Williams, Julia

From:

hkspea@aol.com

Sent:

Monday, October 17, 2016 5:33 PM

To:

Williams, Julia

Subject:

Rezoning Case No. 16 Zone 1026

Julia Williams

Henry Spear

Planning & Design.

4206 Taylorsville Rd.

Dear Ms. Williams:

Please add my comments into the official record of the above referred case.

I live at 4206 Taylorsville Road on the corner of Taylorsville Rd & Houston Blvd.My Property is next door to the proposed development ar 4208 Raylorsville Road, with my back porch and backyard directly adjacent to said proposed development.

The first concern I would like to address is the developers proposed waiver to reduce the distance between our back yard property line to a proposed condominium from the standard code of 35 feet to 25 feet. To put that distance into perspective...... If you've 'ever watched a football game, the distance required to make a first down is a mere 10 yards. Twenty five feet would be 8.3 yards..... Not even enough yardage to make a first down. A very short distance. The construction codes were established for reasons after afore thought and considerations were carefully reviewed. To change these thoughtfully established codes at the mere whim of a developer is not what was purposed when the codes were established.

We bought our home because we had privacy in our back yard with honeysuckle vines and other natural vegetation for privacy and as a natural buffer between our backyard and adjacent farm lot next to it.

There are also five fully grown trees on the other side if our said vegetation buffer which sit on the developers property. These trees also serve as a beautiful natural buffer between our backyard and the developers purchased fawn house. They are also beautiful natural landscapes for viewing as one drives down Taylorsville Road.

The developer would cut these trees down, peal the natural landscapes back like an onion, and build a condominium within 25 feet (8 1/3 yards) of our property line.

It would also be a two story condominium, with the second story looking down on our back porch where we are now enjoy privacy to grill out, read books, and play with our grandchildren.

Please don't let this happen! Please don't let them change the established construction code. I am 72 yrs old and my wife is 68 yrs old. We did not anticipate these changes when we bought our property. We anticipated peace, privacy and to be left alone in our retirement and old age.

For the record, I also want to state that I strongly oppose and object to the proposed Rezoning from single Family Residential to Multi-Family & Office Space.

Increasing the density in this geographical area is dangerous and unwise. Traffic is already heavy and Taylorsville Rd is unsafe and risky to travel on. If this development is allowed or take place, there will be more cars coming to a stop to make the turn into the development..... Where other vehicles are coming at them at 60 -70 MPH (and believe me they do travel that fast on Taylorsville Rd.) There will surely be a fatal crash if this development is allowed. I will keep a copy of this emailed prophecy of a future fatal crash for my records. Does Planning & Zoning want this on their conscience?

There are many other concerns I have for not allowing this development to take place and I will address them at another time.

Sincerely Yours,

Henry Spear

Sent from my iPad

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read this letter.

My name is Adriane Hoffman and I live at 3005 Houston Blvd, Louisville, KY 40220 in Houston Acres off of Taylorsville Road. My property backs up to 4208 Taylorsville Road, which is owned by Teulu Homes, LLC. Teulu Homes, LLC is requesting zoning change for a 1.89 acre lot currently zoned R-4 to R-5A for 1.39 acres and OR-1 for .50 acres. Their plans propose, 3 buildings with 4 two-story condo units in each building. This is a total of 12 condo units proposed for a 1.89 acre lot that already has a two-story single family home currently on the property, which the developer wants to sell as office space.

I oppose this zoning change and the proposed development. Here are a few concerns I have:

- 1. "Spot Zoning" The definition of spot zoning is the process of singling out a small parcel of land for a use classification totally different from that of the surrounding area for the benefit of the owner of such property and to the detriment of other owners.
 - a. The parcel of land at 4208 Taylorsville Road is a 1.89 acre lot zoned R-4. The eight lots that surround 4208 Taylorsville Road property on three sides are all zoned R-4 with single family homes. (See Exhibit A) The developers, Teulu Homes, LLC are spot zoning, by requesting to change a small parcel of land to R-5A & OR-1 that is surrounded by R-4. Teulu Homes, LLC will build their condos, sell them, make a profit and move onto the next project. This rezoning is a benefit to Teulu Homes, LLC, but damaging to the surrounding properties and owners.
- 2. Water Drainage is a current issue along the back of the properties on Houston Blvd that border 4208 Taylorsville Road. During heavy rainfalls, water pools along the back of my property. (See Exhibit B) I am very concerned that I will have more water in my yard once these 12 condos are built. I already have issues with water leaking into my basement during heavy rain storms. MSD came out to our neighborhood on Friday, October 7, 2016 to discuss the drainage questions we have if this development gets approved. MSD said there will have to be some drainage improvements made if these 12 condos are built. These improvements would take place within the existing easement that runs between the back of about five Houston Blvd houses and the 4208 Taylorsville Road property. If the developer just builds under the existing zoning R-4, then they may not have to improve the drainage. It just depends on the developers plans.

Shomited by adviance Highman on 1913/16 mand on 1913/16

- 3. The current Character of our neighborhood is mostly single family one-story homes and a few cape cods. The developer, Teulu Homes, LLC are planning to put 12 two-story condo units on 1.39 acres. The difference in building structures (a two-story condo unit compared to a single family one-story home) changes the character of Houston Acres and surrounding neighborhoods.
- 4. I have Mature Trees that run along the entire length of our property line that back up to Teulu Homes, LLC's property, 4208 Taylorsville Road. If the drainage improvements are made that I mentioned earlier, then most of these mature trees will be removed. A lot of mature trees will have to be cut down which currently provide a buffer between properties, homes for many different kinds of wildlife and shade to our yards and homes. Also according to the developer's plans, spacing between the proposed condo buildings and adjacent property lines are only 5-10 feet, which is too close and unacceptable. If the drainage issue does not cause the removal of numerous mature trees, then the placement of these condo buildings will and we cannot let this happen. It will take many years for newly planted trees to grow to the same height as the trees are now. Plus I also want to protect the privacy that these trees provide.
- 5. Traffic and Safety will be an issue when the population of residents increase in this area on Taylorville Road. Houston Acres neighborhood does not have a signal at Houston Acres and Taylorsville Road and never will because it is too close to the signal at the McMahan intersection. The developer's entrance at 4208 Taylorsville Road will not get a signal for the same reason. It is already difficult and unsafe to turn left out of Houston Acres at peak hours of the day. The increase in cars and foot traffic in this area will generate many safety concerns.
- 6. Density is a big issue with this proposed development. Teulu Homes, LLC is trying to fit too much on such a little tract of land, a 1.89 acre lot. They want to put 3 buildings with 4 two-story condo units in each of them on 1.39 acres. A two-story house already sits on the existing 1.89 acre lot, which is where the owners want to rezone .50 acres to OR-1. Houston Acres and the surrounding neighborhoods will have to worry about additional noise, lights, drainage, safety, etc. The proximity of the proposed 3 buildings, street lamps and dumpsters are too close to our properties and homes.

Houston Acres is a beautiful and quiet neighborhood. I do believe this proposed development will change that. I ask that you please take into consideration what I have written and why I oppose the zoning change and proposed development on 4208 Taylorsville Road by Teulu Homes, LLC.

Thank you again for your time.

Sincerely,

Advise MM

Adriane Hoffman



Water pools in our backyard along the tree line that borders my property at **3005 Houston Blvd** and the property behind mine at 4208 Taylorsville Road (property in question for rezoning).

When there is a heavy rainfall, water pools in the back yard, front yard, as well as leaks into our basement. We are very concerned about where the water will go if 3, two-story condo buildings are built on the property behind ours, which retains a lot more water than ours does during a heavy rain storm. We do not want any more water in our yard or in our basement.

Exhibit A

Print Layout

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

OCT 2 d 2 u lo
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

RECEIVED OCT 28 2016 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely,

* After living here for 6 years, we have never had nice. After the illegal dumping of dirt + trash innediately behind our property, we have had nice number of from our to the (CORNER OF HUSTON BLUD + Tay Lorsville Rd.) back porch to the back porch to the ugly dirt + trach pile which remains behind us to this very day, Considerate of others, Aren't theya!

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

OCT 28 2010
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

3120 Marin Rd

40220

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Carrie Hellmann 4208 Hewitt Ave 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 26 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

1.6

Vicki Mayhorn Vicki Mayhorn 4301 Martha Aue Louisville, Ky 40220 502-451-6902

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Dannett + Kristen fauer Alle Dolphin Rd UM.KY. A0220

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 26 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely,

El Drove

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Wm Sch forsmo

RECEIVED

OCT 2 8 2016

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

3126 Hewitt Ave

Louisville, Ky 40220

RECEIVED

OCT 26 2010
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Ruth A. Cobb 3126 Hewitt hoursville, Key 40220-2226

RECEIVED

OCT 26296 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

CREMY Cobb 3126 Hewitt Are

Louisville, Ky

40220

RECEIVED

OCT Z

PLANNING &
PLANNING &
PESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Mark Baber MARK BABER 10-23-16 3116 HOUSTON BLVD, LOU, KY. 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

Pat Brook's 4208 Martha Averve Louisville, Ky 40220

RECEIVED OCT 25 2016 K CIMINANTH DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2016

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

4207 Martha ave. are property lines up directly behind proposed rezoning 5027185221

RECEIVED

OCT 25200

PLANNING 8

16 ZONE 1026

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT ANNING &

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Many hicklies 3011 Houston Blud.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT ZO ŽIJIO

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

Mark Gammons 4109 Martha Avenue

Louisville, KY40220

RECEIVED OCT 2 5 2016 **PLANNING &** DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2016 **FLANNING &** DESIGN SERVICES

16

ZONE 1026

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Weeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

Rind Mollaway

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2016

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Jillian Lang 3008 Michael Dr. Louisville, KY 40226

RECEIVED

OCT 2.5 2016

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

RECEIVED OCT 2.5 2918

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

Sincerely,

Pat + Don Wainwright 3006 Houston Blod. Louisville, KY40220

we are very concerned with the possible zoneng change. We are stowly lowing our family neighborhoods to strip malls and other commercial ostablishments. We do not want this area to become another Dixie Highway.

ZONE

1026

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

Jerry Trautuein 3101 Marlin RD 502-640-5726.

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely, Maland Lewis Angela Lewis

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely,

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

C. E. Westerfull

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2016

PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

Judy Robison Judy Robison Judy Robison 3113 Houston Blvd Lou Ky 40220 502 394 9106

RECEIVED OCT 25 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Janla M. Donduan auta m Donduan 1010 michael Drive Dujsville, Ky 40220

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2015

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

OCT ZO ZOO PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED
OCT 25 2010

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you.

MARHA ATWELL

3123 HEWITT AUE LOUISVILLO, KY 40220

502-439-8850

RECEIVED

OCT 20 Zuio **FLANNING &** DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

David Jordan
3007 Michael Dr.
Louisville, Ky 40220
(502) 533-5360

RECEIVED OCT 2 4 2016 **FLANNING &** DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Jill Osborne Jill Osborne 3007 michael Drive Lausville, Ky 40220 (500) vfl-3104

RECEIVED nct 2 4 2016 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

Gherlene B Trusty 3103 Pamela Way Louisville, KY 40220

459-6865

Therlene B. Trusty

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

Missy Fourtain
3009 Michael Drive
Louisvill, Ky 40220
SU2-386-5797

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely

RECEIVED OCT 2 4 2016 PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you.

RECEIVED
OCT 3 | 2019

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you.

3123 HewiTT Ave

LOU. Ky 40220

502-645-2515

RECEIVED OCT 3 1 2010

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

M. CAROLYN Pharys

3109 Houston Blvd

456.1739

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

31046 HOUSTON BLVD

Kelly Fleischer

494-7359.

RECEIVED

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you.

3104 HOLSTON BD.

432 - 9864

Alexa Fleischer

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Vames F. FLEISCHER

(502) 777-9189

3104 HOUSTON BLUD

40220,

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Janine Paul Canine Paul 3161 HOUSTON BLYD. LOU KY 40220

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Greg Carpenter 3007 Houston Blud.

(502) 821-3207

RECEIVED
OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Shelly Abraham Shelley Abraham 3107 Hewitt Ave

Coursville, KY 4020

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

4 Blue

3104 Hewitt an

502) 451-8929

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. MYN

4200 Hewith ane

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

459.7448

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou May
MARY LOU MAY
3132 HUNSINGER BIVD
653 7241

RECEIVED OCT 3 i 2015 PLANNING & **DESIGN SERVICES**

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

Ward Jourson DAVID 5 Wilson 502-451-5571

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

Jane L. Wilson

Jane L. Wilson

3134 Honsinger BILD

Louisville 1 Ky 40220

572 4515571

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA A. MEYER 3113 MICHAEL DRIJE 502-473-0388 RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

3010 Michael 1)

Louisville KY 40220

PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

40220-3505

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

3131 Michael Dr

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely.

1022°

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Laurelle Ky Fozzo

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

1 Michael Dr. sville, KY 40270

RECEIVED

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

Drawn Lafter

RECEIVED

OCT 3 2013

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community! Sincerely,

Judy Schnoller

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

hashi Watson

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

AARON LARKIN 4206 TAYLORSVIlle Rdi Louisville, Ky, 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

Karla Larpin 4206 TAYLORSU, 112 Road Louisille, Ky, 40220

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

Hive near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

CINCHY MANNING

CINCHY MANNING

3118 MARLIN RD

CHY 40220

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES August 24, 2016 + Typed
Oct 27, 2016 + mailed

Ms. Julia Williams 444 So. 5th Street Suite 300 Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Re: Rezoning Case #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams

My family and I live next door to 4208 Taylorsville Road. Most recently a building at 4208 had "lead paint" washed off. The paint was not controlled and was blown in all direction including my property and neighbors.

The paint was analyzed and determined to be lead paint. The paint is on the ground and trees.

This proposed development includes removing trees and disturbing the contour of the land. Should this happen, the paint will again be in the air and we will <u>again</u> be exposed. Don't you agree once Is enough?

Additionally, since lead paint was blown off the spray paint (uncontrolled) process began. The dirt and trees are now exposed to lead paint, new point.

Should development be allowed, Houston Acres would be exposed to old and new paint, both of which are deadly.

Surface water could wash these two paints into public waterways. The entire water run-off is directed to Houston Acres residents.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

COPY: file

Ren Spear

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2016

PLANNING &

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

PLAN SPEARS

PLAN SPEARS

PLAN SPEARS

DESIGN SERVICES

PLAN SPEARS

PLAN SPE

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

Aaron Jarkin 4206 Tay Lorsville Rd. Louis ville, Ky, 40220

> OCT 3 4 ZOD PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

Henry Spear 4206 Tay Lorsville Rd, Louisville, Ky, 40220 OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

CORNER OF Huston Blud + Tay Loasville Rd.

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Ken Spear 4206 Taylorsville Rd. (corner of Huston Blud, + Taylorsville Rd.)



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Jamie Benawitz Jamie BONAWITZ 3009 HOUSTON BIND. LOUISVILLE, KY 40220

OCT 28 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

John Grawemeyer 4213 Hewitt Ave.

Louisville, KY 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Sincerely,

3122 Michael Dr 200, Kg 40220

RECEIVED
OCT 28 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Deanne Grawemeyer 4213 Hewitt Ave. ouisville, KY 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

Midred C. Phareis 3109 Houston Blud. Louisville, Ky 40220



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

Rondal C. Bartley 4205 Hewitt Avenue Louisville, KY 40220

PS...I have lived in Houston Acres since 1971! I don't want the setting and nature of our city changed.



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Matalie Eckerle 3120 Michael Dr Louisville, Ky 40220

RECEIVED
OCT 28 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Standonly



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Sta Walup



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

Lam a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. Lam writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Resident - City of Houston Acres

Sincerely,

RECEIVED
NOV 02 2015

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggests a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Donna Schabel Resident - City of Houston Acres

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

3112 Hewitt Ave

Louisville, KY 40220

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 200 4

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely.

Ms. Mildred Sales



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely,

lan Shlitte

NOV 0 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

Austin Jones



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I am a nearby resident to the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. This will affect me, and I wish to express my concerns.

In the developer's "Justification for Zoning," that was submitted to the city, they stated that, "This is a low density moderately priced condominium project that will provide housing for the growing medical community and meet other housing needs in the immediate area."

In a meeting, the developer stated that these condos would be valued at over \$200,000 each. Observation and local research shows similar condo units that are currently for sale have an average value around \$127,000. In addition, many of these units offer amenities such as swimming pool, tennis courts, brick exteriors, etc. All comparisons were within the District 11 area and many showed construction dates that were within the last 15 years. Prices compared were zestimates which are typically 10-20% higher than the actual sale price of these units.

When the developer was question about their high valuations, they explained that they were legally allowed to take estimates from locations further east of the development site and avoided elaborating on any details.

I also disagree that the medical community needs additional housing of this type, within this area. Consistently, there are condo units and apartments in many locations throughout District 11 that are advertising and showing that unit are available.

I wish to conclude by stating that I am in strong opposition to the rezoning of this property.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 2013 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

3126 MARLIN RD

LOUISVIELE, KY. 40220

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 2011 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Tom Boush 4307 manife Aug Low Ky 40220

RECEIVED NOV 0 1 2018 PLANNING & **DESIGN SERVICES**

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS Brumley 3/21 Michael Dr.

Louisville . Ky. 40220

NOV 0 1 2016 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

m. Joelle Schlotter

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 2015

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Ronda Seay 4307 Marothe Ave Lovishille Ky 4020

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

NOV 0 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live near the proposed development site listed above and wish to share my concerns.

There is a Guideline under the developer's Justification for Zoning Change that is titled "Mobility, Transportation, Circulation, Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Transit". Under this guideline, the developer states, "Sidewalks are located along Taylorsville Road thereby insuring an interconnected network for pedestrian access.

This statement is highly misleading if not false. There are no sidewalks in front of this portion of Taylorsville Road. The development map shows a sidewalk that connects to a bike lane located at the north property line. There is no interconnected pedestrian access for several hundred yards.

This is one of many misleading statements that was suggested in the Guidelines and noted in the Meeting Minutes that were submitted to the city by the developer. Many of the comments made by the developer disregard or down play the real opinion of the local community and this development fails to retain the character of the local community.

It is my opinion that the city should reject the zoning change request in addition to waivers and variances for any development that takes place on this property. I would like for this site to remain single family residential.

Mary M. Foulhabr

NOV 0 7 2076
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES



RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

Lam a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. Lam writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Morie A. O'Meill

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you.

Jennifer Nall

3102 Hewitt Avenue

Looisville Ky 40220

(502) 817-8694

OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

John M. NaLL 3102 Hewill Ave.

502-817-3122

OCT 3.1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

James & Maft

James & AGRAFT

3108 MARLIN RD.

562-451-6934

Carlene Graft
CARLENE BRAFT
3,08 Marlin Rd
502-451-6934

OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

Jan L. BORDERS

3111 Michael DR. Louisville, Ky 40220 (502) 459-5085 OCT 3.1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2016

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

502-889-5422

Donna Stottmann Donna Stottmann 3112 Michael Dr.

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

KAREN M BREWER

3112 HUNSINGER BLUD LOUISVILLE KY 40220 502-459-1243

RECEIVED OCT 3.1 2016

PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development site listed above and will be directly affected by the development. I am using this opportunity to express my displeasure with the proposal that has been submitted to the City of Louisville.

In the "Development Center Guideline," the developer suggests, "The redevelopment of the existing building and reutilization of the property as office/residential will represent significant reinvestment along the Taylorsville Road corridor and will also encourage viability and renewed sense of place in the general neighborhood."

My opinion is quite strong since I live in the general neighborhood and am in complete disagreement with this statement. It is my belief that the developer is seeking to rezone the existing building as an office so they can take advantage of the Historic Site Tax Incentives associated with this zoning change.

It is my understanding that normal rezoning takes place during the purchase of a property and prior to any construction. This particular developer, purchased first, remodeled second, and is now looking to rezone the rehabilitated structure.

This does not encourage viability nor does it renew a sense of place in the neighborhood. I would like to see the city maintain the R4 zoning status on this site and feel that the developer has little to no interest in maintaining the character of the surrounding community.

The developer has been misleading in meetings and has repeatedly misquoted or misunderstood citizen concerns that were documented in the Meeting Minutes submitted to the city.

Thank you and please consider these concerns in your decision making.

Sincerely

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2016

PLANNING 8

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams.

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the man Nichlier Mary Micklifes

30th Hausten Blul
458-4654 property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

OCT 3.1 2016 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

ACM A MARTIN MARY

608 72720

OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

AMMINA A/G,

acet al philosoci

OCT 3.1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2016 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

502-459-3541

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Hewith Avenue

RECEIVED

OCT 3 1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live in the same area as the development site proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer is quoted as saying, "Changes in use from single family to multi family or office is permitted at the interface between commercial nodes and residential uses provided the orientation, design, scale and location of the proposed development are compatible with surrounding uses."

I disagree with this statement. This site is completely surrounded by R4 residential units and is currently located outside of the commercial, office and medium residential areas located along Taylorsville Rd. I believe this proposal will have a long term negative impact on the local community as well as District 11. This does not fit within the of Cornerstone 2020 guidelines in regards to the economic impact to the neighboring community.

I do not support the rezoning change in this location. I believe that the developer is capable of constructing single family residential homes that are similar in scope and size of the surrounding neighborhood for a reasonable profit. The developer was perfectly fine with the R4 zoning when the property was purchased and rehabilitation of the existing home began. Single family housing would limit or improve the character of the local community if it was done the right way. I do not believe office buildings or condos fit within this particular locale.

Thank you,

Donna Zinser Clark

Louisville, Ky 40220

4207 Hewitt, Ave.

502/592-3367

OCT 3.1 2016

PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the proposed development at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

Under the "Compatibility Guideline," for the Justification of Zoning Change, the developer states, "Several properties fronting Taylorsville Rd have previously been granted approval for office retail uses where appropriate. We have taken into consideration the concerns of the surrounding property owners in the design of this project."

I do not believe the opinion of the surrounding property owners were taken into consideration. I have not met to a single person who is in support of commercial, office, or increased density residential developments at this location. I am also aware that all neighboring properties to this site are zoned as single family residential.

In the "Meeting Minutes," submitted to the city the developer clearly failed at listening and describing the concerns of local citizens. I am strongly opposed to anything except single family residential homes, shared driveways or cutting down the mature trees located along the perimeter of the development site. I am also opposed to any office or commercial zoning suggested for the main structure on this property.

Thank you and please help us preserve the character of our wonderful community!

Sincerely,

enda Justice

3105 HEWITT AVE

513 485-0220

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2015 **PLANNING &** DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Sorin E. Spohn 4212 Delphin Rd. Louisville, KY 40220

RECEIVED

OCT 3.1 2015 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

RECEIVED

OCT 3/1 2015
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I own a nearby resident to the proposed development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I wish to voice my opinion on this matter.

The developer is quoted as saying, "The proposal will not adversely impact the aesthetic appearance of the existing building and will revitalize and preserve the existing structure that may be eligible for the National Historic Register." This was submitted to the city under the Open Space Natural Areas and Scenic and Historic Resources Guideline of the Justification for Zoning Change.

It is my belief that the developer will seek Historic Registry status on the main structure and apply for National Registry tax incentives on the rehabilitation costs associated with remodeling after the property is rezoned for office space. There is a clear advantage to the developer at the detriment to neighboring citizens. I believe the OR1 zoning request is a precursor to what will snowball into a spot zoning situation.

I am requesting that the zoning change be denied and that this property remain single family residential. The density of the proposed residential area is too high and the office space does not fit into this general area. I believe this will have a negative impact on the surrounding communities.

Thank you.

Paul W. Faulhabe

RECEIVED

NOV 0.3 2016

PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE WOOLDRIDGE 3017 MC MAHAN BLVD. LOUISVILLE KY 40220

Charlie Woldridge

NOV 03 2005
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONF1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

MARY S. BOMAR 4265 Martha Cere Louisville, Ry 40220

RECEIVED

NOV 03 2015

PLANNING &

DESIGN SERVICES

DESIGN SERVICES

OPPOSED TO ZONING CHANGE 4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date	Print Name	Sign Name	Address	Zip
1111/16	Rosanne McCar	1 Format Modell	301 Vichahan	40220
	Melodularter	Moloon Carte	3012 Michae	[Dr4032
142	· Part Grove	Cath Shove	3101 Mico	KBI PL 4022
1/2/16	Rita HECK	Rta Heck	3107 MelAN	MAY "
11/2/16	KC Kehor	KC Kehr	3005 Houston	BIV2
11-3-16	MARY S. BOMAR	Mary S. Bomar	4205 Marthe	we
		,		***************************************
	·		AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	National and the State of American
				december 20 to terminal and the second and the sec
		, and a second s	de Contraction of the Contractio	AS-VALUE VARIABLE VALUE VARIABLE VARIAB

	This is a second of the second		-,	

			- CEN	VED
			RECE!	116
			LTANNI	VO &

0

OPPOSED TO ZONING CHANGE

4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date	Print Name	Sign Name	Address	Zip
13/14	Ribert Bennett	ZIRI)	3127 Hunsinge	*****
10/30/16	Adriane Hoffman	Aline Mille	3005 Houston Blvd	
10/31/16	Betty Holton	Betty Halton	3/12 Mael	
10/31/10	Maurine Word	Mahn Dording	3000 McM	lahan Blud
10/31/16	Adolph Oldach	Odoll Oldack	3/03 Milanie	
10-3116	Ray Kaelw	Kuy Kuch	3126 Huw.	
10-3616	Jekemy Knelu		3126 Aua	•
10-31-16	Nancy P. Mc Clure.	Havcel & Milley	3134 Michae	el Brive
10/3/16	DANIELTIMELURE	Sould Myllen	3134111CHALEZ	
103-14	MHOELHE BREWELL	Medeline Sempl	3/10 HOUSTON	1
10-3/-16	Marcia Allen	Marcia allen	7.	Rd Gozzo
10/3/11		Jon allen	i e	al. 40220
19/3//14	Brook Kelton	Byrga Holtm		n Ad forze
931/1Ca	William Cang	Carlos	3008 Midugo	
10/31/16	Sarah Lang	- Yanak Jakar	3008 Michael D	r 40220
2 Y 1 1	Gregorwick		7703 Blougross C	,
10/31/16	- AMU-	Jen Wilsen	Martha X	1 ,
	MARY SO ABEL	Though all	4209/MART	HAIAN De.
i	ana Bade Emma k	Eida Emala Beida	4209 Marth	ra Ave
	Jusankock	Susan Rock	3100 Michael	Dr.
10-4-6	fii, Myd	Kimlykock	3100 Michael	Dr.
10/31/h	Taryn Fock	tampfock	3(00 Michae	1 Vr

RECEIVED

NOV 03 2016 PLANNING &



4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date Print Name	Sign Name		
10-30-16 Degy Donovan	00	Address	Zip
10.20	leve Joneson	3010 Michael	D = 1/022
10 2011	web heliett		
10-30-le Knotha Able	Lugar MIN	3196 MARCIN	<u>K</u> 1246.226
10.30.14 Conex Albre	AP	Halle Hewitt	tre
10.30 le Judy Robisan		4216 HEWITT D	VE
10:3416 Robert Bounet	Dill-	3113 Houston BI	Vd
1.61	1426	3/27 Huns/19.	
	Text Benet	3127 Hursinge	200
10/20 h. W. 1800	Jane of Wilson	3/3// 1/.	<u> </u>
Diffe I DJ W, I Sen	Unid In Jon	3134 Henringer	. /
10/30/16 PAUL FAULHABER	Paul Farehal	77-07-03	
high has all I	. 6 11 /	3117 Houston	
10/30/16 Shawn Sales		3117 Hourton Blue	<u> </u>
10 3011	Shayn Sales	3008 Michael	DV., 40220
1h 2011	New Spear	4206 TAYLORSU.	The RS.
	Jany Epige	4206 TAYLORSU	1/ 0/
with the second	Sall Strakes	3007 Michael D	Lie /cf
10-30-14 Jill Osborne	- 4// 4 / 3 - 4 .	_	
10-30-16 Dylan Bradford		3007 Michael	_ D / .
1030/6 Paula Donovan II	July Josephio 2	3606 Sudburgh	L Z
10-31-16 Toda Millett	Ella pada de	3010 michael D	7. 40220
10.31-16 100 051	add Millett 3	104 Michael Dr.	10220
	3	1/25 611	. Sign
10.7111	JE17 3	105 Wiles D	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
10 21010 May > e, + Z 1.1	Kai Sein/3	109 Michan	
		2736.77	.40220
10-31-16 Was Stizz 10-31-16 kg; Se, 72 1.1	3 3 3	105 MICHOZ DE	10220 240220 40220 40220

RECEIVED

NOV 03 2013 PLANNING &

4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date	Print Name	Sign Name	Address	Zip
10/31	12 10 11	25/	2	
10/31	Kowin Black	Filher	3120 Marin Ad	
$\overline{\eta/\eta}$	John Hern don	John Henry	3020 May May	
11/1	Mark, Murphy	Mach Stunks	3105 Melevie	
1//1	Julia Margh	Continuo M	3/05 Melonia	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11/1	Carole Smith	Cirole Smith	3700 Sudbu	ny Lh 40220
11-1	Drave Duravana	Danker Doorsh	3010 nicha	/
11/1	George Frazier Sa		3127 HEWITT	
11-1	Perry Neutz	Kerry Duft	3114 Houston	
11-1	Vincent Schwenhard	LA SALAN	3104 Martha	(+
111	17 (A1GO)	Jublu	302Hash	W BlUD
14/1	Jon STUTTS	July	3102 Mari	1,1 Rd 40220
111 }	Both James	Ben	3131 Michael	Dr. 4/0220
11/1	Brian Wade	Bylle	3/31 Mich	ael Dr.
11/ (Jacob Cooley	gacal Craces	4304 Michael	Way
	Danie Fulne	Dang Fulse	3132 Mi chaol	L PC
<u>IVI</u>	Angie Lewis	Angle Lewis	3103 Martha	Ct.
<i>ll</i> //	Kdand Lewis	Kalend Klevin	3103 MARHA, (<u> </u>
1/1	millie Petera	millio texers	3115 Hewith	<u>tak</u>
-/	Spe Brangete	Jal Budwales	,	
14/1	Martha Htwal	/ Marka Hare	13/23 Hawi	4 All
	ROSEMARY ADAMS	R. adams	607 PENLLY	Roty
			RECE	VED

NOV 03 2010 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date	Print Name	Sign Name	Address	Zip
10-31	Shawna Spellmani	Malma	3104 HUNSI	W 40220
10-31	Jeni Borne	Jack Bome		5inger 4025
10-31	JONATHAN BOOME	Juli Booml	3106 HUNSING	EN 40200
16-3,	MARY ANIV BREWER	Man C. Bey	3/2 Herry	gille.
10-31	Stephan John !	Stephanie Schaeler	W12 Regal	
18 3i	KAREN BREWER	Farier Erews	3112 Honsin	CER BUDTORDS
10/31	BRIAN BROWN	Blan	4315 Love Rp	40220
10/31	Morraochebel	Ponna Schabel	3/13 Hunsiger	Brd 40220
10/31	Jespica Dobsen	My Cler	4303 MKNEGI	
20/31	Gud Booting	Von By	4303 Mochaell	vay 40220
10/31	100 for	406	430) MIMACK	un 40110
1931	Debra Derson	Dibra Denson	3172 Hunsin	ger-BIVd
10-31	Terrace Moon		3122 Hunsing	so Bld
10/31	Rank Denson	tent	3122 Hawinger	BUN
10/31	LISA Terrell	Two Jenell	3129 HUNSINGER	Blul.
19/31	Scott Medley -	1	4218 HEW;	++Au
10131	Beerey Medley	Bedly medly	4218 Havit	- ave
10/31	Mejanfesel "	Melan Resch	4218 Dolph	in Pal
10/31	Bryan Twis	Byackas	4218 Dalphy	L RJ
10/3/	Civil white		4212 Held	
10/3)	Kelly Graybeal	Kelly Thanket		2d 40220
10/31	Britany Watt	Bottons of gots	3133 Martin	Rd 4028

RECEIVED

NOV 03 2016 PLANNING &

4208 TAYLORSVILLE ROAD

I am opposed to the re-zoning and I want to keep the zoning as it is now R-4. Re-zoning is <u>not</u> in the best interests of the community for many reasons.

Date	Print Name	Sign Name	Address	Zip
10.31.16	Mul / 2 Kepner	MidelyKen	3105/11chae1	Dr. 40220
10-9-16	Throthy Lee	Hu J	3107 Michae	1 Pi 40208
18/31/16	JASON Schne Jee	Ju Ha	3101 Herry	0
10/1/16	Kin Schwedee	Jul Alul	310/ Hewitt	
193114	Missyfountain	Mu		Dure 4000
10/3/16		Ship	3103 Houston	
103/16		MIJOUNT	3103 Hous	. 1
193/16		Plex, Miller	3103 4005	, //
10/3/16	Stephanie (rable	State of Dealer	3100 Houston	1 -
10/3/16		DOKALA 13 MOOKS	49-08 MARTI	
10/3/16		Yat broshs	4208 Mar	
10-31	John Tivo antino	A CO COO		2th2 Are
		E France	3101 micha	Λ
10-31-1	CHARLES BARTMAN		4302 MARTA	A 1 -
10/31	BONNE BANTMAN	Barne Bortha	430 2 MANU	
10-31	Dolores FAUST	Dolores Taggot	3604 Rosemor	8 CI 482T2
10001	Mar C. Caplell	Wall-lightle	4305 MAVH	GARREL
10/31.	10m Mouse	Tant	4307 mans	in que (1220)
10/31	RONDA SEAY	R Slay		RTAA 40220
10-7(Mudiana Svolbna	JAJ O	31 21 Hun	sengury0220
	BETTY PAMPBER	1 Belty Cans		noinge Blue
		1	RECEN	/ED

NOV 03 2015 PLANNING &

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

NOV 02 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

Dear Ms. Williams,

I live near the development site at 4208 Taylorsville Rd and I am attempting to play an integral role in preserving the character of the local community. The proposed development will impact all residents of the surrounding communities and I have concerns that I would like to have documented.

Under the Economic Growth and Sustainability Guideline in the Justification for Rezoning, the developer submitted the following documentation:

"This development furthers the goal of preserving the existing neighborhood while preserving an existing structure. No nuisances will be created and adjacent properties will not be adversely affected."

Thus far, the illegal dumping of 11 loads of dirt, trash, and rock has taken place which resulted in a stop work order by MSD. The dirt came from a 2nd development site being constructed by the developer. In addition, after the stop work order was placed, the developer cut down over 1000 square feet of vegetation on the property which resulted in a 2nd Stop Work Order issued by MSD.

A petition was submitted by the local community that contained all necessary signatures to hold a public hearing at an evening time at McMahon Firehouse, which is located within walking distance of the development site. Special permission was also received from the McMahon fire chief to ensure they could accommodate the local citizens group to express their opposition. The LDT meeting determined that having the hearing 20+ minutes away from the development site would be satisfactory and justified this with reasoning that I consider to be trivial at best. I can assure you that the relocation of this meeting comes provides clear advantage to the developer and will reduce the ability of the opposition to attend.

Representatives for the developer have also attended two public meetings. Meeting minutes were documented and rebuttals were expressed by the developer at the LDT meeting. The developer clearly misrepresented the opposition when submitting their minutes to the city and overstated their limited attempts to accommodate the neighboring community at the LDT meeting.

I am requesting that the city maintain the single family zoning status for this site.

Sincerely.

3122 Hunsinger Blvd Louisville, Ky Huzzo

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

NOV 02 2016
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Influence 3111 martinged

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

NOV 02 2015
PLANNING &
DESIGN SERVICES

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

RECEIVED

NOV 02 2016 FLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

RE: CASE #16ZONE1026

Dear Ms. Williams,

I am a nearby resident of the development site that is being proposed at 4208 Taylorsville Rd. I am writing this to express concerns regarding 16ZONE1026.

In the "Community Form Guideline," the developer states, "The increase in the proposed density over what is currently permitted in the R4 zone is minimal (net 4-5 unit increase)."

To me, this quote suggest a request to increase the proposed density of the R4 zone by 80-100%. I have not met anyone who considers this minimal. I am requesting that the R4 zoning status remain unchanged.

The developer was willing to purchase this property and rehabilitate the existing structure under the R4 zoning status and at a later date decided to apply for rezoning. I do not believe that rezoning this site to OR1 will be in the best interest of the neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Starla atived 3109 Marlin Pd RECEIVED

NOV 02 2018 PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES