Urban County Planning Commission would remove the Article 8-20(I)(1) requirement for a minimum lot coverage of 30%.

EVALUATION

With the adoption of the Urban Growth Management ZOTA in June 2024, there was a significant realignment of two of Lexington's primary commercial zones. The goal in this realignment was to provide a better differentiation between the Neighborhood Business (B-1) and the Corridor Business (B-3) zones, as well as to improve the efficiency of allowable land uses in both zones to be more consistent with the adopted policies of *Imagine Lexington 2045*. In particular, the B-3 zone was modified to reduce the concentration of lots for the display, rental and sales of automobiles and similar items and ensure safe access spacing between automobile service stations. Additionally, a requirement was added to establish a minimum building lot coverage of 30%. Taken as a whole, these changes were intended to create additional development opportunities with a greater utilization of the land. The goal, as communicated throughout the ZOTA process, was to incentivize smaller commercial outlots using roughly the same size buildings as before, creating greater buildable space for additional outlots. The goal was to yield more development in the same amount of space. Staff based the recommended 30% threshold on an analysis of commercial property conducted in 2017-2018 that indicated the requirement would only be a 2-3% increase from the existing average built floor areas. Additionally, the review of historical development patterns indicated that the impact would affect few parcels.

However, in the ten months since the adoption of the ordinance, commercial development applicants have expressed difficulty in complying with the 30% lot coverage for a myriad of reasons. In addition, development applications post-COVID have shifted to meet the current consumer preferences for





During the review of the current regulations regarding lot coverage, there was significant concern from the development community regarding how stand-alone parking lots would meet the

The proposed staff alternative language provides several pathways for uses, such as drive-thru through facilities, that typically provide larger amounts of VUA on-site than would be allowed under this change. First, the proposed text allows the VUA to be calculated across a development plan, where lots with greater vehicular use area can be balanced out by lots that feature less vehicular use area. In instances where this is not possible, under the new provisions approved by the Planning Commission under the HB 443 ZOTA (ZOTA-25-00001), this ratio would be eligible for consideration of a waiver. Consistent with the pending waiver process outlined in Article 21-9(a)(1), applicants would have ample opportunity to seek relief from this ratio while still providing a net beneficial effect by modifying their vehicular use area to include permeable pavement, canopies or other elements to mitigate the environmental impact of paved surfaces. Likewise, an applicant has similar options in the design and construction of their proposed buildings utilizing LEED construction elements or additional green infrastructure.

The intent behind proposing the implementation of a Vehicular Use Area Ratio was to create a more flexible method to encourage the densification of our corridors and more efficient utilization of the B-3 zoned land. The proposed change alleviates several issues that were present under the current lot coverage framework. Under the current minimum lot coverage requirement, land that was not buildable for buildings, such as setbacks, buffer areas, open space, and stormwater facilities were included within the calculation of the total lot area, and although unbuildable, that lot area contributes to the size of the required building. Under the new framework, complicity is solely based on the relationship between the proposed amount of vehicular use area and the size of the structure on-site. This incentivizes minimizing parking and impervious surface, and increasing total building area regardless of the total lot size. Additionally, by shifting the requirement away from a strict lot coverage application and including all building square footage, a development is given full credit for a multi-story structure.

After review of the Commission-initiated text, as well as considering the request from the commission from the work session, Staff has proposed several modifications which are outlined within the review. Staff has proposed staff alternative language. While the staff alternative does fully remove the minimum lot coverage, as initiated by the Planning Commission, it replaces the requirement with a minimum vehicle use area ratio, which would be defined as the total building square footage divided by the vehicle use area on the lot which it is located. This requirement is contained within the existing Article 8-20(n) requirements for Off Street Parking and Vehicular Use Area. At this time, Staff recommends that a VUA Ratio of 0.30 be implemented within the Corner Business (B-3) zone.

Following the Planning Committee's initiation of the proposed text to remove the 30% lot coverage requirement, Staff discussed the item at their March 20, 2025 work session. At this meeting, commissioners expressed reservations at fully repealing the minimum lot coverage requirement and asked staff to consider alternatives. Committee Member Michael requested staff to look at any alternatives that might relate the amount of building on a lot to the amount of vehicular use area (VUA) as a way to measure the intensity of the development.

drive-throughs, pickup, and delivery services. The current market trend is in opposition to the historical trends staff had observed following other code reforms to facilitate infill along corridors.

requirements. This concern was understandable as there is no associated lot coverage for surface parking lots. This concern was further complicated because a stand alone parking lots do not meet the intent of the B-3, which is to provide for retail and commercial uses, which are necessary to the economic vitality of the community but may be inappropriate in the more neighborhood oriented zones. Staff recommends removing surface parking lots as a principal use in Article 8-20(b)(16), leaving the use as an accessory use within the zone.

The proposed staff alternative text is attached for further review and consideration.

The Staff Recommends: Approval of the Staff Alternative Text, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed text amendment allows for greater flexibility in meeting the requirements of the Corridor Business (B-3) zone, while remaining consistent with the intent of the zone.
2. The proposed text amendment provides for a minimum threshold of utilization that is in agreement with the following adopted goals, objectives, policies contained within *Imagine Lexington 2045* for the following reasons:
 - a. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective d: Emphasize redevelopment of underutilized corridors
 - b. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective e: Maximize development on vacant land within the Urban Service Area and promote redevelopment of underutilized land in a manner that enhances existing urban form and/or historic features.

CAT/DAC/TLW

5/1/2025

Planning Services/Staff Reports/ZOTA/2025/PLN-ZOTA-25-00002: Lot Coverage in the B-3 Zone



Proposed Planning Commission Text

(I) Lot Coverage.

~~1. Building lot coverage: Minimum thirty percent (30%) of total lot area, except where multiple lots are depicted on an approved Final Development Plan. The minimum building lot coverage in such cases shall be thirty (30%) percent of the approved area of all lots depicted.~~

12. Outdoor storage and sales lot coverage: Maximum fifty percent (50%) of all paved areas.

Proposed Staff Alternative Text (Revised)

Sec. 8-20. - Corridor Business (B-3) Zone.

(b) Principal Uses. (Other uses substantially similar to those listed herein shall also be deemed permitted.)

16. Parking ~~lots and~~ structures.

(l) Lot Coverage.

~~1. Building lot coverage: Minimum thirty percent (30%) of total lot area, except where multiple lots are depicted on an approved Final Development Plan. The minimum building lot coverage in such cases shall be thirty (30%) percent of the approved area of all lots depicted.~~

~~12. Outdoor storage and sales lot coverage: Maximum fifty percent (50%) of all paved areas.~~

(n) Off-Street Parking and Vehicular Use Area. (See Articles 16 and 18 for additional parking regulations.)

1. No minimum parking requirements.

2. The minimum Vehicular Use Area (VUA) Ratio shall be 0.3.

Vehicular Use Area (VUA) Ratio means total building square footage on a lot divided by the total vehicular use area of the lot on which it is located, or the total building square footage divided by total vehicular use area as depicted on a Final Development Plan.

Vehicular Use Area may be reduced by:

- A. The amount of VUA square footage covered by a canopy.
- B. The amount of VUA square footage constructed with allowable permeable materials per Article 16 and the Engineering Manuals.

Conditional Uses: The Board of Adjustment may establish additional requirements, as needed.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMEMENDMENTS

1. **PLN- ZOTA-25-00002: LOT COVERAGE IN THE CORRIDOR BUSINESS(B-3) ZONE** – a text amendment to amend the 30% lot coverage requirement in the B-3 zone.

INITIATED BY: URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PROPOSED TEXT: Copies are available from the staff.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: Approval of the Staff Alternative Text.

The Staff Recommends: Approval of the Staff Alternative Text. for the following reasons:

1. The proposed text amendment allows for greater flexibility in meeting the requirements of the Corridor Business (B-3) zone, while remaining consistent with the intent of the zone.
2. The proposed text amendment provides for a minimum threshold of utilization that is in agreement with the following adopted goals, objectives, policies contained within *Imagine Lexington 2045 for the following reasons:*
 - a. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective d: Emphasize redevelopment of underutilized corridors
 - b. Theme E, Goal#1, Objective e: Maximize development on vacant land within the Urban Service Area and promote redevelopment of underutilized land in a manner that enhances existing urban form and/or historic features.

Staff Presentation – Mr. Chris Taylor presented the Staff recommendation on the proposed text amendment. Mr. Taylor gave a brief explanation on how this text amendment came to be and noted the changes to the B-3 zone that took place last year to address the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Taylor stated that during the public input portion of the Comprehensive Plan, increasing density and using existing properties for growth was an area of focus for Staff and lead to a recommendation of a 30% lot coverage requirement in the B-3 zone. In Staff's assessment, this was to nudge development into a higher utilization of the land than what was typical before. Mr. Taylor stated that due to changes in land use and development patterns brought on by the COVID 19 pandemic, this 30% building utilization has become an issue. Mr. Taylor explained that in the January 2025 Planning Commission public hearing, a text amendment was initiated by the Planning Commission to eliminate the 30% lot coverage requirement. Additionally, Staff was asked to find alternatives to eliminating the 30% requirement.

Mr. Taylor stated that after discussions with Staff and members of the Planning Commission, Staff looked into the relationship between the amount of buildings and vehicular use area on the lot. Mr. Taylor explained that Staff's compromise was to create a vehicular use area ratio requirement of 0.30. Mr. Taylor demonstrated how the calculation was performed, and stated that doing this was not eliminating a threshold, but it was lowering one to make it easier for developments. Additionally, Mr. Taylor stated that after discussions with community businesses, Staff added that a ratio may be reduced by the amount of VUA that is covered by a canopy and square footage of UVA constructed with allowable permeable materials. Mr. Taylor stated that this would allow for more options for a commercial property to reach that recommended VUA and allow more flexibility than there is currently.

Mr. Taylor stated that Staff was recommending approval of the Staff alternative text and could answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Commission Comments and Questions – Ms. Worth asked what types of canopy would be allowable. Mr. Taylor stated that it would be canopy that would be placed over the vehicular use and not tree canopy.

Mr. Davis asked what types of permeable materials that would be allowable and what would be the minimum. Mr. Taylor stated that it was a one-to-one ratio, that if you had 500 square feet of permeable material, it would reduce their VUA calculation by 500 square feet.

Ms. Molly Davis asked what types of materials could they be built with. Mr. Taylor stated that it was already defined in Article 16 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Nicol stated that he was having issues with this because the intention for the initiation was to get rid of a requirement completely, and now there is a new requirement proposed. Additionally, Mr. Nicol stated he thought this compromise was counterproductive, that there would be unintended consequences, and that we should not be limiting vehicular use area.

Mr. Michler stated that he thought that the Staff alternative was an improvement from the initially proposed text and allows a lot more flexibility and are easy to calculate and figure out the cost.

Public Comment – Dick Murphy, attorney for Anderson Communities, stated their opposition for the Staff alternative because it would in effect impose a maximum parking requirement that would make things difficult for potential development. Mr. Murphy concluded by asking the Planning Commission to adopt the text amendment in its original form and get rid of the minimum lot coverage requirement.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Zach Davis asked what was the math and reason that Staff went with the 0.3 VUA ratio. Mr. Taylor stated that in Staff's research they looked at many properties on the corridors and many businesses just had the 0.3 number and that ratio worked very well in corridor businesses.

Public Comment – Brenden Gross, attorney for Goodwill, stated their opposition and contended that there was no correlation between building and vehicular use area.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Zach Davis asked why covering VUA square footage with a canopy should be a way to reduce the VUA. Mr. Taylor stated that a canopy does not create the heat island effect that asphalt and concrete does.

Public Comment – Amy Clark, 628 Kastle Road, stated she thought this should be postponed because it needed more work in her assessment.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Zach Davis stated he was having issues with this and pointed to the minutes of the January 30, 2025 meeting where the intent of the text amendment was to eliminate lot coverage in the B-3 zone and it has lead to this alternative text.

Ms. Molly Davis stated that she thought it was the environmental benefits of permeable materials that speaks to the Comprehensive Plan and she thought it was a great compromise to what was asked, but it might be worthwhile to take more time so other members could understand the changes better.

Mr. Nicol stated that he thought a lot of good work was done in 2022 when the Planning Commission and Staff eliminated parking minimums and that he wanted to do this with lot coverage in the B-3 zone in order for the market to determine how much lot coverage is appropriate.

Action – A motion was made by Mr. Bruce Nicol and seconded by Ms. Barksdale to approve PLN- ZOTA-25-00002: LOT COVERAGE IN THE CORRIDOR BUSINESS (B-3) ZONE to remove the 30% lot coverage requirement in the B-3 zone.

Commission Comments and Questions – Mr. Michler stated that if the Planning Commission voted to approve the language proposed by Mr. Nicol they would be eliminating a de-facto parking maximum and would enable larger parking lots. Mr. Michler stated he thought it was important that the dominant feature of our corridor businesses should not be parking lots. Mr. Michler ended by urging the Planning Commission to approve the Staff alternative text instead.

Ms. Worth stated to Mr. Nicol that an applicant can apply for a waiver with the Staff alternative text and if there was a compelling case, then could be granted one.

Mr. Nicol stated that he thought that the Staff alternative text penalizes businesses and the waiver process is to burdensome for most businesses.

Ms. Barksdale stated she thought every alternative is another cost to business and that she is in favor of Mr. Nicol's motion.

Mr. Owens stated that he could not vote for the motion on the floor right now and that he supports the Staff alternative language.

Action – Chair Forester called the question. The motion carried 6-5 (Penn, Worth, Michler, Owens, and M. Davis opposed) to approve PLN- ZOTA-25-00002: LOT COVERAGE IN THE CORRIDOR BUSINESS(B-3) ZONE to remove the 30% lot coverage requirement in the B-3 zone as originally proposed during from the January 30, 2025, public hearing.