# **Planning Commission**

# Staff Report

December 20, 2018



Case No: 18zone1006
Project Name: Massie Avenue

**Location:** 3930, 3934, & 3936 Massie Avenue

Owner(s): WHWJR, LLC
Applicant: WHWJR, LLC
Jurisdiction: City of St. Matthews
Council District: 9- Bill Hollander

Case Manager: Julia Williams, AICP, Planning Supervisor

### **REQUEST(S)**

Change in zoning from R-4 to R-6

Detailed District Development Plan with Binding Elements

#### CASE SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

The applicant is proposing new construction of 12 semi-detached multi-family units on three existing lots in the City of St Matthews near the intersection of Shelbyville/Frankfort Ave and Westport Road. The lots will be consolidated and the existing three homes are proposed to be demolished. All structures will have a garage and individual access from an interior roadway off of Massie Ave.

<u>13206</u>: Request for a change in zoning from R-4 to R-5A for 15 units. This case was continued to a date uncertain at the November 14, 2013 Land Development & Transportation Committee meeting.

#### STAFF FINDING

Staff finds that the proposal meets the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan and requirements of the Development Code.

#### **TECHNICAL REVIEW**

Development Code (St. Matthews)

Transportation Planning and MSD have preliminarily approved the proposal.

#### **INTERESTED PARTY COMMENTS**

Staff has received several phone calls from citizens concerned about the drainage on the site and the building materials.

 Good morning, because of work I was unable to attend the last meeting related to the proposed condo development on Massie Avenue (meeting details below) and I will also miss the 12/20 meeting. I intended to offer comments to Julia Williams, the case manager, but I'm not seeing where to do that on the commission website, so I'm sending here. Please forward and share as appropriate. My wife and I would prefer to see the existing houses and lots remain. Should the development go forward, though, we would like for the City of Louisville to also officially close the un-improved portion of the alley impacted by this development and revert the land to the existing homes. Currently the unimproved piece of the alley between Kennison and Massie (behind Surrey Place) is owned by Louisville and (officially but not actually) maintained by St. Matthews. The land is fenced and already semi-integrated into lawns. In fact, I have seen an old pdf online of a document acknowledging that the alley is no longer in use and allowing Surrey Place to fence in a piece to use as backyards. If the City of Louisville were to close the alley and revert ownership of the land to the adjoining properties, then those of us who already maintain the land would be able to place fences and rebuild garages and otherwise take proper care of the land without having to go through our own zoning and/or building offset exemption issues. Also, folks who are not maintaining the adjoining land would gain ownership and a clear responsibility for maintaining it. Kurt Hampe

### STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR REZONING

Criteria for granting the proposed form district change/rezoning: KRS Chapter 100.213

- 1. <u>The proposed form district/rezoning change complies with the applicable guidelines and policies</u> Cornerstone 2020; **OR**
- 2. The existing form district/zoning classification is inappropriate and the proposed classification is appropriate; **OR**
- 3. There have been major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated in Cornerstone 2020 which have substantially altered the basic character of the area.

### STAFF ANALYSIS FOR CHANGE IN ZONING

Following is staff's analysis of the proposed rezoning against the Guidelines and Policies of Cornerstone 2020.

The proposal is located in an area dominated by single family residences and will be offering more diverse housing options with additional multi-family. The proposal is for high density development accessed from Massie Avenue, a primary collector and just off of Chenoweth Lane, a minor arterial. All structures are oriented to the interior of the site and will not be taller than the maximum height allowed. The proposal displays efficient use of land with a compact layout of buildings. The proposal is for residential use in a residential area with a mix of residential densities. No sidewalks are proposed nor are required by the Development Code. The mass and height of structures are similar to single family homes in the area, and the setback and orientation of the multi-family aide with compatibility of the development. The building materials are similar to what is found in the area. The buildings along this block of Massie are mainly wood clapboard style. There are some brick structures with clapboard or vinyl details. The proposal does not introduce a new density as there is similar zoning adjacent to the proposed site. All setbacks and buffers are in compliance with the Development Code.

All other agency comments should be addressed to demonstrate compliance with the remaining Guidelines and Policies of Cornerstone 2020.

A checklist is attached to the end of this staff report with a more detailed analysis. The Louisville Metro Planning Commission is charged with making a recommendation to the City of St. Matthews regarding the appropriateness of this zoning map amendment. The City of St. Matthews has zoning authority over the property in question.

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW AND STAFF ANALYSIS FOR DDP

Published Date: December 12, 2018 Page 2 of 14 18ZONE1006

- a. The conservation of natural resources on the property proposed for development, including: trees and other living vegetation, steep slopes, water courses, flood plains, soils, air quality, scenic views, and historic sites;
  - STAFF: There do not appear to be any environmental constraints or historic resources on the subject site.
- b. The provisions for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian transportation both within the development and the community;
  - STAFF: Provisions for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian transportation within and around the development and the community has been provided, and Metro Public Works has approved the preliminary development plan.
- c. The provision of sufficient open space (scenic and recreational) to meet the needs of the proposed development;
  - STAFF: There are no open space requirements pertinent to the current proposal.
- d. The provision of adequate drainage facilities on the subject site in order to prevent drainage problems from occurring on the subject site or within the community;
  - STAFF: The Metropolitan Sewer District has approved the preliminary development plan and will ensure the provision of adequate drainage facilities on the subject site in order to prevent drainage problems from occurring on the subject site or within the community.
- e. The compatibility of the overall site design (location of buildings, parking lots, screening, landscaping) and land use or uses with the existing and projected future development of the area;
  - STAFF: The overall site design and land uses are compatible with the existing and future development of the area. Appropriate landscape buffering and screening will be provided to screen adjacent properties and roadways. Buildings and parking lots will meet all required setbacks.
- f. <u>Conformance of the development plan with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code.</u>
  - STAFF: The development plan conforms to applicable guidelines and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and to requirements of the Development Code.

#### **REQUIRED ACTIONS:**

- **RECOMMEND** that the City of St. Matthews **APPROVE** or **DENY** the **Change-in-Zoning** from R-4 to R-6
- RECOMMEND that the City of St. Matthews APPROVED or DENY the Detailed District Development Plan

Based upon the information in the staff report, the testimony and evidence provided at the public hearing, the Planning Commission must determine if the proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan; OR the existing form district/zoning classification is inappropriate and the

Published Date: December 12, 2018 Page 3 of 14 18ZONE1006

proposed classification is appropriate; OR if there have been major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated in Cornerstone 2020 which have substantially altered the basic character of the area.

### **NOTIFICATION**

| Date     | Purpose of Notice  | Recipients   |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 11/15/18 | Hearing before LD&T on 11/29/18  1st and 2nd tier adjoining property owners Registered Neighborhood Groups in Council Distri |  |  |
| 12/6/18  |  | 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> tier adjoining property owners<br>Registered Neighborhood Groups in Council District 9 |  |
| 12/5/18  | Hearing before PC  | Sign Posting on property   |  |
|          | Hearing before PC  | Legal Advertisement in the Courier-Journal   |  |

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1. Zoning Map
- 2. Aerial Photograph
- 3. Staff Cornerstone 2020 Checklist
- 4. Proposed Binding Elements





# 3. <u>Staff Cornerstone 2020 Checklist</u>

- + Exceeds Guideline
- ✓ Meets Guideline
- Does Not Meet Guideline
- +/- More Information Needed
- NA Not Applicable

# Neighborhood: Residential

| # | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element                          | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element  | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments   |
|---|---|---|------------------|--|
| 1 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 1:<br>Community Form | B.3: The proposal supports the creation of a mix of residential housing choices and densities for the neighborhood.   | <b>✓</b>         | The proposal is located in an area dominated by single family residences and will be offering more diverse housing options with additional multi-family. |
| 2 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 1:<br>Community Form | B.3: If the proposal is classified as high density (greater than 12 dwelling units per acre), it is located on a major or minor arterial or in a location that has limited impact on adjacent low or moderate density developments.                 | <b>√</b>         | The proposal is for high density development accessed from Massie Avenue, a primary collector and just off of Chenoweth Lane, a minor arterial.          |
| 3 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 1:<br>Community Form | B.3: If the proposal introduces a new housing type to the neighborhood, it is designed to be compatible with nearby land uses.  | <b>√</b>         | All structures are oriented to the interior of the site and will not be taller than the maximum height allowed.  |
| 4 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 1:<br>Community Form | B.3: Neighborhood streets are designed to invite human interaction and easy access through the use of connectivity, and design elements such as short blocks or bike/walkways in the middle of long blocks to connect with other streets.           | NA               | No new street is being created with the proposal.  |
| 5 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers        | A.1. Locate activity centers within the Neighborhood Form District at street intersections with at least one of the intersecting streets classified as a collector or higher, AND one of the corners containing an established non-residential use. | NA               | This proposal is not an activity center.   |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element                   | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element   | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments   |
|----|--|--|------------------|--|
| 6  | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.2: Develop non-residential and mixed uses only in designated activity centers except (a) where an existing center proposed to expand in a manner that is compatible with adjacent uses and in keeping with form district standards, (b) when a proposal is comparable in use, intensity, size and design to a designated center, (c) where a proposed use requires a particular location or does not fit well into a compact center, (d) where a commercial use mainly serves residents of a new planned or proposed development and is similar in character and intensity to the residential development, or (e) in older or redeveloping areas where the non-residential use is compatible with the surroundings and does not create a nuisance. | NA               | This development is residential only.  |
| 7  | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.4: Encourage a more compact development pattern that results in an efficient use of land and cost-effective infrastructure.  | ✓                | The proposal displays efficient use of land with a compact layout of buildings.  |
| 8  | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.5: Encourage a mix of compatible uses to reduce traffic by supporting combined trips, allow alternative modes of transportation and encourage vitality and sense of place.   | <b>✓</b>         | The proposal is for residential use in a residential area with a mix of residential densities. No sidewalks are proposed nor are required by the Development Code. |
| 9  | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.6: Encourage residential uses in centers above retail and other mixed-use multi-story retail buildings.  | NA               | This residential use is not located in a center.   |
| 10 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.7: Encourage new developments and rehabilitation of buildings to provide residential uses alone or in combination with retail and office uses.   | <b>✓</b>         | This development is near a concentration of non-residential and specifically commercial properties.  |
| 11 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.8/11: Allow centers in the Neighborhood Form District that serve the daily needs of residents and that are designed to minimize impact on residents through appropriate scale, placement and design.   | NA               | This proposal is not a center.   |
| 12 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers | A.10: Encourage outlot development in underutilized parking lots provided location, scale, signs, lighting, parking and landscaping standards are met. Such outlot development should provide street-level retail with residential units above.  | NA               | The proposal is for residential development.   |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element                         | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element   | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments  |
|----|--|--|------------------|---|
| 13 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers       | A.12: Design large developments to be compact, multi-purpose centers organized around a central feature such as a public square, plaza or landscape element.   | NA               | This proposal is a multi-family development only and does not fit the definition of a large development.  |
| 14 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers       | A.13: Encourage sharing of entrance and parking facilities to reduce curb cuts and surface parking.  | ✓                | This proposal has one access point for this development only, but a shared access in this location is not appropriate, due to the property being bounded by other residential.                                    |
| 15 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers       | A.14: Design and locate utility easements to provide access for maintenance and to provide services in common for adjacent developments.   | ✓                | Utilities for the development are being provided. Some utilities are existing.  |
| 16 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers       | A.15: Encourage parking design and layout to balance safety, traffic, transit, pedestrian, environmental and aesthetic considerations.   | ✓                | The parking is located in the most appropriate areas of the site and pedestrian connections are not required.   |
| 17 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 2:<br>Centers       | A.16: Encourage centers to be designed for easy access by alternative forms of transportation.   | ✓                | St Matthews does not require pedestrian connections or sidewalks. There are existing sidewalks along the opposite side of Massie, which join into the network to connect to transit access along Shelbyville Road |
| 18 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.1: The proposal is generally compatible within the scale and site design of nearby existing development and with the form district's pattern of development.   | ✓                | The mass and height of structures are similar to single family homes in the area, and the setback and orientation of the multi-family aide with compatibility of the development.                                 |
| 19 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.2: The proposed building materials increase the new development's compatibility. (Only for a new development in a residential infill context, or if consideration of building materials used in the proposal is specifically required by the Land Development Code.)   | <b>✓</b>         | The building materials are similar to what is found in the area. The buildings along this block of Massie are mainly wood clapboard style. There are some brick structures with clapboard or vinyl details.       |
| 20 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.3: The proposal is compatible with adjacent residential areas, and if it introduces a new type of density, the proposal is designed to be compatible with surrounding land uses through the use of techniques to mitigate nuisances and provide appropriate transitions between land uses. Examples of appropriate mitigation include vegetative buffers, open spaces, landscaping and/or a transition of densities, site design, building heights, building design, materials and orientation that is compatible with those of nearby residences. | <b>✓</b>         | The proposal does not introduce a new density as there is similar zoning adjacent to the proposed site. All setbacks and variances are in compliance with the Development Code.                                   |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element                         | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element  | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments  |
|----|--|---|------------------|---|
| 21 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.6: The proposal mitigates any adverse impacts of its associated traffic on nearby existing communities.   | <b>√</b>         | Transportation Planning has not indicated any adverse impacts on traffic from the proposal.   |
| 22 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.8: The proposal mitigates adverse impacts of its lighting on nearby properties, and on the night sky.   | <b>√</b>         | Lighting will meet Development Code requirements.   |
| 23 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.10: The proposal includes a variety of housing types, including, but not limited to, single family detached, single family attached, multi-family, zero lot line, average lot, cluster and accessory residential structures, that reflect the form district pattern.  | ✓                | The proposal adds diversity in housing choices to the area by proposing high density multi-family in an area that offers predominantly single family homes. |
| 24 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.11: If the proposal is a higher density or intensity use, it is located along a transit corridor AND in or near an activity center.   | ✓                | The proposal is higher density and is near a Town Center.   |
| 25 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.13: The proposal creates housing for the elderly or persons with disabilities, which is located close to shopping, transit routes, and medical facilities (if possible).  | <b>√</b>         | The proposal possibly offers a housing option for the elderly, as there are several TARC routes and services nearby.  |
| 26 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.14/15: The proposal creates appropriate/inclusive housing that is compatible with site and building design of nearby housing.   | <b>√</b>         | The proposal is appropriate and inclusive in that it offers a different housing choice for those that may not prefer single family homes.                   |
| 27 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.21: The proposal provides appropriate transitions between uses that are substantially different in scale and intensity or density of development such as landscaped buffer yards, vegetative berms, compatible building design and materials, height restrictions, or setback requirements.   | ✓                | Buffers and setbacks appear to be in compliance with LDC standards.   |
| 28 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility | A.22: The proposal mitigates the impacts caused when incompatible developments unavoidably occur adjacent to one another by using buffers that are of varying designs such as landscaping, vegetative berms and/or walls, and that address those aspects of the development that have the potential to adversely impact existing area developments. | ✓                | Buffers and setbacks appear to be in compliance with LDC standards.   |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element   | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element   | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments   |
|----|--|--|------------------|--|
| 29 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 3:<br>Compatibility   | A.23: Setbacks, lot dimensions and building heights are compatible with those of nearby developments that meet form district standards.  | <b>√</b>         | All setbacks and building heights appear to be within LDC standards and are compatible with surrounding development. |
| 30 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 4:<br>Open Space  | A.2/3/7: The proposal provides open space that helps meet the needs of the community as a component of the development and provides for the continued maintenance of that open space.  | <b>√</b>         | Open space is not required in the St Matthews LDC.   |
| 31 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 4:<br>Open Space  | A.4: Open space design is consistent with the pattern of development in the Neighborhood Form District.  | ✓                | Open space is not required in the St Matthews LDC.   |
| 32 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 4:<br>Open Space  | A.5: The proposal integrates natural features into the pattern of development.   | ✓                | There are no known natural features on the site.   |
| 33 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 5:<br>Natural Areas and<br>Scenic and Historic<br>Resources | A.1: The proposal respects the natural features of the site through sensitive site design, avoids substantial changes to the topography and minimizes property damage and environmental degradation resulting from disturbance of natural systems.   | ✓                | There are no known natural features on the site.   |
| 34 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 5:<br>Natural Areas and<br>Scenic and Historic<br>Resources | A.2/4: The proposal includes the preservation, use or adaptive reuse of buildings, sites, districts and landscapes that are recognized as having historical or architectural value, and, if located within the impact area of these resources, is compatible in height, bulk, scale, architecture and placement. | NA               | The site does not appear to have any historically significant structures or features.                                |
| 35 | Community Form/Land<br>Use Guideline 5:<br>Natural Areas and<br>Scenic and Historic<br>Resources | A.6: Encourage development to avoid wet or highly permeable soils, severe, steep or unstable slopes with the potential for severe erosion.   | ✓                | LOJIC did not identify any wetlands on site.   |
| 36 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 7:<br>Circulation   | A.1/2: The proposal will contribute its proportional share of the cost of roadway improvements and other services and public facilities made necessary by the development through physical improvements to these facilities, contribution of money, or other means.  | <b>√</b>         | Transportation is not requiring any roadway improvements.  |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element   | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element   | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments  |
|----|--|--|------------------|---|
| 37 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 7:<br>Circulation                       | A.6: The proposal's transportation facilities are compatible with and support access to surrounding land uses, and contribute to the appropriate development of adjacent lands. The proposal includes at least one continuous roadway through the development, adequate street stubs, and relies on cul-de-sacs only as short side streets or where natural features limit development of "through" roads. | <b>√</b>         | The proposal has adequate access and is not required to connect to any other abutting use due to the lower intensity of uses surrounding the development. |
| 38 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 7:<br>Circulation                       | A.9: The proposal includes the dedication of rights-of-way for street, transit corridors, bikeway and walkway facilities within or abutting the development.   | <b>√</b>         | No ROW dedication will be required.   |
| 39 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 8:<br>Transportation Facility<br>Design | A.8: Adequate stub streets are provided for future roadway connections that support and contribute to appropriate development of adjacent land.  | NA               | There are no private or public streets associated with this site.   |
| 40 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 8:<br>Transportation Facility<br>Design | A.9: Avoid access to development through areas of significantly lower intensity or density if such access would create a significant nuisance.   | ✓                | This site is accessed directly from a collector level road and does not appear to impact surrounding single family uses.                                  |
| 41 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 8:<br>Transportation Facility<br>Design | A.11: The development provides for an appropriate functional hierarchy of streets and appropriate linkages between activity areas in and adjacent to the development site.   | <b>√</b>         | By connecting to the existing street network, the appropriate linkages are made.  |
| 42 | Mobility/Transportation<br>Guideline 9: Bicycle,<br>Pedestrian and Transit   | A.1/2: The proposal provides, where appropriate, for the movement of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users around and through the development, provides bicycle and pedestrian connections to adjacent developments and to transit stops, and is appropriately located for its density and intensity.  | -                | Transit stops are located along Shelbyville<br>Road and Frankfort Ave but no sidewalks are<br>proposed.   |

| #  | Cornerstone 2020<br>Plan Element                                   | Plan Element or Portion of<br>Plan Element   | Staff<br>Finding | Staff Comments  |
|----|--|--|------------------|---|
| 43 | Livability/Environment<br>Guideline 10: Flooding<br>and Stormwater | The proposal's drainage plans have been approved by MSD, and the proposal mitigates negative impacts to the floodplain and minimizes impervious area. Solid blueline streams are protected through a vegetative buffer, and drainage designs are capable of accommodating upstream runoff assuming a fully-developed watershed. If streambank restoration or preservation is necessary, the proposal uses best management practices. | ✓                | MSD has no issues with the proposal.  |
| 44 | Livability/Environment<br>Guideline 13:<br>Landscape Character     | A.3: The proposal includes additions and connections to a system of natural corridors that can provide habitat areas and allow for migration.  | NA               | This area is highly developed with no contiguous natural corridors to connect to. |
| 45 | Community Facilities<br>Guideline 14:<br>Infrastructure            | A.2: The proposal is located in an area served by existing utilities or planned for utilities.   | ✓                | There are existing utility connections on site.                                   |
| 46 | Community Facilities<br>Guideline 14:<br>Infrastructure            | A.3: The proposal has access to an adequate supply of potable water and water for fire-fighting purposes.  | ✓                | There are existing public water connections.                                      |
| 47 | Community Facilities<br>Guideline 14:<br>Infrastructure            | A.4: The proposal has adequate means of sewage treatment and disposal to protect public health and to protect water quality in lakes and streams.  | <b>√</b>         | There are existing MSD connections on site.                                       |

### 4. **Proposed Binding Elements**

- 1. The development shall be in accordance with the approved district development plan, all applicable sections of the Land Development Code (LDC) and agreed upon binding elements unless amended pursuant to the Land Development Code. Any changes/additions/alterations of any binding element(s) shall be submitted to the Planning Commission or the Planning Commission's designee and to the City of St. Matthews for review and approval; any changes/additions/alterations not so referred shall not be valid.
- 2. Construction fencing shall be erected when off-site trees or tree canopy exists within 3' of a common property line. Fencing shall be in place prior to any grading or construction to protect the existing root systems from compaction. The fencing shall enclose the entire area beneath the tree canopy and shall remain in place until all construction is completed. No parking, material storage or construction activities are permitted within the protected area.
- 3. Before any permit (including but not limited to building, parking lot, change of use, site disturbance) is requested:
  - a. The development plan must receive full construction approval from Construction Review, Louisville Metro Public Works and the Metropolitan Sewer District.

- The property owner/developer must obtain approval of a detailed plan for screening (buffering/landscaping) as described in Article 12 prior to requesting a building permit.
   Such plan shall be implemented prior to occupancy of the site and shall be maintained thereafter.
- A minor plat or legal instrument shall be recorded consolidating the property into one lot.
   A copy of the recorded instrument shall be submitted to the Division of Planning and Design Services prior to obtaining a building permit.
- 4. If a certificate of occupancy (building permit) is not issued within one year of the date of approval of the plan or rezoning, whichever is later, the property shall not be used in any manner unless a revised district development plan is approved or an extension is granted by the Planning Commission or designee and the City of St. Matthews.
- 5. A certificate of occupancy must be received from the appropriate code enforcement department prior to occupancy of the structure or land for the proposed use. All binding elements requiring action and approval must be implemented prior to requesting issuance of the certificate of occupancy, unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission.
- 6. The applicant, developer, or property owner shall provide copies of these binding elements to tenants, purchasers, contractors, subcontractors and other parties engaged in development of this site and shall advise them of the content of these binding elements. These binding elements shall run with the land and the owner of the property and occupant of the property shall at all times be responsible for compliance with these binding elements. At all times during development of the site, the applicant and developer, their heirs, successors; and assignees, contractors, subcontractors, and other parties engaged in development of the site, shall be responsible for compliance with these binding elements.
- 7. The materials and design of proposed structures shall be substantially the same as depicted in the rendering as presented at the December 20, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Published Date: December 12, 2018 Page 14 of 14 18ZONE1006