

**Captioning Transcript of Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting - November 1, 2022**

**"Chair Flood"**

Thank you for joining us today. This is the planning and zoning committee of the Louisville Metro Council I am chair Council Woman Madonna Flood I'm joined by Committee Member Bill Hollander Council Woman Nicole George Councilman Jecorey Arthur Councilman Kevin Triplett We're also joined by Councilman Mark Fox. Who has a piece of legislation on our agenda as well as Councilman Markus Winkler Vice Chair Scott Reed will be joining us. Later Councilman Robin Engel is on his way he's in transit also, but they will be here.

For a little bit of housekeeping items number 2 and 3 will be held today. Number 2 is being held at the applicants request. So, we're going to move on to item number 1, which is an ordinance related to the zoning of properties located at 12404 and 12406. Taylorsville Rd and 3830 Swenny Lane containing approximately 6.8 acres and being a little the metro case number 22 zone. 0. 0 1 4. Properly moved by Councilman Arthur for a 2nd, by Councilman Triplett. We're ready for discussion.

**"Brian Davis"**

Alright. Good afternoon. Brian Davis, little electro planning and design. This is planning. Commission docket number 2214 for hope will handle the hospital. The properties in question or 2,020,412 406, Taylorsville Road. In 3830 swinging lane they are located Mitchell Council district, 20. This is an aerial photo of the proposed site. You can see there are a couple of existing single family structures. That are on the road frontage and then the property goes back in above the points or division, which is located to the south of the property. So, the property's currently are for the applicant is requesting a change is going to see 1. You can see that it's primarily our forward to the North. To the South and to the West and then as you go East, you get over towards the, the Tyler PD area and some of the commercial development that is. The contents, tailors rows, you approach it. So, the request is the changes already from our to, that was proposing a 6,000 square foot veterinary clinic building with access from Taylorville road the zone in here, the intersection of Taylorville road and swinging lanes you saw on the last map. So it is similar to that. that This is the advocates colorized development plan that they presented at the planning commission hearing. So, you have terrorism road located about the, uh. The top of the map, which is to the North, and then you can see the proposed. Uh, location for the entrance, they would be eliminating the 2 existing driveway. Cuts and then building this new 1 here for the commercial access, then you can see how that.

Goes back and then access to the parking lot there for the vet clinic. This is a rendering that was provided by the applicant to show the what the proposed building could potentially look like. They have this neighborhood meeting was conducted on November 29th 2021. the land development transportation committee met on September 22nd 2022 and then the planning commission public hearing was conducted on October 6 2022 no one spoken opposition. the planning commission public hearing was conducted on october six two thousand and twenty two no one spoken opposition And the planning commission made a motion to recommend approval to change the zoning from our 4 to that passed by vote of 8. 0. That's all I have, unless you have questions for me,

**"Chair Flood"**

just a comment, the 4.6 acres that has left the residuals going to remain our 4, but there had to be their previous discussion.

To change the whole site our 6, I think our side right originally, they had there was, uh, some plans to potentially change that to our 6 for apartments, but that was dropped by the applicants. They're only pursuing the portion at the front.

This is we've been joined by Vice Chair Councilman Scott Reed This is in Councilman Stuart Benson's district. I did send out the notice on Friday, but I have not heard.

Back from him, some, assuming that it's okay otherwise usually I hear from.

Immediately, and I'm going to go ahead and just, he might have any questions or comments before we move on.

About this saying, we'll go ahead and vote on it and send it out just because we're getting towards the end of the year. And we really need to be cognizant to the fact that we need to move.

The things with the 90 day rules on it as soon as we can.

Vice Reed

Yes, Committee Member Engel

Without objection voting is closing, there are 6 yes votes and what not voting and this ago to old business at our next meeting. {[vote taken]}

And we have a request to move item number 4 up on the agenda.

Councilman Winkler it's a resolution requesting the planning commission review, the local metal line development code, LDC and section 105 of the local metal. Excuse me? Local Jefferson County federal government code of ordinance relating to short term. to short term

Short term rentals rentals as amended and I need a motion.

Motion order motion to on table by Councilman Arthur, and seconded by Councilman Triplett all those in favor. Signify by saying.

Those opposed nay hearing none the motion carries were ready for discussion. I think the chair will call on councilman Winkle. You have on the amendment.

**"Council Member Winkler"**

For this yes. And, uh, can the County Attorney confirm whether that was loaded in the system or not.

**"Travis Fiechter"**

Uh, Travis, Fiechter, Assistant County Attorney It does not look like it made it to the system

**"Council Member Winkler"**

so I can read that. And if you'd like, yeah. Give me 30 seconds to just give a quick overview. And then I'll have you read it? Okay.

Um, colleagues, if you remember, uh, 2 weeks ago, when we had this discussion, you know, there was some question about sort of what we were trying to accomplish and how it was worded in the ordinance primarily around, you know, granting the, um.

Uh, the, the basically short term rental buy, right? When really, what we were trying to address was that the 600 foot rule shouldn't apply. So, uh, Travis has worked on some clarifying language that basically, the Adi would still require the.

But, for purposes of granting the, um, you wouldn't exempt it as owner, the 600 foot rule wouldn't apply if the owner basically lives within the 4 corners of the property, which is precisely what I was trying to get at. So, Travis, do you want to read that into the record?

And then if a member of the. of the

Maybe could make it as a motion. I would appreciate it and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**"Travis Fiechter"**

I'd be happy to so you would strike everything and the 3rd line after the word short term rental and insert the phrase without triggering the 600 foot rule.

So, the full binding element would now read or the full binding element, the full section would now read allowing situations where an owner and a primary structure or unit on a given lot may use their other unit parentheses, including other unit in a duplex. duplex

Close parentheses slash, slash as a short term rental without triggering the 600 foot rule. So, as we keep this current conditional use process in place.

**"Council Member Winkler"**

So, if someone could move that as an amendment, I would appreciate it. Motion Arthur and seconded Reed properly made by Councilman Arthur And 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilman Reed, can we discuss please.

**"Chair Flood"**

Does anyone else have any questions or comments?

And we're still we're still taking.

ADU I'm making it a short term rental. Well, you're allowing it through the process.

**"Council Member Winkler"**

Um, which you would do today. The only thing you're doing is saying that the 600 foot rule doesn't.

Um, if the owner lives on the property that the 600 foot rule doesn't trigger a denial.

So the process remains the same as it is today.

**"Chair Flood"**

See, Joe Haberman is here just in case we have questions, I guess.  
Your thoughts.

**"Joe Haberman"**

I mean, I understand what Joe Haberman planning design services. I understand what councilman Winkler wants, so I don't have any questions. It's really would be up to the planning commission. And council to look at some of the cases we have done. I can state that for duplexes where we. The accessory dwelling unit changes are relatively new. We do have a number of duplexes that have come through the conditional use process and been subject to the 600 foot separation requirement. And those are situations where they might have multifamily zoning and not. Held to some of those other standards that we put in place. For, and they needed relief and. It would make some sense to look at whether or not. The reasoning 4 to 600 foot rule, not applying to owner a host occupied units is they had a level of. Watching over the property, we can look at that and see if that applies to the whole property and see if the change is a good idea.

**"Chair Flood"**

Thank you Joe, anybody else have any questions or comments.  
Councilman Hollander,

**"Committee Member Hollander"**

I'll just I'll just explain my vote against this and it's really about number 1 and it again relates to the 600 foot rule. That's that's actually my biggest concern here. As, as Joe just said, I mean, we have situations, we have situations in my district where there are duplexes where an owner lives in 1 side of the duplex. And the other side is rented out longterm. And to now say that, that can be turned into a short term rental without the 600 foot rule, just takes housing stock out of the community. And I don't think we should be doing that. Thank you.  
Council Woman Nicole George,

**"Committee Member George"**

thank you, chair. I want to clarify something. So, since it's not in the system, and I'm just trying to recall what Travis read. If I currently have an, and I want to. As an owner prints it out, I would need to currently apply for a. Correct for to become a short term rental.

**"Joe Haberman"**

That's correct.

**"Committee Member George"**

And with this change, if. And within 600 feet of another, I could still apply for that. And it wouldn't be an automatic denial.

**"Joe Haberman"**

As proposed, we wouldn't even consider to 600 foot separation requirements and applicable standard, but I would note under the existing rules. You can get relief to the 600 foot requirement. So. It's not an automatic no, it's just the burden is on the applicant to explain why it's not an appropriate regulation in their context. Sure.

**"Committee Member George"**

So it could be waved. Currently, but as what we're proposing in the way of resolution and. In study would be that the 600 foot rule wouldn't even be. Factored in, okay. Um, a lot has happened in the last 2 weeks. So I would just say, I don't see where that satisfies. The concerns that several of us raise last time. Um, and I'm, I'm. Fully support the piece on the duplexes and think there's a problem to be solved there. And I don't think. If memory serves from 2 weeks ago, that's not where the point of contention was. So I appreciate the spirit of trying and I see. Councilman Winkler is ready to respond all that to say, I don't see where this satisfies the primary concern from from last committee. Thank you.

**"Chair Flood"**

Councilman Winkler or did you have something to add.

**"Council Member Winkler"**

Yeah, I think 1 of the areas that it it addresses to counsel on George's point is you still keep the process in place, which was 1 of the concerns last time. Um, so that has been addressed. Right? All this does is clarify is ask the planning commission rather than having this be made on an arbitrary decision process to, to clarify the law. And say, is there a material difference between, um, again me me running out of a room in my house me, running out a room in my basement, that happens to have a 2nd door me, running out. My 2nd unit that happens to be a duplex me, running out my garage apartment that's attached to my structure or me running out my. Garage apartment that happens to be 2 foot detached from my structure again to me, all 5 of those are essentially functionally the same thing. Um, and I think having clarity and consistency of the rules is important, and I don't know how I can say that they're okay with waving the requirement for a duplex. Um, and that somehow having a garage apartment is materially different than a duplex. To me, those 2 things are functionally the same.

**"Chair Flood"**

Joe, do we have a lot of where the unit is actually inside the house, and they're using them a short term rentals.

**"Joe Haberman"**

We, we do have some I, I don't know. How many I can get that information, but.

Looking at 80 years under the current ordinance, which has only been in effect for a year or so I think we have 30 that we've adopted under that ordinance. If I'm.

Correct on my memory and they're they are in a variety of different. Formats there's some that are carriage houses. There's some that are. Within the building, and then we have apart from the ADUs we have duplexes where they're either non conforming to that ADu requirement they existed before that requirement came into play or they just have zoning that allows.

Those kind of forms as well.

So, it's a mix, but we do have a number of them for sure.

#### **"Chair Flood"**

I just want to.

Make a statement that every time we pass a resolution asking you all to do something in the things, come back or suggestions come back always here.

Well, the resolution was sent over there with a unanimous vote, just because someone supports a study does not mean they're going to support what comes back to the metro council because I think that's a misgivings and it's used a lot on this council and it's really not fair that you say you'll support a study.

But you may not, you may not agree with what the the outcome is, because it may not fit your neighborhood or not yet. But you're your district. And that's what we're here for is to represent the people of our districts.

Anybody else have any comments before we vote on this.

Amendment seeing none all those in favor of the amendment to the resolution say, aye aye.

All those opposed, I.

Anybody.

Just do a roll call vote because I can't tell whose people are mailing and I.

Can't read lips on the amendment those who are in favor of the amendment. Pardon? Oh, oh, oh, okay.

Okay.

Vice Reed Yes.

There are 3 yes votes 2 no votes and 1 extension.

Therefore, yes, councilman Robin Engel

#### **"Committee Member Engel"**

Madam chair in the interest of respect for this committee. I just walked in and I missed a lot of the discussion and so I'm I'm going to abstain. So that's not a. yes and that's not a.

no, I don't like to do that, but.

Yes.

#### **"Chair Flood"**

Absolutely, if do we need to we need to reconsider now? Ok, I would be that would be acceptable. Thank you.

I am on the amendment passes.

Now, we have the whole document in front of us. Does anyone have any questions about the entire document?

Saying none, it's a resolution calling for a voice vote, but I will open the voting. Please I'm not going to try to read lips again.

Hello.

Hi, Reed yes.

I don't have a present, but.

Doesn't say present, but.

Yes, so it can be used for.

It records it, thank you.

Without objection voting is closing there are 2 yes. Votes and 3 no votes. So, therefore it will go to our business with a.

Recommendation for the now.

[vote taken]

Okay, thank you.

Hello.

Moving on to.

Item number 5.

It's an ordinance relating to the amendment of the sobro plan development district for an adjustment to the boundary lines of the sub area map and being a little metro case number 22 0021 and it was tabled

at our last meeting. at our last meeting

So, I'll take a motion to 2nd, Arthur.

Properly made by Councilman Kevin Triplett and Councilman Arthur all those in favor. Signify by saying, aye aye.

Those opposed by, like, sign hearing none we're ready for discussion. Now will turn it over to you. I think. Did you have questions.

Um, or did you need him to brief us on what the changes were?

Okay, bye,

**"Committee Member Arthur"**

thank you. All for.

Holding this, I just wanted to clear up some concerns that I had about neighborhood boundaries and the feature of this area, and the way that neighborhoods.

A shift over time and my concerns were addressed so I'm happy to move forward with this project.

**"Chair Flood"**

Anybody else have any questions or comments.

Yes, he must have been in the councilman Reed.

Is he going? Yeah, it says red that the thought was just.

Okay.

We're ready to vote

Vice Reed

Without objection voting is closing.

There are 6 yes. Votes and this can.

Oh, go ahead. Councilman Reed. We voting is not close. Go ahead.

Councilman Reed

Voting is closing there 6 yes votes and since this is this can go to consent calendar. But do you want it to go to all business Councilman Arthur? [vote taken]

**"Committee Member Arthur"**

It can go to consent

**"Chair Flood"**

Okay, it'll go to consent calendar and our next council meeting. Moving on to item number 6 is an ordinance related to the revised district development plan for properties located at 107 1. 21381 English villa drive containing approximately 1.3 acres and being a Louisville metro case number 22. 0. 0 7. 5. Properly made by Councilman Arthur, an author 2nd by Councilman Triplett, we're ready for discussion.

**"Brian Davis"**

This is planning commission docket number 2275 for the jaguars restaurant villages of English station. The properties in question are 370,213 801 English, fill a drive. It is located in 2, Metro council districts, district, 11 and district 19.

The request before you use a revised detailed district, develop plan for the proposed drive through restaurant, the applicant is proposing to construct the restaurant with the drive through and processing 1.3 acres. The subject side is only in the neighborhood form district. The building is within local metro while most of the parking areas within the city of Middletown. So this is an interesting site from a development code standpoint. This is the subject site outlined in red here. This is a Shelbyville road.

Shelbyville road

Located on the north side, then you have English and drive that kind of comes around as a package road. Oh, sorry.

And provides access to the site.

This is an aerial photo you can see how the other site.

It's currently vacant, the African provided these renderings and elevations.

Uh, to show what the proposed a restaurant would look like.

And then there was a scientist package that was also presented as part of the review that went before the planning commission.

So the previous development plan, as you can see included a 1 stored retailer, office building and then there was a binding element on there that if.

If they use change to a address the restaurant, then it would come back before mental counseling. So that's why the plan is here today. This is the development plan that the Africans proposing. So very similar in terms of, like, the location of the building.

But then again, they proposed uses a restaurant, so you have the restaurant on the East side of the property and then the primarily parking lot on the West side the line there that is the line between.

You have on the East and Middletown on the West and then also the dividing line between the 2 metro council districts.

The planning commission kit as the public hearing on this item on October 62022nolspoken opposition to the request.

And they motion directly and approval the detailed district district development plan passed by 8 to 0.

That's all I have, let's have any questions for me.

**"Chair Flood"**

Councilman Hollander.

**"Committee Member Hollander"**

So, I just have a question. I'm curious about something. I'm not sure I've seen a case where there are 2 zoning authorities that are involved. Well, this plan need to be approved by the Middletown government also.

**"Brian Davis"**

Yes.

It's also been transmitted to them for consideration as well.

**"Chair Flood"**

Okay, thank you. Yeah, this is enhancement. Kevin Kramer's district and it also lists in Councilman Piagentini.

we doing Kramer's office and he said that he didn't know if he would be here or not and specifically said if they have any questions or comments to call me.

But I haven't heard from Councilman Kramer's office.

Does anyone else have any questions? So our decisions not final right

Brian it will be.

And to be as I am Middletown.

**"Brian Davis"**

Uh, correct. Yes.

Anyone else have any questions? Yes. Go ahead

**"Committee Member Hollander"**

to follow up on that. I guess again. I'm just curious about this. I guess that means that you for this whole plan to take effect.

You need approval of both governments if either government said no, then the development plan would not pay for it, right?

**"Brian Davis"**

That's correct. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

**"Chair Fowler"**

If it's the pleasure of the committee to wait to see if we can.

Because I tried to call counseling Kramer again this morning and couldn't get his office. It's a development plan changed. So we have some time to.

To table it, if we wish to do that, I will look at the committee to see what their pleasure is.

I wish I could hear. Would you agree the table you want to table it you think? Or you think motion to table okay motion the table.

Properly moved By Councilman Arthur and seconded by Councilman Hollander all those in favor signify by saying, aye. All right. Bye.

Those opposed by, like, hearing none it will go, we'll table it and see if we can.

Get any other comment in the meantime, maybe middle town make their decision to.

Moving on to item number 7.

An earnest relating to the revised district development plan for properties located at 10501 and 1511prestonhow. I containing

approximately 0.79 acres and being a little metro case number 22. 0. 0 5 4.

being a little metro case number twenty two zero zero five four  
It's not gonna go properly moved by Councilman Arthur and seconded by  
Committee Member Engel Maybe the 2nd, we're ready for discussion.

**"Brian Davis"**

This is planning commission doc, number 2254 for Mike's carwash.

The property is located at 105. 01, Preston highway.

Located metro Council district 23. this is the, the full development site, which was previously rezoned is all of the area here that you see in the purple. We're looking at the middle lot today.

So I'll explain a little more when we get to the detailed plan. This is an aerial photo of what the subject site did look like. There were some single family structures there. They are in the process of developing the site. site

So the request before you today is a detailed district development plan for that center site. It's located on Preston highway other.

Yeah, the 3 contiguous parcels you had a proposed Thornton's on 1 of the sites, propose chick fillet on the other and then this now proposed car wash in the center.

This is a site photo of what the.

Property currently looks like so, the zoning there's only came through is 2181. this is the development plan. So, South is on the right side of the map over here.

So, you can see there's the proposed Thornton's and the proposed chick fillet over on the north side of the development site. And then this track too is left vacant. So, there was just a general plan for track to because they did not have a tenant at tenant at that time.

at tenant at that time

But now they do, so, Mike's carwash is proposing to locate on that track 2.

So that you would see you see how that fits into the overall development. Here. You would still maintain access that would come around from the Thornton's around to the chick fillet area. There's also frontage access in front of the car wash.

but then you can see how the carwash fits into the overall development there.

These are the applicant renderings that were provided at the planning commission hearing just to give you an idea of what the, um.

Character of the proposed building looks like the hearing before the development review committee on October 5th 2022. that was kind of in a. A mistake on our notice part, so it went to, on the 5th, but because this item there was a binding element, any changes to the development, and had to go to metro Council. The RC continue that case to the planning commission on October 6th? No.

1 spoken opposition to the request and then the motion directly to approval the detailed district development plan passed by motivate to 0. zero

So, that's all I have unless you have any questions for me,

**"Chair Flood"**

is this a main carwash? You know, where.

You know, some car washes, there's nobody there and it's just the, the, you pull through and you can use it. 24. 7 is this? But this is not. This is like a.

Where you drive up and you drive through the building and they wash the car and.

**"Brian Davis"**

Right, right yeah, they, they typically have employees there on site. they have an opening and closing time I do from a 70 a m to 9. 0. P. M.

**"Chair Flood"**

Is that in the form of a binding on here?

I didn't see it on the binding elements unless, you know, sometimes it's. Might be me overlooking it.

**"Brian Davis"**

No, we did not have that as a binding element on in.

In our review no.

Okay, I'm s.

Since we have time on this, I myself would be interested in.

Do an, a binding element from 70 a M, to 9 people just simply because we've had some issues with some car washes that are close to residential areas.

And that's a concern of mine. And I think 9 o'clock off is a.

Really? Good specific. Should we.

**"Travis Fiechter"**

And those are the typical like, system wide operating Mike's car washes so that I think the app would be okay with that. By the moment.

Yeah, the advocates attorney give a little not. Um, so that seems appropriate and that's part of the testimony obviously, uh, while we're. Touching buying the elements, they have the older version of the standard council bunny element. Interestingly, when this case came through, uh, we knew this matter would be coming back in front because they, it was there were 3 parcels here.

And 2 of them had proposals, and this 1 was they didn't have a tenant at the time. So we knew this would be coming back. And before us, this is sort of by design. The binding isn't working is planned.

But we do have that new language, and I would recommend updating that as well. Again, it's a little bit less restrictive. Now, in this case, car washes are so specific of a use that I think it's likely they would be triggered if they did change. But nonetheless, I think that language change would be appropriate here.

And I'm happy to read that into the record Madam chair. If, uh.

If you would like,

**"Chair Flood"**

okay, and then the other. Oh, so we're going to have to remember it anyway because you like that to be the last binding element. Yeah, if possible I just think it's easier for, for future reference, you know, years down the road. People know what to look for.

**"Travis Fiechter"**

So I would suggest a.

New binding element number 13 that says hours of operations I'll be from was at 90 am to 7. 0. P. M. no.

789789 PM sorry other way around um.

And then you'd strike the current language, which would be bumped to 14 and the new binding on 14 would read.

Any significant increases to the Pro structures for the increases in building height number of units number of buildings close parentheses and the increase in density on the property, any changes in use on the property, which directly or indirectly require a public hearing before the planning commission or subcommittee thereof,

and or any amendments to the binding elements, other than 1 the addition of new binding elements 2 changes to binding elements that really update the public hearing date or 3 updating a previous version of this binding element to reflect current language shall be reviewed before the planning commission, the final action to.

Determined by Metro Council.

And I moved those amendments to the binding elements. Okay. Okay.

Properly moved by myself and seconded by councilman Robin Engle all those in favor of the changes to the binding elements. Signify by saying, aye. All right, those opposed by likes on hearing none.

[vote taken]

This is announcement James Peden's district, and I had sent him the same email and also had called him.

To ask him to call me cause I was going to add a binding elements. So, and I did not hear back with.

Back from James, and James is usually really good about if he asks questions, he will call me immediately when he gets my notes. So, does anyone else have any questions on it before we move forward?

**"Brian Davis"**

Can I just get a clarification on the hours?

That's just like the hours that it's open to the public and doesn't restrict, like, cleaning or

**"Chair Flood"**

no, no, no. That's just where they're yeah, I understand that. They have that traditionally a lot of these.

Car washes now are so nice that some of their properties are cleaner. I wish that some other businesses would keep their curb appeal up to some of those. So, no, I'm not going to.

I stipulate cleaning up.

Or I don't think we need to.

I think we're ready to vote a see no 1 else in the queue.

Reed

Yes, without objection voting is closing there are 7 yes. Votes and this will go to old business at our next.[vote taken]

Council meeting I have a question real quick since we do development plans. If we don't make any amendments. Can those go straight to consent calender or? No.

**"Travis Fiechter"**

Yeah, I don't believe there's anything in our rules or policies that require them to go to old business.

**"Chair Flood"**

Okay, thank you. Just a question since the beginning. Some of those. Okay.

We're gonna go ahead and skip to item number 9 because I promised Councilman Fox and we're getting too close to that so item number nine is an ordinance relating to the closure of a portion of enterprise drive adjacent to csx railroad containing approximately two point zero three four acres and being in level metro case number twenty two street closure zero zero one five 2nd. Properly moved by Councilman Triplett 2nd by Councilman Hollander, we're ready for discussion.

**"Brian Davis"**

This is a planning commission docket number, 22 street closure, 15 for enterprise drive. So, enterprise deterministic enterprise, drive, located, mental, cancel district 13. so the request is a closure of a portion of the right away for enterprise drive. There's a related development plan for a 175,000 square foot office warehouse. And so the, the proposal would shorten that drive proposal would shorten that drive And then which currently dead ends at the CSS railroad tracks, you'll see on the map here in a moment. Um. So, the property in question is here outlined in red, you can see the right of way up here currently does extend and then it dead ends into the, the railroad tracks. here's an aerial photo so again currently undeveloped you have the big turnaround here and then what the street closure plan shows is the the area basically the road will be shortened so instead of going all the way to the railroad tracks that would terminate at the beginning of the proposed development athens proposing to construct a new turnaround point as you can see here on the development plan so again proposing office warehouse It's on that property. The right away would be shortened and then the new term is the new turnaround point would be at the front of this property. The Atlanta development, transportation committee had their meeting on August 22nd, 2022 the planning commission public hearing was on October 6 2022 no spoken opposition and then the motion directly and approval the closure passed by a vote of 8 to 0. that's all I have. Unless you have any questions for me. to zero that's all i have unless you have any questions for me

**"Chair Flood"**

Councilman Fox, this is in your district, you have anything that questions or comments.

**"Council Member Fox"**

Well, thank you for indulging my schedule 1st of all Madam chair. And 2nd of all, I'll be supporting this.

If you had to do a tier 1, residential notification, you'd have to go so far they wouldn't even know where this was.

It's in a light industrial area, and that ends at a railroad track. So I see. No.

Concern with anything as relates to this.

Thank you there'll be yes, well, thank you. Let's not it changes.

**"Chair Flood"**

Honestly we're not going to let you vote on this yet. Sorry?

You know how I am? This is an Ordinance so we will be calling a roll call vote, Cheryl.

Vice chair Reed

Without objection voting is closing, there are 7 yes votes in this will go to consent calendar at the next council meeting.[vote taken]

Thank you moving back to item number 8.

an ordinance relating to the closure of a portion of old between south the south side of town road and the east bank of Floyd's for containing approximately one point two six acres and being a little metro case number twenty two street closure zero zero one three

Motion Arthur properly moved by Councilman Arthur a 2nd, by Councilman Hollander

**"Brian Davis"**

We're ready for discussion planning commission docket, number, 22 street closure, 13 for old Taylorsville road closure.

The property is located Mitchell Council district 20.

So the request is the closure of a public, right of way to close a portion of hotels, the road south of Taylorville road and then terminating at the floods fork, the closure includes a portion of the of an existing roadway.

It is adjacent to 15 20,705,415. 202 Taylorville road and the evidence is willing to provide a 30 foot wide access to accommodate the utilities that are in the area.

a thirty foot wide access to accommodate the utilities that are in the area

So this is an aerial photo you can see the old Taylorville road currently extend south from Taylorville road, and then dead ends at the creek.

There isn't a crossing there.

And so these are some photos you can see there's payment there, but it's not.

Necessarily maintained, so Here's just some of the photos of the, the area.

Of which they're proposing to close. This is the, uh.

Closure plant again, the, the right of way would terminate at.

The current intersection with the with 148.

And then go all the way down to where it terminates at the bridge or the, where there's no bridge the Atlanta development transportation committee meeting was held on August, 22nd, 2022 planning commission, public

hearing. I was on October 6 2022 no spoken opposition and emotion recommended approval.

The closure passed by vote of 8. 0. opposition and emotion recommended approval the closure passed by vote of eight zero

Hello.

Questions for me.

**"Chair Flood"**

Does anyone have any questions.

The no one one in the queue no one's on either key. Therefore. Um.

It's an calling for a roll call vote please.

Reed

Yes, without objection 1 is closing there are 7 yes of votes.

And this will go to the consent calendar at our next council meeting.

[vote taken]

Think, the only thing that we didn't hear was the 2 items that were being held.

I'll look for Cheryl.

Yes, keeping me straight here.

Hey, thank you. Um, just a quick reminder that we're, we're getting towards the end of the year, and we have less and less counsel and

committee meetings, because we're entering the holiday season. So, um.

This place keep an eye on. I'll also tell us that the full council keep

an eye on the list in case. We overlook something.

We do try to send out reminders to folks as a courtesy, but sometimes we

make mistakes to sending those out. So, it's going to be very busy

according to Emily we will have a lot coming over.

So, with that objection, we will adjourn until our next scheduled meeting.

Thank you. No objection adjourned