

From: Dock, Joel
To: dsloran@ups.com; Harrington, Scott; njwillen@bellsouth.net; david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: RE: Meijer connection, continued questions
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 11:26:00 AM

Thank you,
David Loran

An official application to revise the approved development plan on the Meijer property has not been submitted. All tracts within the development will be linked by streets and sidewalks. A future connection thought the Meijer property to Hurstbourne parkway would connect the entire development and all those connected to its streets through to Hurstbourne parkway. The connection is largely driven by the density on tract 3 – multi-family, but the connection serves to connect to public streets.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 11:57 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: Meijer connection, continued questions

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hi Joel,
I am putting together slides for Monday's meeting and have a few more questions below.

To be clear, Meijer properties has not submitted a plan to connect to Tract 2 and 3? Or entire development?

From my understanding all the Tracts 1, 2, 3 and 4 connect together. Is this correct?

So if/when Meijer agrees to a submit a plan and make a connection to RJT development they will connect to the entire development not just the townhomes and apartments in Tract 2 and 3?

See document attached, the message is certainly contradictory reading only apartment developments will connect? Can you explain this, please?

From: Dock, Joel
To: charlesdavis2@juno.com
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne View Dr.
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:09:00 AM
Attachments: 2020044-0020_Hurstbourne Flwy Connection Exhibit_102720_f1.pdf

I've attached an exhibit showing the connection to Hurstbourne. This connection will require submittal of revised development/subdivision plans for the property (Meijer) at 4502/4500 S. Hurstbourne Parkway. KDOT provided the following:

The improvement discussed below is to modify the median into a J Turn Intersection. This modification would allow left turn movements into the development, but restrict the left movements out. This is similar to the improvements made at the Buca Di Beppo on Hurstbourne and some of the improvements on the New Dixie Highway.

Access to the private lot (Meijer) will not be permitted per KDOT and binding element without the roadway creation and improvements to Hurstbourne as requested by state.

With respect to naming of roadways, roadway names will not be finalized until record plat as approved by E-911. Names can be approved and held via preliminary plans but are not final until assigned by E-911 using street centerlines. This roadway is actually an extension of Brownwood which terminates at the round-a-bout internal to the development and then continues with a separate name. E-911 will make the final call on naming.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: charlesdavis2@juno.com <charlesdavis2@juno.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 8:18 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne View Dr.

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Mr. Dock:

I was reviewing comments from KDOT on the connection of the development to Hurstbourne Parkway.

Am I correct that KDOT wants a 'J curve' constructed at the location if the road is built? I understand

KDOT's reasons for doing so at that location to prohibited those wanted to turn left from the drive to Hurstbourne Parkway north toward Sw Mile Lane, Taylorsville Road, I-64 and other points north. It appears that the J curve would permit cars coming from the south to turn west on Hurstbourne View to get to Meijer's or the proposed development.

I know that may help access problems for those wanting to go south toward Bardstown Road, but would not improve access and movements north by any means.

One possible action would be to have the cars wanting to go north on Hurstbourne to go on to Meijer's private road to access the existing traffic light in front of Meijer's. However, I don't know how much liability Meijer's would have if a accident occurred on its private road from people wanted to access that traffic light from the proposed development occurred.

One solution would be for the developer to work with Meijer's to have that private roadway dedicated to public use.

Finally, oppose the proposed Hurstbourne View Drive there exist Wattbourne Lane. I think, but not completely sure that the proposed roadway should also be Wattbourne Lane, if I remember Planning Commission procedure and rules correctly.

If you have a chance please respond to my comments.

Thank you,

Charles Davis

From: Brian Davis, AICP
 To: [REDACTED]
 CC: [REDACTED]
 Subject: RE: Current Incident Rate, Public Hearing 2/22, Canceled? 20-2001-0020
 Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021, 4:51 PM
 Attachments: [REDACTED]

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hi Brian,
 I'm excited to hear that about the 20-2001-0020. I've had a lot of questions about the status of the project and the status of the project. I'm excited to hear that about the 20-2001-0020. I've had a lot of questions about the status of the project and the status of the project.

As you know, I've been a member of the Planning Commission since 2017. I've been a member of the Planning Commission since 2017. I've been a member of the Planning Commission since 2017. I've been a member of the Planning Commission since 2017.

I'd be glad to help you with any questions you have about the project.

I will be
 I will be
 I will be

RED ZONE REDUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Employers allow employees to **work from home** when possible
- Non-essential **Government offices to operate virtually**
- **Reduce in-person shopping**: order online or curbside pickup
- **Order take-out**: avoid dining in restaurants or bars
- **Enforce businesses that follow and enforce mask mandate and other guidelines**
- **Reschedule, postpone or cancel public and private events**
- **Do not host or attend gatherings of any size**
- **Avoid non-essential activities outside of your home**
- **Reduce overall activity and contacts, and follow existing guidance**, including 10 steps to defeat COVID-19

KYCOVID19.KY.GOV

1-800-455-6789

From: Davis, Brian [Metro] Brian.Davis@louisvilleky.gov

Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 7:21 PM

To: For an: David (KRS)MEI odolan@krs.com; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; nguyen@louisvilleky.gov

CC: Inc, Emily <emily.inc@louisvilleky.gov>; Reynolds, Joe <joe.reynolds@louisvilleky.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Current Incident Rate, Public Hearing 2/22, Canceled? 20-2001-0020

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Good Afternoon David,

I actually had a conversation about this yesterday with the Planning Commission chair. When we set the meeting date on January 7, the statewide penalty rate was 11.8% and Jefferson County's incidence rate was 47.8. As of February 15, the incidence rate has fallen to 25.3, with some people expecting it to be below 25 next week (just the sending and vaccination rates were close for weather, not sure how that will change those projections). The statewide

*The above information is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended to constitute an offer of insurance or any other financial product. Please contact your insurance agent for more information. © 2021 MetLife Insurance Company. All rights reserved.

penalty rate has also fallen below 8 percent this week. Considering that, the ability to host the event online, and our ability to provide up to 125 socially distanced seats at The Jeffersonian we intend to move forward with the meeting at this time.

We also discussed weather related delays, so we will continue to monitor weather and road conditions the day of the meeting. My plan is to speak with them again later this week to see what the best course of forward weather products are and what we need to be watching for in terms of canceling or not.

Thanks,
 Brian Davis

Brian Davis, AICP
 Planning Manager
 Planning & Zoning Services
 (502) 574-5140
 brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov

From: [REDACTED]


Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:39 PM

To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Davis, Brian <brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; nguyen@louisvilleky.gov

Subject: Current Incident Rate, Public Hearing 2/22, Canceled? 20-2001-0020

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the contents is safe

We are still in the "Red" in Jefferson County and less than a week away from the scheduled night hearing public meeting. Is this going to be rescheduled?



Jefferson County
 Current Incidence Rate
 Legend: 0-100
 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Thank you,

David Isaac
 david.isaac@louisvilleky.gov
 502-767-9030

From: Nancy A. Jack Wittenbrink
 To: Dock, Joel; Brown, Jeffrey E; benzy.sarraf@ky.gov; Davis, Brian
 CC: Harrington, Scott; Vicki Cureton; David Logan; Kathy Tieskott; charlesdavis@louisvilleky.gov; Rebecca
 Hennessey; sarah@louisvilleky.gov
 Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Huntbourne Commons - Main Access
 Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021, 5:36:55 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

The Planning Commission's Staff Report states, on the bottom of page 3 of 19, that Watterson Trail is the primary access to the site. It will not be the primary access for Huntbourne Commons

The first Zimmerman traffic study numbers are higher at Huntbourne Parkway / Watterson St. This access point is between the Meijer gas station and the car wash. Look at the numbers on pages 11 and 12 to see that Huntbourne Parkway will be used at a higher rate than Watterson Trail.

It has been mentioned that construction traffic is to use Watterson Trail. But residential traffic will use Huntbourne Parkway first as indicated in the traffic study. The narrow streets of Brody Ln and Brownwood Dr would be used next. Watterson Trail would be a last choice and only used to travel south to Bardstown Rd.

The primary access through Watterson Trail assumption is another flaw of this project. This and no firm agreement concerning the Meijer intersection and the density of this project are enough for the commissioners to vote NO.

Please share this email with all the commissioners and add to the public record.

Thank you,

Nancy Wittenbrink

From: Linda Hudson
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Hurstbourne complex near Ridgehurst Subdivision
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 7:40:36 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Regarding 20-Zone-0020

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Linda Hudson <lhudsonburton@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Feb 15, 2021, 7:20 PM
Subject: Proposed Hurstbourne complex near Ridgehurst Subdivision
To: <qucsnansicki@gmail.com>

This is way too many residences in this area. The traffic will be terrible and thus more accidents and gridlock. They plan on using Brody Lane as an through way in our Subdivision. This road will not accommodate the traffic. Destroying the street that our HOA maintains. It has been over 25 years since this Subdivision was developed and no one should have access. There will be drainage issues as well for many. PLEASE STOP THIS FROM DESTROYING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD!!!!

SOME single family homes and the assisted living development with area landscaping would be much more appropriate. This is all about money and believe me those doing this would not allow where they live.

dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 Incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100K? Is Jefferson County in the "Red?" Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

Thank you,

David Loran
David.Loran@louisville.gov

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34:00 AM

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "H" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

• Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:

Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

Louisville

20-ZONE-0087

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#)

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50:00 AM

1. KYTC is not responsible for construction any roadways to serve the development. That is a responsibility of the developer. The BE is intended to cap the number of units build in advance of connection.
2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Can you clarify the questions...

Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

From: Dock, Joel [<mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <David.Loran@louisville.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "H" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

- Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:**
Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

Louisville

20-ZONE-0087

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:44:00 AM
Attachments: 20-ZONE-0020_Hurstbourne-Fwy-Connection-Exhibit_162720.pdf

KYTC is responsible for approving projects to improve their rights-of-way or impact their rights-of-way.

The applicant has provided an exhibit showing a roadway connection to Hurstbourne Parkway, see attached. KYTC has requested a "J" turn at the intersection with new roadway and Hurstbourne.

No approval has been received as no plan requesting approval has been received by our office in the area of the Meijer parking lot. The owner that is referenced is the owner of Meijer lot.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Clarify please and add into report:

KYTC is responsible for the APPROVAL of a drawn up plan for roadway by developer to development through Meijer to Hurstbourne Pkwy ?

Wasn't there a "J" hook connection plan drawn up and submitted for record? Was this approved by KYTC and/or Planning Commission or both?

- A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Again, wasn't a plan already submitted for new road and connector to Hurstbourne Fwy through

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100K? Is Jefferson County in the "Red"? Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

Thank you,

David Loran
Dloran@louisvillemetro.gov

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Meijer Properties? Who is the "owner" you are referencing?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

- KYTC is not responsible for construction any roadways to serve the development. That is a responsibility of the developer. The BE is intended to cap the number of units build in advance of connection.
- A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Can you clarify the question...

Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34 AM
To: Lorán David (FKX9HMD) <dioran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "#" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dioran@ups.com <dioran@ups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

Thank you,

David Lorán
dioran@ups.com

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking any action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:

Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.



20-ZONE-0087

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln. if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100K? Is Jefferson County in the "Red"? Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

From: dioran@ups.com
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:13:30 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Please place answer in case files.

If Meijer isn't requesting approval does this mean they are AGAINST a connecting road? They have had since October of last year to make a request, is this correct?

With your past experience, in your opinion, does this mean Meijer is opposed and will not allow a connection?

Note: I have signed up to speak for the meeting. Will receive an email confirmation. We'll have a PowerPoint.

Thank you,
David Lorán

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Lorán David (FKX9HMD) <dioran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

KYTC is responsible for approving projects to improve their rights-of-way or impact their rights-of-way.

The applicant has provided an exhibit showing a roadway connection to Hurstbourne Parkway, see attached. KYTC has requested a "J" turn at the intersection with new roadway and Hurstbourne.

No approval has been received as no plan requesting approval has been received by our office in the area of the Meijer parking lot. The owner that is referenced is the owner of Meijer lot.

Joel P. Dock, AICP

Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: david@louisvillemetro.gov <david@louisvillemetro.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvillemetro.gov>; loran@louisvillemetro.gov; scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Clarify please and add into record.

KYTC is responsible for the APPROVAL of a drawn up plan for roadway by developer to development through Mejer to Hurstbourne Parkway?

Wasn't there a "J" local connection plan drawn up and submitted for record? Was this approved by KYTC and/or Planning Commission of Basin?

- 2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Again, wasn't a plan already submitted for new road and connector to Hurstbourne Parkway through Mejer Properties? Who is the "owner" you are referencing?

From: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvillemetro.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <loran@louisvillemetro.gov>; scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

- 1. KYTC is not responsible for construction any roadways to serve the development. That is a responsibility of the developer. The BE is intended to cap the number of units build in advance of connection.
- 2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: david@louisvillemetro.gov <david@louisvillemetro.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvillemetro.gov>; loran@louisvillemetro.gov; scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

• **Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:**

Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

 20-ZONE-0087

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Mejer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: david@louisvillemetro.gov <david@louisvillemetro.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvillemetro.gov>; loran@louisvillemetro.gov; scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Can you clarify the questions...

Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Mejer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Mejer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

From: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvillemetro.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <loran@louisvillemetro.gov>; scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvillemetro.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "H" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Mejer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 Incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100K? Is Jefferson County in the "Red"? Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

Thank you,

David Loran
loran@louisvillemetro.gov

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:22:00 PM

Meijer is not the applicant on the proposed change in zoning, anything outside the proposed application to change the zoning is not under our control. That is why a binding element is being considered to cap the number of units built without additional connection. We can control how the site subject to rezoning is developed but we cannot control the development of a site outside the change in zoning request. Upon receipt of an application for the connection across the Meijer property, we can then review that application and approve or deny which would have an impact on the development site that is currently subject to change in zoning and those attached binding elements.

Our office can encourage submittal of an application for the Meijer property, which I believe we have done, but cannot compel the submittal of an application for development of a private property.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:13 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Please place answer in case files.

If Meijer isn't requesting approval does this mean they are AGAINST a connecting road? They have had state October of last year to make a request, is this correct?

With your past experience, in your opinion, does this mean Meijer is opposed and will not allow a connection?

through Meijer to Hurstbourne Pkwy?

Wasn't there a "J" hook connection plan drawn up and submitted for record? Was this approved by KYTC and/or Planning Commission or both?

2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Again, wasn't a plan already submitted for new road and connector to Hurstbourne Pkwy through Meijer Properties? Who is the "owner" you are referencing?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

1. KYTC is not responsible for construction any roadways to serve the development. That is a responsibility of the developer. The BE is intended to cap the number of units build in advance of connection.
2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Can you clarify the questions...

Note: I have signed up to speak for the meeting. Will receive an email confirmation. Will also have a PowerPoint

Thank you
David Loran

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

KYTC is responsible for approving projects to improve their rights-of-way or impact their rights-of-way.

The applicant has provided an exhibit showing a roadway connection to Hurstbourne Parkway, see attached. KYTC has requested a "J" turn at the intersection with new roadway and Hurstbourne.

No approval has been received as no plan requesting approval has been received by our office in the area of the Meijer parking lot. The owner that is referenced is the owner of Meijer lot.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Clarify please and add into record

KYTC is responsible for the APPROVAL of a drawn up plan for roadway to develop to development

Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if # is notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34 AM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "H" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

• Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:

Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.



20-ZONE-0087

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 Incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100K? Is Jefferson County in the "Red"? Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:48:00 PM

The binding element was initiated by the Planning Commission. The discussion appeared limited to tract 3.

Whitfield is not being connected. I have no concerns with the binding element however. Please make that statement at Planning Commission so that PC can consider it's incorporation.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:42 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
So please explain the binding element and my request for binding element to be included.

There is a binding element that will limit the amount of apartment dwellings to be built entirely on the site WITHOUT a Meijer connection? This is initiated by your office?

ALSO follow up on my binding element request. I cannot find it in the record. I requested a binding element that Whitfield Ln. never connect to this development. If rezoning is permitted.

Thank you
David Loran

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:22 PM
To: Loran David [FKX9HMD] <dloran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

Thank you,

David Loran
dloran@ups.com

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Meijer is not the applicant on the proposed change in zoning, anything outside the proposed application to change the zoning is not under our control. That is why a binding element is being considered to cap the number of units built without additional connection. We can control how the site subject to rezoning is developed but we cannot control the development of a site outside the change in zoning request. Upon receipt of an application for the connection across the Meijer property, we can then review that application and approve or deny which would have an impact on the development site that is currently subject to change in zoning and those attached binding elements.

Our office can encourage submittal of an application for the Meijer property, which I believe we have done, but cannot compel the submittal of an application for development of a private property.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:13 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Please find a answer in case files.

If Meijer isn't requesting approval does this mean they are AGAINST a connecting road? They have had since October of last year to make a request, is this correct?

With your past experience, in your opinion, does this mean Meijer is opposed and will not allow a connection?

Note, I have signed up to speak for the meeting. Will receive an email confirmation. Will also have a PowerPoint.

Thank you,
David Loren

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:joel.dock@louisville.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Lorán David (FKX9HMD) <ldavid@meijer.com>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

KYTC is responsible for approving projects to improve their rights-of-way or impact their rights-of-way.

The applicant has provided an exhibit showing a roadway connection to Hurstbourne Parkway, see attached. KYTC has requested a "J" turn at the intersection with new roadway and Hurstbourne.

No approval has been received as no plan requesting approval has been received by our office in the area of the Meijer parking lot. The owner that is referenced is the owner of Meijer lot.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: jordan@theinamen.com <jordan@theinamen.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Clarify please and add into record.

KYTC is responsible for the APPROVAL of a draw up plan for roadway by developer to development through Meijer to Hurstbourne Hwy?

Wasn't there a "J" road connection plan drawn up and submitted for record? Was this approved by

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:joel.dock@louisville.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:34 AM
To: Lorán David (FKX9HMD) <ldavid@meijer.com>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

This is a topic that is still open for discussion at Public Hearing. "#" is the amount of units permitted before roadway improvements/connection to Hurstbourne is made.

Brian Davis provided a response to the second part.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: jordan@theinamen.com <jordan@theinamen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Below is a message from one of your slides updated in November 2020.

KYTC and/or Planning Commission on 10/17?

- 2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Again, wasn't a plan already submitted for new road and connector to Hurstbourne Hwy through Meijer Properties? Who is the "owner" you are referencing?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:joel.dock@louisville.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Lorán David (FKX9HMD) <ldavid@meijer.com>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

- 1. KYTC is not responsible for construction any roadways to serve the development. That is a responsibility of the developer. The BE is intended to cap the number of units build in advance of connection.
- 2. A revised plan will be required for the adjacent roadway connection. That will require the owners signature upon submittal. No such application has been submitted.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: jordan@theinamen.com <jordan@theinamen.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; jordan@theinamen.com; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020-2_16_2021

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Can you clarify the questions...

Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12:

Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.



20-ZONE-0087

Hurstbourne Connection/Binding Element #12: Prior to requesting a building permit for the (#) dwelling on a combination of tracts 2 and 3, a public roadway connection shall be made to Hurstbourne Parkway. Any improvements required by KYTC to Hurstbourne Parkway at its intersection with the new roadway shall be made prior to vehicular connectivity being made available to this roadway from the development site.

What does the (#) represent? Number of units? What is this number? This statement is unclear. Does this translate that KYTC will only build a road connecting through Meijer parking lot to Hurstbourne Ln, if (#) notated, a certain amount of dwelling spaces are built?

Does this mean that the proposed connector to the property proposed for zoning change is NOT agreed upon by Meijer Properties and R.J. Theinamen? Or Theinamen and KYTC?

Staff Finding

- Jefferson County remains in the "Red" (46.5 per 100k) as of the 11/11/20 Incidence Rate Map. The case cannot be scheduled for a public meeting.

Also, we are less than a week away for a scheduled public night hearing meeting. What is the latest update of cases percentage per 100k? Is Jefferson County in the "Red"? Is the meeting still on the schedule?

Please clarify and place into comments of case.

Thank you,

David Lorán

DavidLoran@metrolouisville.com

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and those authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Charles Morrison
To: Doc, Joel
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Huntbourne Commons - Main Access
Date: Friday, February 19, 2021 9:50:43 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As residents of Brownwood Drive we are opposed to the current project as presented. Putting multi-family housing in that space is too much. Since Brownwood Drive would be a main access point for them, it would cause increased traffic in an otherwise quiet neighborhood. Since the Watterson Heights subdivision has no sidewalks and very few street lamps, the increased traffic would pose a safety hazard to those walking or bike riding. An acceptable alternative would be to eliminate the proposed apartments and townhouses and replace them with single family homes.

Please share this with the commissioners and add it to the public record.

Thank-you,

Charles and Cynthia Morrison
7708 Brownwood Drive
Louisville, KY 40218

From: Marissa Dries
To: Dock_Joe1
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:18:31 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Good Morning,

I am writing to you today to express my deep concerns regarding the rezoning at 8127 Watterson Trail (Case Number 20-ZONE-0020). My concerns are focused solely on Tract 2. I recently moved to this neighborhood with my husband and we were thrilled to have a safe and quiet location to raise our son. The day we closed on our house I was distraught to learn that this was all subject to change. I do not agree with or understand why a 3-story apartment complex could belong in this area. It would be in the middle of residential homes and blocked in by the commercial stores on Hurstbourne Lane and the senior living facility at Watterson Trail. This space makes much more sense for single-family homes as it is already surrounded by them. An apartment complex with so many additional people could bring additional crime, lower the neighborhood's property values, deteriorate our street with construction, pollution and noise, and bring additional traffic through our street. Brownwood Drive does not have sidewalks or street lamps. Many members of this neighborhood walk daily along the street as it is currently a dead end and limited to only neighbors/local traffic. Connecting this street to the proposed development without addressing this would be grossly negligent to the safety of the existing people living on this street, including my 2 year old son. My first hope would be that the apartment complex be transitioned to single-family homes that fit the style of the existing surrounds so as not to decrease property values with street lamps and sidewalks added for safety. If this cannot be obtained and the zoning is approved for a 3-story apartment complex, I strongly request and urge that the street at Brownwood Drive NOT be connected and a concrete wall or similar barrier be installed. I understand that land development is part of our society as our city continues to grow, but I urge all those involved to think of the people who have already put their hopes and money into their homes in the existing surrounding areas. It is the safety, finances, happiness and way of living for my family and those around us that are at risk.

Thank you,

Marissa Dries

Justification- Watterson Trail is a roadway maintained by Metro Louisville and is shown as a "Major Collector" which requires a minimum of 80 feet of right of way. (Existing 100' of row at Hurstbourne to Hendrick Dr.). The right of way in front of the subject site is listed "right of way varies" the applicant and the owner of the adjacent tract should be required to dedicate at least 40 feet from the existing centerline of Watterson Trail and build roadway to improve access to the site and to Hurstbourne Parkway. Those requirements are justified by Community Form-Neighborhood, Mobility Goal 3, Policy 6 (cost sharing) and Policies 7 and 8 which require dedication to provide adequate roadway improvements on or near the site in question. Metro Subdivision Regulations under 6.2.1 B requires dedication.

Metro Subdivision Regulations, Section 6.2.5 B requires that access from new lots or a new street connecting an existing street shall not be approved unless the existing street has adequate pavement width to provide for ingress and egress to the proposed development (Watterson Trail certainly does not).

I would also point out that the above described improves to Watterson Trail would provide for future development along Watterson Trail to Bardstown Road. I would like to point out that there exist numerous 5 acre residential tract west of the site on Watterson Trail that most likely will be proposed for more dense development in the future. By improving Watterson Trail in front of the proposed development the commission would be preparing for future development and making request for additional road widening of Watterson Trail to meet the requirements of the 20/40 and the Development Code.

I request that this matter be reviewed and considered.

Thank you,
Charles A. Davis
3815 Brody Lane
Louisville, KY 40299

From: charlesdavis@louisville.gov
To: Dock_Joe1
Subject: Dt 20-zone-0020-roadway connections and staff report
Date: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 11:19:49 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Gentlemen:

I was reviewing the comments from KDOT concerning the intersection of "Hurstbourne View Drive", now listed as Hendrick Drive at Hurstbourne Parkway.

If I understand DOT's position it would approve the proposal if it is improved as a "J turn" intersection. I understand why it would want to discourage left turn movements to Hurstbourne Parkway north at that location because of the existing traffic signals at Watterson Trail and in front of Meijer's and other traffic issues

However that leaves the only way cars could go north on Hurstbourne from "Hurstbourne View Drive" would be turn left on to Meijer's parking lot access roadway and proceed north to the traffic signal in front of Meijer's. Of course that is a option. I am not an attorney, but I would point out the possible liability that Meijer could open up if they openly allow cars from "Hurstbourne View Drive" to access its private property to use the existing traffic signal to go north on Hurstbourne Parkway and an accident happens on its private property. To state it another way-who would be sued?

There does exist a possible roadway improvement that would provide more access to the development and at the same time address future transportation needs.

That is to improve Watterson Trail from the west property boundary of the site for rezoning to the existing roadway improvements that are in place at Hendrick Lane near Hurstbourne Parkway.

I realize that there is a tract of land between the subject tract and the existing improvements near Hurstbourne, however it is owned by the same group as the owners of the tract subject to the rezoning. Could not the owners of the tract not included as well as the owners and applicant of the rezoning dedicate additional row to Watterson Trail so that additional turn lane (s) be added to match with the existing turn lane at Hurstbourne Parkway? Those improvements would greatly increase access and exit from the rezoning site to Hurstbourne Parkway north at rush hours to provide access north to Taylorsville Road, I-64 and other points.

Plus those improvements would greatly improvement traffic along Watterson Trail from Bardstown Road.

From: Nancy & Jack Wilenbrink
To: Harrington, Scott; Dock_Joe1; Bloom, Jeffrey E
Cc: Vicki Queenan; Kathy Tieskotter; Rugehaupt Homeowners; Shan Graham; David Logan
Subject: Re: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - 7 other developments
Date: Monday, February 1, 2021 9:18:42 AM
Attachments: image002.png

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott,

Yes, this is interesting information but will the commissioners read it before February 22? Or do they care? Traffic is a serious problem now and will become more severe in the future. There are also 1200 parking spaces planned! Profit is not a bad word but greed is. It's clear that the zoning process is biased against the neighborhoods and favors the developer.

Nancy

On Monday, February 1, 2021, 9:02:26 AM EST, Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov> wrote.

This is a great supporting document when illustrating growth/density so you can bring this up during your hearing testimony

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | Legislative Assistant
Office of Councilman Kevin J. Kramer

Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456


City Hall

fax: 502.574.4501

601 West Jefferson Street

email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov

Louisville, Kentucky 40202

 [Sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter](#)

This is just an example of a notice

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <nwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 2:53 PM
To: Dick, Joel <Joel.Dick@louisvilleky.gov>; Brown, Jeffrey E <Jeffrey.Brown@louisvilleky.gov>;
Kenny, Carrie <ky.gov, Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Kathy Triskotter <ktriskotter@gmail.com>; David Loran
<david@davidorandesign.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>; Shan
Graham <shahng@twc.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - 7 other developments

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Jeffrey, Kenny and Scott,

The following are 7 future developments which will impact one of the busiest roads (Bardstown) and intersections (Bardstown at Hurstbourne) in Louisville. There may be other developments in this area that I'm not aware of. This additional traffic will greatly impact Bardstown Rd and Hurstbourne Parkway and surrounding areas since this is the route to the Gene Snyder and I65. The 7 developments illustrate how dense apartments will be in the area.

1. Cayman Investments at 6875 S Hurstbourne Pkwy allows for up to 360 dwellings. 18Zone1071 is in Council District 23 and 24 which has James Peden and Madonna Flood as councilpersons.
2. KJS at 4805 (4809, 4811, 4813, 4901 and 4907) Bardstown Rd proposed in December a rezoning for 348 units apartment complex across 15 3-story buildings on 18 acres. This is in the area of South Waterson Trail near the existing Bardstown Tire store. This is in Council District 22 which has Robin Engel as the councilperson.
3. Vogt Retail at 4310 - 4318 Bardstown Rd and 4403 - 4405 Fegenbush Ln will be between the McDonalds and Resthaven Cemetery. 20-Zone-0006 will be 37,000 square feet of commercial retail center, a medical office building, 2 restaurants, a bank and a gas station. This is in Council District 2

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dick, Joel, Brown, Jeffrey E; kenny.carrie@ky.gov; Harrington, Scott
Cc: Vicki Queenan, Kathy Triskotter, David Loran, Ridgehurst Homeowners, Shan Graham
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - 7 other developments
Date: Sunday, January 31, 2021 2:53:00 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Jeffrey, Kenny and Scott,

The following are 7 future developments which will impact one of the busiest roads (Bardstown) and intersections (Bardstown at Hurstbourne) in Louisville. There may be other developments in this area that I'm not aware of. This additional traffic will greatly impact Bardstown Rd and Hurstbourne Parkway and surrounding areas since this is the route to the Gene Snyder and I65. The 7 developments illustrate how dense apartments will be in the area.

1. Cayman Investments at 6875 S Hurstbourne Pkwy allows for up to 360 dwellings. 18Zone1071 is in Council District 23 and 24 which has James Peden and Madonna Flood as councilpersons.
2. KJS at 4805 (4809, 4811, 4813, 4901 and 4907) Bardstown Rd proposed in December a rezoning for 348 units apartment complex across 15 3-story buildings on 18 acres. This is in the area of South Waterson Trail near the existing Bardstown Tire store. This is in Council District 22 which has Robin Engel as the councilperson.
3. Vogt Retail at 4310 - 4318 Bardstown Rd and 4403 - 4405 Fegenbush Ln will be between the McDonalds and Resthaven Cemetery. 20-Zone-0006 will be 37,000 square feet of commercial retail center, a medical office building, 2 restaurants, a bank and a gas station. This is in Council District 2 which has Barbara Shanklin as the councilperson. No number of units have been provided.
4. Star Hill at 6600 S Hurstbourne Pkwy and 5800 S Waterson Trail will be on both sides of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 10-Zone-0096 proposes a mix residential and commercial uses on 35 acres, including multiple apartment complexes, retail users and banks. It is in district 24. No number of units have been provided.
5. Highgates at 6106 S Waterson Trail is south of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 20-Zone-0074 will have 240 apartments and 67 single family residential lots. It is in district 24 and 23.
6. Hurstbourne Corporate at 7000 Ridge Creek Rd (6601 Sunnyhill Rd) and 7191 Hurstbourne Pkwy is trying to rezone 16 acres. 19Zone1029 proposes 208 apartment units. It is in district 2 and 24.
7. St Barnabas at 3042 Hikes Ln is proposing 507 apartments on 9.5 acres. This LDG development is in district 26 which is Brent Ackerson.

The developments mentioned above have 1,730 housing units with some development numbers not identified yet. The 7 developments propose 1,663 apartments, 67 single family lots and the increased traffic associated with them. When Hurstbourne Commons (district 11 - Kevin Kramer) is included this is 2,432 new units! Less than 4% of the planned units are single family homes. These developments are scattered across 6 Metro Council districts. They are approved individually by zoning, in a vacuum, without regard for the increased density or increased traffic generated by other developments.

Hurstbourne Commons is the largest development planned in the area with 702 units. 598 are apartments. Hurstbourne Commons needs more single family homes or townhouses. More single family homes would decrease the density, blend in with the existing residential area and allow purchase of single family lots not available today.

which has Barbara Shanklin as the councilperson. No number of units have been provided.

4. Star Hill at 6600 S Hurstbourne Pkwy and 5800 S Waterson Trail will be on both sides of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 10-Zone-0096 proposes a mix residential and commercial uses on 35 acres, including multiple apartment complexes, retail users and banks. It is in district 24. No number of units have been provided.
5. Highgates at 6106 S Waterson Trail is south of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 20-Zone-0074 will have 240 apartments and 67 single family residential lots. It is in district 24 and 23.
6. Hurstbourne Corporate at 7000 Ridge Creek Rd (6601 Sunnyhill Rd) and 7191 Hurstbourne Pkwy is trying to rezone 16 acres. 19Zone1029 proposes 208 apartment units. It is in district 2 and 24.
7. St Barnabas at 3042 Hikes Ln is proposing 507 apartments on 9.5 acres. The LDG development is in district 26 which is Brent Ackerson.

The developments mentioned above have 1,730 housing units with some development numbers not identified yet. The 7 developments propose 1,663 apartments, 67 single family lots and the increased traffic associated with them. When Hurstbourne Commons (district 11 - Kevin Kramer) is included this is 2,432 new units! Less than 4% of the planned units are single family homes. These developments are scattered across 6 Metro Council districts. They are approved individually by zoning, in a vacuum, without regard for the increased density or increased traffic generated by other developments.

Hurstbourne Commons is the largest development planned in the area with 702 units. 598 are apartments. Hurstbourne Commons needs more single family homes or townhouses. More single family homes would decrease the density, blend in with the existing residential area and allow purchase of single family lots not available today.

These other proposed developments are another illustration of why Hurstbourne Commons should not be approved as it is now planned. It also points out the need for single family homes in our area.

Nancy Willenbrink

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

These other proposed developments are another illustration of why Hurstbourne Commons should not be approved as it is now planned. It also points out the need for single family homes in our area.

Nancy Willenbrink

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Davis, Brian
Cc: Vicki Queenan; Kathy Tieskotter; David Lorán; Ridgehurst Homeowners; Shari Graham
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, January 28, 2021 9:41:00 AM
Attachments: SDYL-444-80421612810470.pdf

Nancy Willenbrink

All:
On January 12, 2021 signs were posted by staff at Whitfield, Brownwood, Brody, and Watterson Trail, see attached certification of sign posting. A member of our staff has occasionally checked on certain signs that were questioned by others. Once signs are posted we have limited control over what the weather or citizens do with those signs. If the sign has been removed, we will gladly replace the sign as time and road conditions allow, and re-certify the posting.

The applicant has requested a combination of 2 and 3-story structures. You may object to that height similarly to any other objection to the project in a public hearing or in comments made prior and provided to the Planning Commission.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 6:41 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Davis, Brian <Brian.Davis@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Kathy Tieskotter <ktieskotter@gmail.com>; David Lorán <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>; Shari Graham <sharig@twc.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel and/or Brian,

What is the link to the Hurstbourne Commons files? I'm looking for the Attachments file.

Why is there no sign posted, about the upcoming public meeting on February 22, at the end of Brownwood Dr? One of the two signs is down at the end of Brody Ln.

What is the procedure to only allow 2 story buildings instead of 3 story buildings in this development? What steps need to be taken to submit a formal request?

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Harrington, Scott; Dock, Joel; Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Ridgehurst Homeowners; Timothy Queenan; chad@sharig.com; David Lorán
Subject: 20-Zone 0020 Hurstbourne Commons LDT Staff Report 11.12.20
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 4:38:06 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,

I have just begun reading the LDT Committee Staff Report dated 11/12/2020 and have several concerns and questions.

In the Case Summary paragraph 2 states:

The proposal calls for the development of an assisted living facility and 60 multi-family residential dwelling units in the proposed OR-1 zoning district on Tracts 1 and 2 along Watterson Trail and proposed Laurel Spring Drive.

How many buildings are planned for the assisted living facility? How many people will the facility house?

Case Summary paragraph 3 states:

Primary access to the development site is provided from Watterson Trail, a primary collector roadway. Secondary access from roadway stub connections is provided from Brownwood Drive and Brody Lane. An additional point of access is proposed to connect with the adjacent activity center (Meijer).

When Hurstbourne Commons was originally proposed Meijer was listed as one of the main access points, now it is being listed as an additional point of access. Why? Meijer is needed to help alleviate the traffic congestion on the neighborhood roads, Brownwood Drive and Brody Lane.

I will be on the call tomorrow and hope to hear the answers to my questions.

Thank You
Vicki Queenan
3807 Brody Lane
502-495-6344

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel; Brian Jeffrey E. Kenny; Cairns@tkc.gov
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Bahin, Tejaswiler; Vicki Queenan; David Lorán
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Traffic
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 2:52:57 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Thieneman (Cliff A.) admitted about 41 minutes into the 11-12-20 meeting that they don't know which sections will be developed first. So Thieneman and LD&T are agreeing to construction vehicles traffic (for 100 single family homes, 2 large buildings and 200 apartments) all on Watterson Trail. Construction traffic will be increased on the 2 lane narrow Nachand Lane also. Everyone needs to know, including the KYTC, that this will lead to traffic congestion along Watterson Trail, especially at the Hurstbourne Lane intersection. When will the city begin improvements along Watterson Trail? Will improvements be started the same time construction vehicles are using this area?

How much of the Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Parkway J turn intersection improvements will Thieneman pay for? Will Thieneman pay 100% in these 2 areas since it is Hurstbourne Commons traffic driving these road reconstructions?

Page 11 of the Zimmerman original traffic study has 49 cars turning left at Wattbourne (Watterbourne) Lane and 0 cars turning left at (Meijer) Hurstbourne Crossing Drive onto Hurstbourne Parkway. The new October 22 traffic study now has 0 cars turning left at Wattbourne Lane and 25 cars turning left at (Meijer) Hurstbourne Crossings Drive. There is no reason why 24 cars from Hurstbourne Commons entrance would turn left onto Watterson Trail. 49 cars would turn left at the (Meijer) Hurstbourne Crossings Drive. All parties seem to have agreed to this route and increased volume of future traffic.

Hurstbourne Parkway has a left turn now between the Meijer gas station and the car wash at Wattbourne Lane. Zimmerman has it spelled incorrectly as Watterbourne. What will a future J hook intersection do?

Can you explain what a J Turn Intersection will look like? Hurstbourne Lane in front of the Buca di Beppo today looks like an extended left hand turning lane. Please explain the difference. A J turn intersection looks like a U turn.

Page 18 of the October 22 traffic study has a new Figure 7 for the "PM Peak Hour Site Trips for site up to 199 Apartments". Could you explain what this is describing?

There is a LD&T file titled "KYTC concept approval 102020.pdf". It was 3 emails between KYTC (Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Department of Highways) and Thieneman's Land Design & Development.

"ANY connection" is mentioned in the KYTC Concept Approval. Is a gravel road from Hurstbourne Commons through the Meijer property considered ANY connection?

Does the public have access to the "attached exhibit drawing" that Kevin Young (Land Design & Development) mentions in his October 13 email?

Thank you,
Nancy Willenbrink

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Kathy Tieskotter; Vicki Queenan; David Loran; Rudgehurst.Homes@msbets
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Night Meeting
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 2:57:29 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott,

There are major changes to the Hurstbourne Commons development that the public has not been made aware of. Information needs to be shared and made available to the public before any virtual meeting. Remember also that not everyone has access to a computer.

If there is no physical night hearing the public should still have physical access to the drawings of future road improvements at Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Parkway and all Hurstbourne Commons plans.

I want to formally request access to these drawings at the Jeffersonian or any other suitable location if a virtual public meeting takes the place of the physical night hearing

Thank you,
Nancy Willenbrink

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Brown, Jeffrey E; Harrington, Scott; Kathy Tieskotter; Vicki Queenan; David Loran; Rudgehurst.Homes@msbets
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Watterson Heights & Brody Ln
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 3:02:25 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

40 minutes into the 11-12-20 meeting Cliff A (Thieneman's lawyer) says that it is a "good result". The route of future increase traffic through Watterson Heights (and Brody Lane) is a good result for Thieneman, not the residents. Cliff never answered Kathy T's safety concerns about no sidewalks and that the residents pay for any street lighting today in that area. Can or will Thieneman or the city pay for sidewalks, street lighting or speed bumps?

Regardless of what the Zimmerman traffic study shows there is nothing to stop large amounts of future traffic on Brody Lane and the streets of Watterson Heights. Could there be a 1 lane fire lane in the future? Can this restriction be determined now and shared with the home owners?

What is the penalty when construction traffic is found on Brody Lane or on any Watterson Heights streets? Who will need to be contacted?

What is the penalty if Thieneman doesn't fulfill its binding element agreements?

How much is the MSD sewer bond?

Nancy Willenbrink

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
Subject: Fire lane on Brody
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 1:46:00 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Here is the response from DPW:

"We typically defer to the fire department that serves the area to determine if a fire lane is warranted. If the fire department determines that the fire lane parking restriction is warranted, we would install the parking restriction signs."

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Develop Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning/design>



From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Brown, Jeffrey E
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Kathy Tieskotter; Vicki Queenan; David Loran
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Traffic
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 3:51:00 PM

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 2:53 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Brown, Jeffrey E <Jeffrey.Brown@louisvilleky.gov>; Kenny.Carrico@ky.gov
Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; Kathy Tieskotter <ktieskotter@gmail.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Traffic

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Thieneman (Cliff A.) admitted about 41 minutes into the 11-12-20 meeting that they don't know which sections will be developed first. So Thieneman and LD&T are agreeing to construction vehicles traffic (for 100 single family homes, 2 large buildings and 200 apartments) all on Watterson Trail. Construction traffic will be increased on the 2 lane narrow Nachand Lane also. Everyone needs to know, including the KYTC, that this will lead to traffic congestion along Watterson Trail, especially at the Hurstbourne Lane intersection. When will the city begin improvements along Watterson Trail? Will improvements be started the same time construction vehicles are using this area?

The developer is responsible for improvements along Watterson Trail. Unless the improvements are tied to a threshold of permits which they are not in this case, the improvements would be made during road work and infrastructure.

How much of the Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Parkway J turn intersection improvements will Thieneman pay for? Will Thieneman pay 100% in these 2 areas since it is Hurstbourne Commons traffic driving these road reconstructions?

The developer will work in coordination with KYTC on responsibilities for improvements.

Page 11 of the Zimmerman original traffic study has 49 cars turning left at Wattbourne (Watterbourne) Lane and 0 cars turning left at (Meijer) Hurstbourne Crossing Drive onto Hurstbourne Parkway. The new October 22 traffic study now has 0 cars turning left at Wattbourne Lane and 25 cars turning left at (Meijer)

Hurstbourne Crossings Drive. There is no reason why 24 cars from Hurstbourne Commons entrance would turn left onto Watterson Trail. 49 cars would turn left at the (Meijer) Hurstbourne Crossings Drive. All parties seem to have agreed to this route and increased volume of future traffic.

Hurstbourne Parkway has a left turn now between the Meijer gas station and the car wash at Wattbourne Lane. Zimmerman has it spelled incorrectly as Watterbourne. What will a future J hook intersection do?

The example that was provided was the Buca di Beppo's location on Hurstbourne Parkway. Final design will be approved by KYTC.

Can you explain what a J Turn Intersection will look like? Hurstbourne Lane in front of the Buca di Beppo today looks like an extended left hand turning lane. Please explain the difference. A J turn intersection looks like a U turn.

Page 18 of the October 22 traffic study has a new Figure 7 for the "PM Peak Hour Site Trips for site up to 199 Apartments". Could you explain what this is describing?

There is a LD&T file titled "KYTC concept approval 102020 pd". It was 3 emails between KYTC (Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Department of Highways) and Thieneman's Land Design & Development.

"ANY connection" is mentioned in the KYTC Concept Approval. Is a gravel road from Hurstbourne Commons through the Meijer property considered ANY connection?

This may need further discussion.

Does the public have access to the "attached exhibit drawing" that Kevin Young (Land Design & Development) mentions in his October 13 email?

That reference sounds like the Rodway concept exhibit that was provided.

Thank you,
Nancy Willenbrink

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
CC: Brown, Jeffrey E.; Harrington, Scott; Kathy Tieskotter; Vicki Queenan; David Loran; Ridgehurst Homeowners
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Watterson Heights & Brody Ln
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 3:58:00 PM

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 3:07 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Brown, Jeffrey E <Jeffrey.Brown@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; Kathy Tieskotter <ktieskotter@gmail.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Watterson Heights & Brody Ln

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

40 minutes into the 11-12-20 meeting Cliff A (Thieneman's lawyer) says that it is a "good result". The route of future increase traffic through Watterson Heights (and Brody Lane) is a good result for Thieneman, not the residents. Cliff never answered Kathy T's safety concerns about no sidewalks and that the residents pay for any street lighting today in that area. Can or will Thieneman or the city pay for sidewalks, street lighting or speed bumps?

The developer will only be responsible for on-site improvement, including frontage improvements (sidewalks, roadways, turn lanes, street trees).

Regardless of what the Zimmerman traffic study shows there is nothing to stop large amounts of future traffic on Brody Lane and the streets of Watterson Heights. Could there be a 1 lane fire lane in the future? Can this restriction be determined now and shared with the home owners?

The fire district has jurisdiction. If they determine that a fire lane is warranted then DPW will install signs.

What is the penalty when construction traffic is found on Brody Lane or on any Watterson Heights

streets? Who will need to be contacted?

Binding elements are citizen driven. If a binding elements is approved restricting construction traffic, a citizen should document that violation and report to 311. This will be difficult to enforce through a site visit so that is why I recommend the citizen document the violation. Code enforcement will then issue a notice of violation to take corrective action. In the event this becomes a significant issue, further enforcement in the form of monetary penalty could be required. The penalty/violation can be appealed to the Planning Commission.

What is the penalty if Thieneman doesn't fulfill its binding element agreements?

How much is the MSD sewer bond?

Nancy Willenbrink

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
CC: Harrington, Scott; Kathy Tieskotter; Vicki Queenan; David Loran; Ridgehurst Homeowners
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Night Meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 4:01:00 PM

PO's can arrange for anyone to visit our office in-person to view files. I have requested that meeting material be present in hard copy at the in-person location.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 2:57 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; Kathy Tieskotter <ktieskotter@gmail.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Night Meeting

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott,

There are major changes to the Hurstbourne Commons development that the public has not been made aware of. Information needs to be shared and made available to the public before any virtual meeting. Remember also that not everyone has access to a computer.

If there is no physical night hearing the public should still have physical access to the drawings of future road improvements at Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Parkway and all Hurstbourne Commons plans.

I want to formally request access to these drawings at the Jeffersonian or any other suitable location if a virtual public meeting takes the place of the physical night hearing.

Thank you,
Nancy Willenbrink

From: Kathy Tieskotter
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: n.rjwillen@louisville.gov; Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Vicki Owens; David Loran; Budak, Kristi; Cindy Morrison; Stan Graham
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - Watterson Heights Safety Issues
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 7:21:55 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,
 I'm Kathy Tieskotter. I live at 4120 Wenwood Drive in the Watterson Heights neighborhood. I serve as the Secretary for the Watterson Heights Neighborhood Association (WHNA) and am also a member of the Board of Directors. Watterson Heights does not have a HOA, just a Neighborhood Association. I'm writing to express concerns of the majority of the homeowners in the neighborhood related to rezoning for the proposed Hurstbourne Commons development, specifically opposition to the large number of apartments in the proposal.

There is a significant safety issue posed by the traffic that will result from the density of the planned apartments combined with the single-family and office plans. Watterson Heights does not have any sidewalks. Individual homeowners have to request and pay for installation of streetlights, and also pay the monthly electric bill, so there are only a couple of streetlights in the entire neighborhood.

Brownwood will be a main entrance/exit road to/from Hurstbourne Commons. To get to Brownwood from Watterson Trail, traffic will need to take Whitfield Dr. to Roswell Way to Wenwood Dr. to Brownwood. The only other way to get to Brownwood from Watterson Trail is via Nachand Ln. to Roswell Way to Wenwood Dr. to Brownwood. These streets cut through most of Watterson Heights. I'm not sure if the traffic study included these streets, but the impact of the traffic, especially from the apartments, is a serious safety issue.

I don't believe these issues have been addressed by the developer in any of the Land Development & Transportation Dept. meetings. Please include these concerns on the agenda for the Planning Commission meeting on December 3, 2020.

We need to know if sidewalks and streetlights will be installed in Watterson Heights, and if so, who will pay for the on-going sidewalk maintenance and electric usage cost. If not, what will be done to ensure the safety of the residents of Watterson Heights?

Thank you.

Kathy Tieskotter
 ktieskotter@gmail.com
 Landline phone: 502-493-8088

From: davidloran@ups.com
To: Dock, Joel; n.rjwillen@louisville.gov
Cc: david@louisville.gov
Subject: Binding Element request, second request
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:26:19 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
 I do not see record of binding element request in your documentation.

I have formerly asked for a Binding Element prior, several months ago, and asking again to be added to official record:

Binding Element: Whitfield Drive will not connect from Hurstbourne Commons development to Watterson Trail or from any different/new/other owners thereafter, in perpetuity.

Thank you,

David Loran
 Watterson Heights Neighborhood

From: Dock, Joel
To: davidloran@ups.com; david@louisville.gov
Cc: david@louisville.gov
Subject: RE: Rezoning request incorrect Tract 2, and Parking spaces; 20-ZONE-0020, Tract 1 and 2
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 2:04:16 PM
Attachments: image001.png
 image002.png

We typically request that the minimum district to allow for the proposed use is requested. However, the applicant can move forward with whatever zone they chose and our office will review the appropriateness of that zone.

The parking calculations appear to be accurate on both tracts.

Parking is not restrictive, meaning any passenger vehicle (tenant, employee, customer, visitor) may use spaces.

For multifamily we do not ask about bedrooms.

Underground parking is proposed. It does not impact the proposed height.

Tract 1 parking:

PARKING REQUIRED	=	MIN.	MAX.
100 UNITS/0.5 SPACES MIN.	=	50 SP	
100 UNITS/1.5 SPACES MAX.	=		150 SP
TOTAL PARKING PROVIDED	=	141 SPACES (5 HC SP INCLUDED)	

Tract 2 parking:

PARKING REQUIRED	=	MIN.	MAX.
60 UNITS/1.5 SPACES MIN.	=	90 SP	
60 UNITS/3 SPACES MAX.	=		180 SP
PARKING PROVIDED	=	48 SPACES	
SURFACE PARKING	=	50 SPACES	
UNDERGROUND PARKING	=	0 SPACES	
TOTAL PARKING PROVIDED	=	98 SPACES (2 HC SP INCLUDED)	

Joel P. Dock, AICP
 Planner II
 Planning & Design Services
 502-574-5860

From: davidloran@ups.com <davidloran@ups.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:49 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>; n.rjwillen@bellsouth.net
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: Rezoning request incorrect Tract 2, and Parking spaces; 20-ZONE-0020, Tract 1 and 2

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
 For the record.

Tract 2 Rezoning request is incorrect. If there are no offices being built there is not any justification for this to be in the planning. I formerly request 20-ZONE-0020_Plan_110220.pdf be redrawn to correctly reflect what is planned to be developed on Tract 2. I formerly request the designation to OR-1 to immediately be denied for Tract 2 this development.

Can you explain why the justification for Tract 2 (according to 20-ZONE-0020_Plan_110220.pdf) for the developer to request R-4 to OR-1? This should be a R6 request not OR-1, there is no explanation for this Office rezoning when the plan calls for apartments to be built on the site of Tract 2.

Can you please clarify the amount of parking spaces that are planned for Tract 1 and 2 of 20-ZONE-0020 proposed development?

Tract 1:
 How many total spaces?
 Is the parking behind the building mandatory for employees only?
 Are residents allowed to have personal vehicles?

Tract 2:
 Is there underground parking?
 How many spaces proposed?
 How many spaces outside the apartments on ground level?
 Are these one bedroom, two bedroom units?
 For the city of Louisville what is the formula for parking spaces/occupancy?
 If there is indeed underground parking, does this change the height of 3 story building?
 What is the height of this building going to be?

Thank you,

David Loran
 Watterson Heights Neighborhood
 7803 Whitfield Drive

Louisville, KY 40218
502-767-9010

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Dock, Joel; Harrington, Scott; Nancy & Zack Wilenbank; charleskay2@juno.com; Kathy Tieskotter; David Loran; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons Variance Code Request for Tract 3 from LDC, section 5.3.1.C.4
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 2:41:37 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel Dock,

I would like to formally request a denial of the following variance code requested by RJ Thieneman:

Variance from LDC, section 5.3.1.C.4 to allow for proposed structures on Tract 3 to exceed the maximum height of 35' and be 42' in height.

This variance would adversely affect the essential character of the general vicinity of ranch and 2 story houses.

The proposed height of three stories would not be in accordance with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. There are no other three story buildings with a height of 42' in this residential area. This excessive building height may be appropriate if built on the other side of Hurstbourne Parkway.

There are 10 acres of undeveloped land at the proposed new entrance of Hurstbourne Commons at Watterson Trail. The neighborhood does not need to set a precedent with tall buildings in this area.

There is no special circumstance for this variance request. The applicant has admitted they want the variance in order to achieve more profit.

In summary, granting this variance would be a detriment to all the one and two story homes in this area.

Thank you,

Vicki Queenan

3807 Brody Lane

From: dloran@ups.com
To: Dock, Joel <davidro@bellsouth.net>
Cc: davidlorandesign.com; thekottier@gmail.com; qucenanvicki@gmail.com; cmorris@bellsouth.net; jharrington19@yahoo.com; shamp@kvc.com; Harrington, Scott
Subject: RE: Rezoning request incorrect Tract 2, and Parking spaces; 20-ZONE-0020, Binding elements request
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 3:16:34 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png

502-767-9010

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Loran David [FKX9HMD] <dloran@ups.com>; njwillen@bellsouth.net
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Rezoning request incorrect Tract 2, and Parking spaces; 20-ZONE-0020, Tract 1 and 2

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Joel,

Has your office officially reviewed and approved the appropriateness of the zoning for Tract 2 as OR-17 Is there still a chance for denial of this particular rezoning request for OR-1 by your group?

We typically request that the minimum district to allow for the proposed use is requested. However, the applicant can move forward with whatever zone they chose and our office will review the appropriateness of that zone.

I also requested a combination 6' shadowbox fence and landscaping along Tract 1 and 2. I believe you said you would contact the Atty for developer, Clifford Ashburner. Is this correct? Is this request in the official record?

The parking calculations appear to be accurate on both tracts.

Please add it to official record and also request more specifically, landscaping with a berm built up and then a fence on the other side of the berm for Tract 1 and 2.

Parking is not restrictive; meaning any passenger vehicle (tenant, employee, customer, visitor) may use spaces.

I disagree with connecting a R4 neighborhood to a potential rezoning R6 apartments and townhomes. Watterson Heights was originally developed and designed to connect with another R4 neighborhood. I am in agreement with Kathy Tieskotter, Board of Directors, Watterson Heights Neighborhood Association, others in Watterson Heights neighborhood and those particularly who live on Brownwood Dr, that connecting to a R6 high density development is dangerous to those who live in Watterson Heights. This will be a cut-through for motorists, who not only live in Tract 3 but also for the entire proposed development of 4 tracts of land and will deeply impact the safety of pedestrians and places them in danger because of lack of proper street lights and sidewalks.

For multifamily we do not ask about bedrooms.

I officially ask to place in record for request that if rezoning and connection to Brownwood is approved that the developer will provide the installation of sidewalks and lights for the all Watterson Heights streets. Also request a binding element that, in perpetuity, maintenance of sidewalks and payment for street lights for Watterson Heights be provided for by developer or any future owners of Hurstbourne Commons or under any other given name.

Underground parking is proposed. It does not impact the proposed height.

Thank you,
David Loran
Watterson Heights
7803 Whitfield Dr.
Louisville, KY 40218

Tract 1 parking:

	MIN	MAX
PARKING REQUIRED	=	50 SP
100 UNITS/0.5 SPACES MIN.	=	150 SP
100 UNITS/1.5 SPACES MAX.	=	
TOTAL PARKING PROVIDED	=	141 SPACES (5 HC SP INCLUDED)

Tract 2 parking:

	MIN	MAX
PARKING REQUIRED	=	90 SP
60 UNITS/1.5 SPACES MIN	=	180 SP
60 UNITS/3 SPACES MAX	=	
PARKING PROVIDED	=	48 SPACES
SURFACE PARKING	=	50 SPACES
UNDERGROUND PARKING	=	
TOTAL PARKING PROVIDED	=	98 SPACES (2 HC SP INCLUDED)

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: joel.p.dock@louisvilleky.gov <joel.p.dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:49 PM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.p.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; n.williams@bellsouth.net
Cc: bjay@louisvilleky.gov
Subject: Rezoning request incorrect Tract 2, and Parking spaces; 20-ZONE-0020, Tract 1 and 2

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
For the record,

Tract 2 Rezoning request is incorrect. If there are not offices being built there is not any justification for this to be in the planning. I formerly request 20-ZONE-0020_Plan_110220.pdf be redrawn to correctly reflect what is planned to be developed on Tract 2. I formerly request the designation to OR-1 to immediately be denied for Tract 2 this development.

Can you explain why the justification for Tract 2 (according to 20-ZONE-0020_Plan_110220.pdf) for the developer to request R-4 to OR-1? This should be a R6 request not OR-1, there is no explanation for this Office rezoning when the plan calls for apartments to be built on the site of Tract 2.

Can you please clarify the amount of parking spaces that are planned for Tract 1 and 2 of 20-ZONE-0020 proposed development?

Tract 1:
How many total spaces?
Is the parking behind the building mandatory for employees only?
Are residents allowed to have personal vehicles?

Tract 2:
Is there underground parking?
How many spaces proposed?
How many spaces outside the apartments on ground level?
Are these one bedroom, two bedroom units?
For the city of Louisville what is the formula for parking spaces/occupancy?
If there is indeed underground parking, does this change the height of 3 story building?

From: Nancy B. Wink
To: Dock, Joel; Brown, Jeffrey E.; kenny.sampson@louisvilleky.gov; harrington.scott@louisvilleky.gov
Cc: nancy.williams@bellsouth.net; bjay@louisvilleky.gov; brad.leray@louisvilleky.gov; elizabeth.hornemont@louisvilleky.gov
Subject: 20-Zone-0020-Hurstbourne Commons - Developments & Traffic
Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 5:58:52 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, Jeffrey, Kenny and Scott,

The following are 6 future developments which will impact one of the busiest roads (Bardstown) and intersections (Bardstown at Hurstbourne) in Louisville. There may be other developments in this area I'm not aware of. This additional traffic will greatly impact Bardstown Rd and Hurstbourne Parkway and surrounding areas

Cayman Investments at 5875 S Hurstbourne Pkwy allows for up to 360 dwellings. This is in Council District 23 and 24 which has James Peden and Madonna Flood as councilpersons

KFS at 4805 (4809, 4811, 4813, 4801 and 4807) Bardstown Rd wants rezoning for a 348 units apartment complex across 15 3-story buildings on 18 acres. This is in the area of South Wattersson Trail near the existing Bardstown Tire store. This is in Council District 22 which has Robin Engel as the councilperson

Vogi Retail at 4310 - 4318 Bardstown Rd and 4403 - 4405 Fegenbush Ln will be between the McDonalds and Resthaven Cemetery. 20-Zone-0006 will be 37,000 square feet of commercial retail center, a medical office building, 2 restaurants, a bank and a gas station. This is in Council District 2 which has Barbara Shanklin as the councilperson. No number of units have been provided.

Star Hill at 6500 S Hurstbourne Pkwy and 5800 S Wattersson Trail will be on both sides of the section of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 10-Zone-0098 proposes a mix of residential and commercial uses on 35 acres, including multiple apartment complexes, retail users and banks. It is in district 24 which is Madonna Flood. No number of units have been provided.

Highgates at 6106 S Wattersson Trail is south of the section of Hurstbourne Pkwy. 20-Zone-0074 will have 240 apartments and 67 single family residential lots. It is in district 24 and 23 which is James Peden.

Hurstbourne Corporate at 7000 Ridge Creek Rd (6601 Sunnyhill Rd) and 7191 Hurstbourne Pkwy is trying to rezone 16 acres. 19-Zone-1029 proposes 208 apartment units. It is in district 2 and 24.

4 out of 6 developments mentioned above have 1223 housing units with some development numbers not identified yet. The first one Caymen is the largest at 360 units. This is in addition to the 700 housing units Hurstbourne Commons will generate. 500 are apartments. Hurstbourne Commons is the largest development with 700 units in the area. Combined with what is mentioned above, this makes at least 2,000 new units and the increased traffic associated with them.

This is another illustration of why Hurstbourne Commons should not be approved as it is now planned.

Nancy Wink

What is the height of this building going to be?

Thank you,

David Loran
Wattersson Heights Neighborhood
7803 Whitfield Drive
Louisville, KY 40218
502-767-9010

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: David Dock
To: bjay@louisvilleky.gov; harrington.scott@louisvilleky.gov; joel.p.dock@louisvilleky.gov
Cc: nancy.williams@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 7:03:55 AM

Good Morning Mr. Loran,

Do you have some time today when you would be available for a phone call?

Thanks,
Brian Davis

Brian Davis, AICP
Planning Manager
Planning & Design Services
(502) 574-5160
brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov

From: dloran@louisvilleky.gov
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 2:29 PM
To: Davis, Brian <brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov>; harrington.scott@louisvilleky.gov; Dock, Joel <joel.p.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; n.williams@bellsouth.net; kieskotter@gmail.com
Cc: stpm@louisvilleky.gov
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Brian,

Thank you for your reply.

The health at work document for venues and event spaces from the state website, see attached, are **REQUIREMENTS** and not recommendations.

Concerns regarding scheduled night hearing meeting:

- The **Health at Work** document guidelines for venues and event spaces that Planning and Design Services is adhering to is outdated from July 2020, and doesn't represent the current state of COVID-19 spread surge results from holidays through **November 2020, December 2020 and January 2021.**
- **Concerns** that Planning and Design Services cannot accommodate and meet the requirements for a safe meeting.
- The **high positivity rate of COVID-19 in Louisville** and state (Red Zone level) last week was 11.66% positivity rate, earlier this week was 12.22% and **today 01/15/21 the positivity rate is 12.34%**
- The **majority of people** who signed the request for night hearing petition are in the **high-risk category for COVID-19 due to their age.**
- **Citizens** who signed night hearing petition, again, are older people who have **limited technology access.**
- Alternative to citizens with limited technology access is to go to downtown Louisville to a 5th Street office. **Citizens are concerned with current high crime rate and safety in the downtown area.**
- Webex technology for virtual meetings is not reliable and stable software. **Webex sound and video quality is not optimal, faulty and poor.**
- Due to **lack of vaccination, a large group of citizens has lost the opportunity to gather in-person and to present in front of a full committee.**
- The in-person meeting will be with **one committee member** and the original intent of in-person meeting has lost its

Integrity.

I am requesting that the in-person night hearing meeting be postponed, at the most until the COVID-19 vaccine is readily available to all in the community or at the very least until **Tier One Group C** has been scheduled or had an opportunity to be vaccinated. By this time the surge from the holidays should subside and the risk factor should be diminished.

Please consider and put this scenario into perspective, if one person perished due to contracting COVID-19 because they attended a rezoning public meeting scheduled by Planning and Design Services versus simply making a choice to delay the meeting for a short time, wouldn't the decision be one that says, **"yes, let's wait until some of our citizens have had opportunity to vaccinate for COVID-19."** Unfortunately, this is not an "imaginary scenario" and it's our current reality.

I have contacted the Mayor's office to report opposition to the scheduled in-person meeting as a danger to our citizens and community at large. It is my opinion that it is irresponsible to hold an in-person meeting at this time with the health risk and safety concerns. I believe this to be the opinion of many who are opposed for a night hearing meeting on Monday, February 22 at 6:30 PM. I have texted Bob Theineman to see if he will call to discuss postponement of the meeting. We have spoken to one another at the initial public meetings and on the phone last year after the pandemic began.

Regards,

David Loran
Vice President, Watterson Height Neighborhood Association
7803 Whitefield Dr., Louisville, KY 40218
502.767.9010

From: Davis, Brian [mailto:brian.davis@louisville.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 9:17 AM
To: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>; Loran David [HX39HME] <dloran@ups.com>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; Powell, Stephen [mailto:stephen.powell@louisville.gov]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night hearing

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

I'll preface this email by saying those are recommendations not requirements

We will continue to monitor the COVID situation and any requirements handed down by local, state and federal agencies. At this point, we are planning to conduct the meeting in compliance with the Kentucky healthy at Work recommendations for venues and meeting spaces. Anyone who is able to tag into the meeting online via Webex is encouraged to do so.

Thanks,
Brian

Brian Davis, AICP
Planning Manager
Planning & Design Services
(502) 574-5160
brian.davis@louisville.gov

From: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 9:15 AM
To: Brian Davis [mailto:brian.davis@louisville.gov]; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; Powell, Stephen [mailto:stephen.powell@louisville.gov]; Scott, David, Brian <dbscott@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

Brian or Joel - Would you please answer the question below?

Scott

From: Brian Davis [mailto:brian.davis@louisville.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; Powell, Stephen [mailto:stephen.powell@louisville.gov]
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Night hearing

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,
What is the timeframe when the night hearing meeting will be cancelled and rescheduled if we are still in the red zone?

Our current recommendations from the Governor's Office:

RED ZONE REDUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Employers allow employees to **work from home** when possible
- Non-critical **Government offices to operate virtually**
- **Reduce in-person shopping** order online or curbside pickup
- **Order take-out** avoid dining in restaurants or bars
- **Propose businesses that follow and enforce mask mandate and other guidelines**
- **Reschedule, postpone or cancel public and private events**
- **Do not host or attend gatherings of any size**
- **Avoid non-essential activities** outside of your home
- **Reduce overall activity and contacts** of your **existing guidance** including 10 steps to defeat COVID-19

KYCOVID19.KY.GOV

Thank you,

David Loran
Company Manuals Editor
Technical Publications
UPS Airlines
502.359.7980
dloran@ups.com

The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the individual named. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or take any action in reliance of the contents of this information. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or take any action in reliance of the contents of this information. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or take any action in reliance of the contents of this information. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or take any action in reliance of the contents of this information.

From: Brian Davis
To: scott.harrington@louisville.gov; Dock, Joel; davidbrian@louisville.gov; brian.davis@louisville.gov
Cc: stephen@psl.com; Lou Lohy
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night hearing
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 4:20:28 PM

Good Afternoon,

Just following up to some of the items in this email and the phone conversation I just had with Mr. Loran.

The in-person venue for this meeting is The Jeffersonian, 1061 Taylorville Road, Jeffersonton, KY (not our regular downtown meeting location). It is a large venue operated by the city of Jeffersonton. The venue setup will have seats seven feet or center, for a total of 115 seats at the in-person venue (I can forward you the seating diagram if you wish). We are aware the Healthy at Work standards are requirements, which is why we have been careful with the selection of the in-person venue for the proposed public hearing.

Webex is the only online meeting software available for our use as authorized by Louisville Metro IT. There is a possibility we could stream the meeting on Facebook Live. People who view the meeting in that capacity would not be able to speak, but it is another option for viewing/hearing the public hearing. I can explore that further if you'd like.

We are keeping a very close eye on what additional guidelines are being handed down at all levels of government. I think it will be interesting to see what federal guidelines may come into play over the next few weeks.

I will also reach out to the Planning Commission chair to see what factors she would like us to monitor as we get closer to the public hearing date.

If anyone has any questions or comments feel free to reach out to me.

Thanks,
Brian Davis

Brian Davis, AICP
Planning Manager
Planning & Design Services
(502) 574-5160
brian.davis@louisville.gov

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 2:28 PM
To: Davis, Brian <Brian.Davis@louisville.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisville.gov>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisville.gov>; njw1en@bellsouth.net; ktlesletter@gmail.com
Cc: stephen@psl.com
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Brian,

Thank you for your reply.

The Healthy at Work document for venues and event spaces from the state website, see attached, are **REQUIREMENTS** and not recommendations.

Concerns regarding scheduled night hearing meeting:

- The **Healthy at Work document guidelines** for venues and event spaces that Planning and Design Services is adhering to is **outdated from July 2020**, and doesn't represent the current state of **COVID-19 spread surge** results from holidays through **November 2020, December 2020 and January 2021**.
- Concerns that Planning and Design Services cannot accommodate and meet the requirements for a safe meeting.
- The **high positivity rate of COVID-19 in Louisville** and state (Red Zone level) last week was 11.66% positivity rate, earlier this week was 12.22% and **today 01/15/21 the positivity rate is 12.34%**
- The **majority of people** who signed the request for night hearing petition are in the **high-risk category for COVID-19 due to their age**.
- Citizens** who signed night hearing petition, again, are older people who have **limited technology access**.
- Alternative to obtain with limited technology access is to go to downtown Louisville to a 5th Street office. **Citizens are concerned with current high crime rate and safety in the downtown area**.
- Webex technology for virtual meetings is not reliable and stable software. **Webex sound and video quality is not optimal, faulty and poor**.
- Due to **lack of vaccination, a large group of citizens has lost the opportunity to gather in-person and to present in front of a full committee**.
- The in-person meeting will be with **one committee member** and the original **intent of in-person meeting has lost its integrity**.

I am requesting that the in-person night hearing meeting be postponed, at the most until the COVID-19 vaccine is readily available to all in the community or at the very least until **Tier One Group C** has been scheduled or had an opportunity to be vaccinated. By this time the surge from the holidays should subside and the risk factors should be diminished.

Please consider and put this scenario into perspective, if one person perished due to contracting COVID-19 because they attended a rezoning public meeting scheduled by Planning and Design Services versus simply making a choice to delay the meeting for a short time, wouldn't the position be one that says, **"yes, let's wait until some of our citizens have had opportunity to vaccinate for COVID-19,"** unfortunately, this is not an imaginary scenario and is our current reality.

I have contacted the Mayor's office to report opposition to the scheduled in-person meeting as a danger to our citizens and community at large. It is my opinion that it is irresponsible to hold an in-person meeting at this time with the health risk and safety concerns. I believe this to be the opinion of many who are opposed for a night hearing meeting on Monday, February 22 at 6:30 PM. I have texted Bob Theriault to see if he will talk to discuss postponement of the meeting. We have spoken to one another at the initial public meetings and on the phone last year after the pandemic began.

Regards,

David Loran
Vice President, Watterson Height Neighborhood Association
7803 Whitfield Dr., Louisville, KY 40218
502.767.9010

From: David, Brian <brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 9:17 AM
To: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David (FKX9HMAD) <dloran@wattersonheight.org>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

I'd preface the email by saying these are recommendations, not requirements.

We will continue to monitor the COVID situation and any requirements handed down by local, state and federal agencies. At this point, we are planning to conduct the meeting in compliance with the Kentucky Healthy at Work recommendations for venues

and meeting spaces. Anyone who is able to log into the meeting online via Webex is encouraged to do so.

Thanks,
Brian

Brian Davis, AICP
Planning Manager
Planning & Design Services
(502) 574-5160
brian.davis@louisvilleky.gov

From: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 9:15 AM
To: Watterson Height Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David, Brian <dloran@wattersonheight.org>
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

Brian or Joel - Would you please answer the question below?

Scott

From: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David, Brian <dloran@wattersonheight.org>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Night Hearing

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,
What is the timeframe when the night hearing meeting will be canceled and rescheduled if we are still in the red zone?

Our current recommendations from the Governor's Office:

RED ZONE REDUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Employers allow employees to **work from home** when possible
- Non-essential **Government offices to operate virtually**
- **Reduce in-person shopping** - order online or curbside pickup
- **Order take-out** - avoid dining in restaurants or bars
- **Encourage businesses that follow and enforce mask mandate and other guidelines**
- **Reschedule, postpone or cancel public and private events**
- **Do not host or attend gatherings of any size**
- **Avoid non-essential activities** outside of your home
- **Reduce overall activity and contacts, and follow existing guidance**, including 10 steps to defeat COVID-19

KYCOVID19.KY.GOV LOUISVILLE KENTUCKY

Thank you,

David Loran
Company Manuals Editor
Technical Publications
UPS Airlines
502.559.7980
dloran@wattersonheight.org

This information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake.

From: Dan Smith
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: David Loran
Subject: Proposed zoning changes at 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 2:27:41 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a nearby resident of the proposed Hurstbourne Commons development, I wish to voice my opposition to the proposed zoning changes from R4 to OR-1 in tracts one and two. The possibility of multi-story offices being added to the neighbor is not consistent with the hundreds of single family homes in the neighborhood. There are already many unused office spaces in the nearby areas of Hurstbourne Lane, Bardstown Road, Breckenridge Lane and Hikes Point, to name just a few. I am also concerned about increased traffic congestion in an area that already sees a high volume of traffic throughout the day, and for the safety of our neighborhood children on the sidewalks and streets that have no existing sidewalks.

I am very much in favor of single family homes and keeping the R4 zoning designation, matching the surrounding neighborhoods. Thank you.

Dan Smith
4002 Bluestem Lane
Louisville, KY 40218
dls1251@gmail.com

From: Dock, Joel
To: Vicki Queenan
Subject: RE: Case 20ZONE0020 known as Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Monday, May 11, 2020 9:00:00 AM

Vicki,
The zoning has not been approved or docketing for a public meeting.

Brody Lane is a Public Road; therefore, it can be used by the public and for the public to connect as it was provided as the public roadway connection for future development. The comprehensive plan calls for access to higher density development to be obtained primarily from areas of similar intensity. This point of access would be S.Watterson Trail and ideally the Meijer access road but that connection is uncertain at this time.

The development plan shows connections to Watterson Trail, Brody, Brownwood, and Meijer. The connectivity to Meijer has not been resolved. I have been provided no additional information on the Meijer connection.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Case 20ZONE0020 known as Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,

I live on Brody Lane the proposed street that will be one of the access points for the new "Hurstbourne Commons".
I have been informed many times that Brody was always aligned to be an access street. I feel that when Brody was listed as the covenant access it was for a neighborhood of homes not a mini community which is being built called "Hurstbourne Commons".

Can you tell me has there been any updates on this case?
Zoning approved?
Are there still the same four accesses for "Hurstbourne Commons"?

From: Tina Hester
To: Dock, Joel
CC: Tina
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons concerns
Date: Thursday, January 30, 2020 4:51:49 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,
We attended the meeting last night and still have many concerns about the development.
Drainage is the biggest concern for those of us that are still on septic tanks. If you take away a natural area that is used as drainage and replace it with concrete what will happen to our property? The answer we got last night was it's your problem. This is not our problem, we didn't create this problem. Yes you are creating the problem.
Traffic is the next issue. This area does not need any more traffic issues. We can barely turn left out of Whitfield now. Adding an entrance off of Watterson Trail to this just adds to the problem. You are asking for accidents to happen. We live here, we use these roads daily, we know the problems we already have. I have many concerns but what about the wildlife in the area? What happens to them? Just run away, find a new home, good luck crossing Hurstbourne and Watterson Trail. We do not need this in our area. It's all about the almighty buck, just because the Thieneman's have the bucks doesn't make it right. Please help us fight this.
Thank you

Tina Hester

There is no access going through Meijer, has Meijer approved that?

--
Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Ridgehurst Subdivision
502-296-4015

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nick Wideman
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, January 31, 2020 8:24:00 AM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Your comments have been received, forwarded to the applicant, and incorporated into the record of the Planning Commission.

To receive electronic communications on this project please sign up for Louisville Metro CityDelivery at:

<https://public.usofeb.org/condat/courts/4103/LOUISVILLE/subscribe.htm>

With respect to the Brody Lane connection it is a required connection as it is a roadway stub. This connectivity is not subject to relief, unless there is a significant issue with constructability or it increases the classification of the roadway (Land Development Code, section 59.2.A.1.a.i). The legislative body (metro council) may approve an alternative plan for connectivity but at this point it is early in the process and a full review of the plan has not yet occurred.

Joel P. Dock
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: Nick Wideman [mailto:nwidem91@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 6:16 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Re: Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

safe

Hi Joel,

I have a comment for the record: I've been told by multiple people there are at least two Bald Eagles on the proposed property to be developed which need to be located and protected.

How can I stop Brody Ln. from going through into this new development? Is there someone I can contact or a petition I need to file?

Thank you,

Nick Wideman
502-298-2164

From: Cathy Heck
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: check1@twc.com
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2020 5:22:10 PM
Attachments: Memo to Joel Dock on Hurstbourne Commons concerns.docx

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I have attached a memo of my concerns regarding the proposed Hurstbourne Commons. I can be contacted as follows -

Cathy Heck
4110 Spring Park Ln.
Louisville KY 40218
check1@twc.com
502-493-1626

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Monday, February 17, 2020 2:30:22 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,

I am a residence at Ridgehurst Subdivision.

I would like to know if zoning is approved for Hurstbourne Commons and as they begin development, builders find that they have to blast to remove rock etc.

- Would our neighborhood be informed before blasting begins?
- Would the builders be responsible for cracks, settlement and or damage that may occur to our homes due to the blasting?

Thank You,

Vicki Queenan
502-495-6344

From: Dock, Joel
To: Vicki Queenan
Subject: RE: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:53:00 AM

State law sets out standards for blasting. I am not familiar with all of the requirements. I do know that adjoining residents have a responsibility in properly documenting the conditions prior to blasting. I can forward your questions to the applicant and see if a blasting element/land use restriction can be worked out in the form of a "pre-blast survey."

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2020 2:30 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,

I am a residence at Ridgehurst Subdivision.

I would like to know if zoning is approved for Hurstbourne Commons and as they begin development, builders find that they have to blast to remove rock etc.

- Would our neighborhood be informed before blasting begins?
- Would the builders be responsible for cracks, settlement and or damage that may occur to our homes due to the blasting?

Thank You,

Vicki Queenan
502-495-6344

From: Dock, Joel
To: Adam Embry
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:55:00 AM
Attachments: image003.png
image003.png

Good comments! I might suggest reaching out to the council person on side street speed humps. There are warrants and you've touched on those so I'm not sure what can be done but it's worth another conversation given potential new development.

The applicant will perform a traffic study and I will forward these comments to them for consideration.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development/Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5868
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: adam embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

From: Dock, Joel
To: Adam Embry, Clifford (Cliff) Ashburner, @DUS@SCORE.COVA
Subject: FW: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:55:00 AM

For your records, please consider this potential impact.

From: adam embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

859-699-6323

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

859-699-6323

From: Dock, Joel
To: adam.embry
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:42:00 AM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Adam,
I'll forward this to our Public Works folks as well to get some thoughts. Again, I'll also pass these comments along to the applicant.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development/Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: adam.embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:39 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Re: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Thank you for the response. I have had many pleasant conversations with Councilman Kramer and a number of other individuals over the past few years, all whom were helpful. The quick summary:

[image002.png](#) <image002.png>

From: adam.embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this side portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

- According to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and Ridgehurst Place (side portion) are technically two separate roads that just happen to have the exact same name
- Per the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Ridgehurst Place (side portion) would be required (among other things) to have an average volume of 300 cars per day, which it currently does not

The new development will unquestionably bring more traffic to this area, which is fine. I just want to make sure traffic deciding to bypass the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) is accounted for on the study. After speaking with representatives at the meeting, their assumption was any initial assessments for the traffic study would have only considered traffic on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and not have considered the traffic increase on Ridgehurst Place (side portion) from cars attempting to bypass the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion).

Currently cars already do this, bypassing the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and driving faster on Ridgehurst Place (side portion).

I'm not sure if factoring in the assumed traffic increase for Ridgehurst Place (side portion) would be projected to meet or exceed an average volume of 300 cars per day.

Adam Embry

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2020, at 9:55 AM, Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov> wrote:

Good comments! I might suggest reaching out to the council person on side street speed humps. There are warrants and you've touched on those so I'm not sure what can be done but its worth another conversation given potential new development.

The applicant will perform a traffic study and I will forward these comments to them for consideration.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development/Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>
<image001.png>

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

855-699-6323

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. If it is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it, if you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Brian
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 11:38:24 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I am Brian Goblen and live on 8207 Laurel Spring Dr, Louisville, KY 40299. I have attended both of the neighborhood meetings at Woodhaven and have made comments there. I wanted to ensure that my concerns are entered and addressed.

1. Minor concern - The road that is projected to come out opposite of Laurel Spring Drive on Watterson Trail will make it extremely difficult for residents form Laurel Spring drive and Walnut hills to turn left (south) on Watterson trail. We already have long wait times due to traffic during peak rush hour times. I expect this to be a safety concern with a substantial increase in accidents. Turning lanes and/or traffic light may be required.
2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern.
3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments, ... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems.

Please respond that you have received this email.

Thanks,
Brian Goblen

From: Dock, Joel
To: Brian
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 12:25:09 PM

MSD provided a couple responses in reed to your questions. Keep in mind that this project is in the early stages and has not been officially filed.

2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern. Detention will be provided so that the pre-developed flow rate will not be increased in the post-developed condition.
3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments, ... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems. We have requested a downstream facility capacity request for this site. We will evaluate the downstream sanitary capacity once they submit the DFO, to ensure the increase in sanitary flow will not cause downstream problems.

From: Brian <bg0454@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I am Brian Goblen and live on 8207 Laurel Spring Dr, Louisville, KY 40299. I have attended both of the neighborhood meetings at Woodhaven and have made comments there. I wanted to ensure that my concerns are entered and addressed.

1. Minor concern - The road that is projected to come out opposite of Laurel Spring Drive on Watterson Trail will make it extremely difficult for residents form Laurel Spring drive and Walnut hills

to turn left (south) on Watterson trail. We already have long wait times due to traffic during peak rush hour times. I expect this to be a safety concern with a substantial increase in accidents. Turning lanes and/or traffic light may be required.

2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern.
3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments, ... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems.

Please respond that you have received this email.

Thanks,
Brian Goblen

From: Malika Rizmanova
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development comments
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 12:36:03 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,
My name is Malika Rizmanova. I have contacted developer with my comments couple times. Decided to email you as well.

I think This development is too dense and One of the main concerns is that it will add to already very congested traffic in the area.
I think target of this development is older and young generation- apartments, assisted living, smaller homes - retirement like community.

This location is very convenient for working families, access to major roads, highways and shopping stores, close to schools and hospitals. We need more newer single family homes here, including for families with children. We need parks and playgrounds I believe this has to be taken into consideration. That will benefit and help many growing families, also potentially reduce density of this project and have more positive public opinion.
Since it's already planned to build homes in 2000-2300sqft range, it should also fit to build ones that are say 2500sqft. it will not price out potential home buyers.
Thank you in advance for taking into consideration!
Regards,
Malika

From: Karen Norton
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case Number: 20-ZONE004 (Hurstbourne Commons)
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 12:10:13 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As President of the Greenhurst Condominium Association, the following items are of concern to our residents and we would like to see measures taken to address these concerns:
1. Greenhurst has a detention pond with a walking path around it. Despite the no trespassing signs, there is a large amount of foot traffic around the pond that is not Greenhurst property owners. Therefore, we are requesting that a privacy fence be constructed along the property line with Greenhurst and Hurstbourne Commons. This safety measure would be an additional step to keeping all area residents safe.
2. Two additional traffic lights need to be installed along Hurstbourne Lane. A light is needed at the intersection of Ridgehurst Place and Hurstbourne Lane as there are numerous accidents in that location at the present time. A second traffic light will be needed where Brownwood intersects Hurstbourne Lane. With the increased automobile traffic and the present pedestrian traffic from the extended stay hotel crossing to access Meijer and TARC, this intersection will need increased regulation.
Thank you,
Karen Norton
President --- Greenhurst Condominium Association
Sent from my iPad

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel; Harrington, Scott; doran@ups.com
Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40:41 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday

Thanks,
Nancy Willenbrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 76. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

From: Harrington, Scott
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Dock, Joel; doran@ups.com
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00:07 PM
Attachments: image002.png

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting. No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16ZONE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. If an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

I will include... all those issues that you mentioned like the heat island you mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to Council based on your testimony and that of the developers.


Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | Legislative Assistant
Office of Councilman Kevin J. Kramer
Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
fax: 502.574.4501
email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
 Sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter

City Hall
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

[Click here to file a digital waiver request](#)

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; dloran@ups.com
Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday.

Thanks,
Nancy Willenbrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts. and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager, Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

From: dloran@ups.com
To: harrington.scott@louisvilleky.gov; Dock_Joel@louisvilleky.gov
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor, and more questions about development
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:18:04 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,

Are these minutes recorded and publicly available for everyone to read the concerns raised from the two meetings at Woodhaven?

I have raised the concerns outlined below clip at both meetings. Not only has the issue NOT been addressed and any attempt to improve, but it has been revealed through the current plan to be much worse than originally anticipated. The latest design calls for [tree canopy to be preserved](#) (see calculation clip below from developer plan).

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 1)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	250,118 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	10% (25,012 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (50,024 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (50,400 S.F.)

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 2)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	227,015 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	2% (4,540 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (45,403 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (46,080 S.F.)

Kevin Young mentioned in the first meeting that every tree that they (developer) can save means that is one less tree than they have to plant according to City/Planning Development recommendations.

According to the [2-ZONE-0020_Plan_022420.pdf](#) file the developers plan calls for NOT keeping any of the trees on planned rezoned areas.

TRACT 1 and 2 contain many 80 ft. tall mature trees. Currently along the property line these trees along with brush offer a spectacular buffer zone blocking off noise and visible traffic flow on Watterson Trail from the backside of Watterson Heights. These are not ornamental trees, but mature oaks, walnut, maple, etc. It will take more than half a life-time to regrow these trees. I

believe our city's current interest here is in retaining Louisville's tree canopy and replanting as well.

How can this not be a major concern and not be addressed prior to development with suggestion for redrawing plans?

The city for developer said that they redrew plans for design to reroute connector coming off Broadway and the street going through the development in Breanwood to have a curb type of median to slow traffic. As far as I know these redesigns were the only issues addressed. And these solutions were met without much fanfare.

I spoke with Meyer property atty and there is still unanswered questions how the development and traffic flow will look like going through Meyer parking lot. I believe this is a case of RGL being fairly informed and another issue where the developer appears to be moving forward without having a full vision of the plan and/or approval from another party or the city itself to extend Watterson Lane. Is this going to be treated as a main entrance since it is coming off a major state road and the other access points are through neighborhoods? These are just a few items I would like to be addressed beforehand.

Thank you,
David Loran

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting. No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16ZONE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. If an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

I will include... all these issues that you mentioned like the heat island you can mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to Council based on your testimony and that of the developers.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | Legislative Assistant
Office of Councilman Kevin J. Bamer
Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
fax: 502.574.4501
email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
[Sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter](#)

City Hall
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

From: Harrington, Scott [mailto:Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00 PM
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>; Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David [CMG2WVW] <dloran@ups.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

Project 2040 - Citizen User Guide

significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late.

From: Nancy & Jack Willebrink <nwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.P.Dock@louisville.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient, and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday.

Thanks,
Nancy Willebrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; Harrington, Scott; nwillen@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor; and more questions about development
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:51:00 PM
Attachments: image001.png; image005.png; Pages from 20-ZONE-0020_Application_022420-2.pdf; image002.png; image006.png

<Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor; and more questions about development

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

With respect to the neighborhood meeting, the applicant is required to hold the meeting, produce a sign-in sheet and produce a summary of the meeting which is submitted with the formal application. The summary submitted is attached.

Scott and Joel,
Are there minutes recorded and publicly available for everyone to read the concerns raised from the two meetings at Woodhaven?

On tree canopy, it is not uncommon for a developer to indicate 0% preserved canopy and then preserve a much greater amount at a later date during the landscape plan review phase. My review only compels them to meet the minimum required which can be achieved through preservation or all new plantings.

I have raised the concern outlined below clip at both meetings. Not only has the issue NOT been addressed and any attempt to improve, but it has been revealed through the current plan to be much worse than originally anticipated. The latest design calls for zero percent retention of existing tree canopy. See calculation clip below from developer plan.

I have not reviewed the most recent plans at this time and do not have a response for your last few access questions beyond the fact that our transportation Planning staff reviews the plan with consultation from public works and review all traffic studies submitted and ensures that the recommendations of those studies are incorporated into the plan.

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 1)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	250,118 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	10% (250,118 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (50,024 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (50,400 S.F.)

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisville.gov/government/planning-design>

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 2)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	227,015 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	2% (4,540 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (45,403 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (46,080 S.F.)



Kevin Young mentioned at the first meeting that every tree that they (developer) can save means that is one less tree that they have to plant according to City/Planning Development recommendations.

According to the 2-ZONE-0020_Plan_022420_.pdf file the developers plan calls for NOT keeping any of the trees on planned rezoned areas.

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:18 PM
To: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisville.gov>; nwillen@bellsouth.net; Dock, Joel

TRACT 1 and 2 contain many 80 ft. tall mature trees. Currently along the property line these trees along with brush offer a spectacular buffer zone blocking off noise and visible traffic flow on Waterson Trail from the backside of Waterson Heights. These are not ornamental trees, but mature oaks, walnut, maple, etc. It will take more than half a life-time to regrow these trees. I believe our city's current interest here is in retaining Louisville's tree canopy and replanting as well.

How can this not be a major concern and not be addressed prior to development with suggestion

for redrawing plans?

The atty for developer said that they redrew plans for design to re-route connector coming at off Bredy and the street going through the development to Brownwood to have a curve type of median to slow traffic. As far as I know these redesigns were the only issues addressed. And these solutions were met without much fanfare.

I spoke with Mejer property atty and there is still unanswered questions how the development and traffic flow will look like going through Mejer parking lot. I believe this is a case of NO1 being fully informed and another issue where the developer appears to be moving forward without having a full vision of the plan and/or approval from another party or the city itself to extend Withourne Lane. Is this going to be treated as a main entrance since it is coming off a major state road and the other access points are through neighborhoods? These are just a few items I would like to be addressed beforehand.

Thank you,
David Loran

From: Harrington, Scott [mailto:Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00 PM
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <nwillen@louisvilleky.gov>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David (CMG2VWV) <dloran@louis.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting.

Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; dloran@louis.com
Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday.

Thanks,
Nancy Willenbrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late.

No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16ZONE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. It an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

I will include... all those issues that you mentioned like the heat island you can mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to Council based on your testimony and that of the developers.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments.

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | Legislation Assistant
Office of Councilman Kevin J. Kramer
Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
fax: 502.574.4501
email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
 sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter

City Hall
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Thank you for the support and information!

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <nwillen@louisvilleky.gov>

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Ashburner, Clifford
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Fwd: Comment cards for Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, March 27, 2020 2:35:14 PM
Attachments: 20200327.000
20200327.000

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel:

Please see our responses in green below. Let me know if you have further questions

Cliff

From: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 10:54 AM
To: Ashburner, Clifford <Clifford.Ashburner@DINSMORE.COM>; 'young@idd-inc.com' <young@idd-inc.com>
Subject: Comment cards for Hurstbourne Commons

Throughout the comments cards provided in the formal application several individuals posed questions. Many will be addressed through plan revisions – drainage requirements, etc., but others may require specific attention.

1. I sent you an email some time back that asked that your group consider a pre-blasting survey binding element and I have not yet received a response. Can you clarify this?
2. There were other questions concerning connectivity to sewers for residents currently on

444 South Fifth Street, Suite 200

Louisville, KY 40202

502-574-5860

<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission from the law firm of Dinsmore & Shohl may constitute an attorney-client communication that is privileged at law. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail, so that our address record can be corrected.

septic. Will these individuals or neighborhoods be able to tie into the development to connect to sewers (maybe an MSD question as well)? Any progress on Meijer through connectivity? Will the proposed driveway be on the 15' buffer? If so, how will the driveway be constructed? Will the proposed driveway be on the 15' buffer? If so, how will the driveway be constructed? Will the proposed driveway be on the 15' buffer? If so, how will the driveway be constructed?

3. Please also note that in both neighborhood meeting summaries a 25' buffer around the perimeter was referenced, but a 15' TBA is shown. This is the requirement, however the 25' buffer is the goal to include the 15' buffer.
4. Any consideration to placing barriers to prevent access to Greenhurst walking path around detention? We noted that the fact that the 25' buffer is included around the path that is only the advantage and the question of the 15' buffer is to address that path in a manner that is consistent with the goal of the 15' buffer. The intent of being able to get around the path would not be the intent of the 15' buffer around the path.
5. What route will construction traffic use? We noted that the 15' buffer is included around the path and the 15' buffer is included around the path.
6. Any consideration for green roofing or white roof systems to reduce heat island? We noted that the 15' buffer is included around the path.
7. Has your group reached out to individuals with specific questions in the comment cards? We noted that the 15' buffer is included around the path and the 15' buffer is included around the path.

I'll have comments compiled later today for the development plans.

Thanks,

Joel P. Dock, AICP

Planner II

Planning & Design Services

Department of Development Louisville

LOUISVILLE FORWARD

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case 20ZONE0020 known as Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, May 6, 2020 5:08:08 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,

I live on Brody Lane the proposed street that will be one of the access points for the new "Hurstbourne Commons". I have been informed many times that Brody was always aligned to be an access street. I feel that when Brody was listed as the covenant access it was for a neighborhood of homes not a mini community which is being built called "Hurstbourne Commons".

Can you tell me has there been any updates on this case?
Zoning approved?
Are there still the same four accesses for "Hurstbourne Commons"?
There is an access going through Meijer, has Meijer approved that?

--
Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Ridgehurst Subdivision
502-296-4015

From: Karen Norton
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case Number: 20-ZONEPA-0004 (Hurstbourne Commons)
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 12:10:13 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As President of the Greenhurst Condominium Association, the following items are of concern to our residents and we would like to see measures taken to address these concerns.

1. Greenhurst has a detention pond with a walking path around it. Despite the no trespassing signs, there is a large amount of foot traffic around the pond that is not Greenhurst property owners. Therefore, we are requesting that a privacy fence be constructed along the property line with Greenhurst and Hurstbourne Commons. This safety measure would be an additional step to keeping all area residents safe
2. Two additional traffic lights need to be installed along Hurstbourne Lane. A light is needed at the intersection of Ridgehurst Place and Hurstbourne Lane as there are numerous accidents in that location at the present time. A second traffic light will be needed where Brownwood intersects Hurstbourne Lane. With the increased automobile traffic and the present pedestrian traffic from the extended stay hotel crossing to access Meijer and TARC, this intersection will need increased regulation

Thank you,
Karen Norton
President-- Greenhurst Condominium Association
Sent from my iPad

From: Marilyn Hicks
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Expansion
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 7:17:42 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a resident of Nachand Springs Patio Community, I am oppose to the changing of the Zoning from residential development to commercial medical office space. I agree that we have enough empty spaces along the Hurstbourne corridor now that could offer medical office space. With Watterson Trail being only two lanes and traffic has a problem with backing up as it is, this would pose a problem.

M. Hicks

From: Cecil C. Webber, Jr.
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020Fwd: Planned development behind Meijer - Saturday meeting - Meet Your Legislators
Date: Saturday, March 7, 2020 12:42:32 PM
Attachments: Meet_Your_Legislators.pdf

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Continuing email from Clay and Debbie Webber.

Our questions about number of units being reduced and the quality of the apartments.

We understand those might have been out of scope of Stuart Benson but hoping you might be able to answer.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: donotreply@cinesystems.net
Date: March 5, 2020 at 4:52:17 PM EST
To: Clay Webber <Cwebberjr@gmail.com>
Subject: Planned development behind Meijer - Saturday meeting - Meet Your Legislators

Good Afternoon,

This email is an FYI from the Board of Directors at Brookhollow Homeowners Association:

A 70-acre mixed-use development named Hurstbourne Commons is planned for the property behind Meijer on Hurstbourne Parkway. It will consist of approximately 550 residential housing units including 312 apartments. One of the access points is Brody Lane off of Ridgehurst Place which is next to Greenhurst Drive. Brody is a dead end street today. Traffic will proceed onto Ridgehurst Place and therefore Brookhollow Drive. An application for zoning changes has been submitted.

District 11 Metro Council member Kevin Kramer, his Legislative Assistant, Scott Harrington and others will be at a "Meet Your Legislators" meeting Saturday, March 7 from 9:00-10:00 at the Jeffersontown library on 10635 Watterson Trail. See the attachment. Kevin Kramer will be voting on this zoning change but cannot participate in off the record conversations since it is in his district. District 20 Metro Council member Stuart Benson is scheduled to attend also.

If you have concerns about the density and increased future traffic of this development, the meeting on Saturday is an opportunity to share them.

Also, your comments on case 20-ZONE-0020 can be sent to the Planning and Design Case Manager Joel Dock at Joel.Dock@LouisvilleKy.gov.

Powered by [CINC Community Association Management Software](#)

Dooley, Rachel M

From: charlesdavis2@juno.com
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 9:49 AM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020 Comments

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Mr. Dock:

Pursuant to the notice of the meeting before the LD&T Committee on July 9, 2020 concerning the above docket number I would like to submit the following comments:

1. The Community Form-Neighborhood, Mobility Goal 3 Land Use Development, Policy 6 (Cost Sharing) and Policies 7 and 8 require dedication to provide adequate roadway improvements on or near the site in question. Metro Subdivision Regulations under 6.2.1 B requires dedication. Metro Subdivision Regulations, Section 6.2.5, B, requires that access from new lots or a new street connecting an existing street shall not be approved unless the existing street has adequate pavement width to provide for ingress and egress to the proposed development.

Watterson Trail is shown to be a Major Collector roadway which requires a 80' row. The existing Watterson Trail at this location is grossly inadequate to meet that standard. Should not the developer dedicate additional row to provide 40' from the center line on the north side of the roadway? Since the included area for rezoning and the area "Not Included" is owned by the same group why not require the owner of both tracts to agree to dedicate 40' along its frontage on Watterson Trail to Hendricks Lane? With that ROW available could not at least one more lane be added to Watterson Trail from the entrance to the proposed development to the existing widen lanes existing near Hurstbourne Parkway to improve traffic flow with the owner and applicants providing most of the cost for the improvements?

2. Has any agreement been reached with Mejer's to provide/dedicate access through Mejer's existing parking lot to Hendricks Lane? Also has Mejer's agreed to allow its lot and roadways to be used for traffic to cross its lot to Hendricks for a right turn south on Hurstbourne or to go on its roadway to access the traffic light in front of Mejer's to go north on Hurstbourne? That access is critical to the development considering the backup presently occurring at Hurstbourne Parkway and Watterson Trail at the AM peak.

If adequate access is not available at is time, but may be in the future, why not phase the development based upon adequate access in the future when improvements are made to Watterson Trail by widening and access across Mejer's is provided to Hendricks Lane and to the traffic light in front of Mejer's?

3. The Traffic Study appears to well done based upon the requirements. However, assumptions or just that, a educated guess. I have seen many fail not due to any fault of the engineer doing the study, but do to citizens, developers and government's "need" for more development. There exists numerous tracts of land on the west side of Hurstbourne Parkway between Watterson Trail and Bardstown Road that may be used for not known low or high density uses. Plus a number of parcels south of Bardstown Road either already rezoned or available for more additional development. I hope the study is correct, but I have seen many fail in the past. Just look at the area between I-64 on Hurstbourne Parkway to Taylorsville Road. When the roadway was first developed it was thought that 2 lanes south would be adequate for future development by engineers. The roadway has had to be widen first to add an additional lane north and then additional lanes for left and right turns on to Taylorsville Road and then recently to add to the depth of the east turning

Dooley, Rachel M

From: ksmith@aheadhr.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:02 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Attached Comments - Case 20-Zone-0020
Attachments: Comments - Case 20-ZONE-0020 - Lori J. Chester Smith.pdf

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Mr. Dock:

Please find comments for the above case. I am forwarding on behalf of my wife, who is on the road today.

Thank you.

Kyle Smith, JD, SPHR
CEO and Counsel
Ahead Human Resources
2209 Heather Lane
Louisville, KY 40218
Phone: (502) 212-7282



Connect with us:



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

lanes at Taylorsville Road so those waiting to turn did not stop those wanting to continue south on Hurstbourne. What now if any new improvements are needed? My fear is that this development and others in the future could create some of the same problems at Watterson Trail.

The major problem with the study for those of us in Ridgehurst Place is that the study shows that in 2027 with this build occurring the intersection of Ridgehurst Place and Hurstbourne Parkway will be "F" at PM peak traffic.

4. The proposed use on Tract 1 is a very large development for this area. It would be the largest structure on Watterson Trail from the center of Jeffersonstown to Bardstown Road with the exception of development right at the intersection of Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Parkway. Is it in character with the surrounding single family development and doctor's office uses in mass and scale? With the zoning proposed it is most likely speculation. Changing it to all apartments would create a need for more required parking spaces as would a medical office with lab. If the proposed zoning and use is approved it should be bound by binding requirements to ensure that any proposed use change can be adequately reviewed by citizens and the Planning Commission?

5. The proposed use on Tract 2 is vague. Housing of this type is hard to define. Who will make the decision of who is admitted as a occupant? Are they going for a "Home for the Infirm or Aged"? or it just apartments period. In either case the amount of parking for the number of units is inadequate just as apartment or senior housing with employees.

6. Do they need R-7 zoning for the proposed apartments and town homes? Would not R-6 be more appropriate and in character with the surrounding development? Plus, in my mind the multifamily uses really should be adjacent to the frontage of the property on Watterson Trail and not back inside. Most dense use should be "up front". They may say they placed the units in the middle because of problems in developing around the gas easement. It can be done! Follow the existing gas easement across Mejer's and across Hurstbourne Parkway and you find a well designed apartment development using the easement as parking and open space.

7. Should not some of the apartments be used as lower income apartments to further the goals of the Comprehensive Plan?

8. The residents of Brody Lane welcome new neighbors in the proposed single family homes. However, we are concerned about the traffic study being incorrect and there would be a large volume of cut through traffic from the development and from Watterson Trail at AM peak time on the existing portion of Brody Lane which is a 50' row. The driveways on the existing section are short and many park cars on the street because of the depth of the driveways. The existing pavement width is 23'. If there is a car parked on Brody there is not sufficient width for 2 cars to pass. We would like to propose that a fence or gating be placed on the proposed roadway as it leaves the multifamily portion of the development and that cars from the proposed houses use Brody Lane as access. The Jeffersontown Fire District would have the necessary tool or tools to remove the gate or fencing if needed. That has been used in other subdivisions without any adverse affects. In addition, it would still meet the Regulations as it is not required to have a second entrance unless it exceeds 200 houses with the existing development and the proposed homes which is not the case here.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Charles A. Davis
3815 Brody Lane
Louisville, KY 40299-6521

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:16 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Vicki Queenan, David Loran
Subject: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail - Hurstbourne Commons Development

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,

I am opposed to the rezoning from R-4 to R-6 development of multi-family housing on the site. There is an overabundance of established and under construction multi-family units in the area.

I live on Brody Lane and we have emailed about my concern with Brody being a main road for Hurstbourne Commons Development. I do understand that Brody was set up as an access road for houses and I feel comfortable with more R4 or R5 single family housing not R-6. The acreage available was originally designed for around 200 homes.

The density of adding the R-6 multi-family housing doesn't fit the surrounding neighborhoods and will be disconnecting current neighborhoods from each other.

Here are some questions I have for the call tomorrow:

< Is the traffic report from Diane Zimmerman, set up by Thieneman Co. complete? What are the results?

< Has MSD been informed of Hurstbourne Commons proposal for this land?

What does MSD say about the water issues this many cause as our neighborhoods are already having water issues.

< If Hurstbourne Commons zoning is approved as Thieneman proposes, will monies be set aside from The Thieneman Company for repairs should there be any water issues in the future?

< Has Mejer given approval to have an access road placed on their property?

--
Thank You
Vicki Queenan

Dooley, Rachel M

From: David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 3:28 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Concerns for Hurstbourne Commons development

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Here is my list for record, thank you sir.

I am opposed to changing the Zoning from R4 to DR-1 in tract one and two of development. This will allow for the possibility of three story offices to be developed which do not match neighborhoods surroundings which are comprised of houses not offices. Preservation of single family homes and neighborhood disconnection are a concern. Future concern includes the 10 acre tract of adjacent land. Once offices are developed and then the 10 acres is purchased at a later date this allows for more validity to build even more offices. Single family homes are in high demand vs commercial office space. The Hurstbourne corridor has many unused offices available that could serve the community. Also medical offices are going to be developed in the old Kmart in Hikes Point which will fill a close by need for any neighbors in area. However, I'm in favor of development of R5 single family homes or keeping the R4 zoning designation.

Clifford Ashburner stated in second Woodhaven meeting that Tract two could be developed into apartments or office buildings? Well, what is the answer? This leaves developer too much latitude to misleading the citizens thinking it could be senior living ,55 years and up apartments (which was originally presented), or just "regular" apartments or three story office buildings. Too much ambiguity with this part of development for tract two.

We are opposed to the rezoning from R-4 to R-6 development of multi-family housing on the site. There is an overabundance of established and under construction multi-family units in the area. We are in favor of more R4 or R5 single family housing not R-6. The acreage available was originally designed for around 200 homes. The density of adding the R-6 multi-family housing doesn't fit the surrounding neighborhoods and will be disconnecting current neighborhoods from each other.

At both meetings there was objection to connecting the development with a road through Watterson Heights.

The developer needs to provide a new alternative for a road leading out to Nachand Lane. The development should NOT include a connector to Watterson Heights through Brownwood. There is no need to develop an ingress and egress that will drastically change the dynamic of a small quiet neighborhood with little traffic. There are not any sidewalks in this neighborhood to connect to the development. There are infants, adolescents and seniors in this area. The street is only 20' wide and will be used as a cut through from Hurstbourne corridor. This will be a major impact to the existing neighborhood.

600 plus units is too dense for amount of land to be developed. The number was 550 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 498 apartments! Why is this development 83% apartments?

The height of any buildings should be reduced to two stories to match existing neighborhoods and this will reduce apartments occupant impact

Have all property owners been approached to purchase land for a newly constructed road to Nachand Lane? There is not anyone that lives Brody Lane that welcomes a connection to the development. The developer plans should be

redrawn and flow traffic with a new constructed road to Nachand, Hurstbourne Lane and Watterson Trail. Or if you cannot purchase property to build a new road to Nachand Lane, again reduce the size/density of the development where the plan only needs to be connected to Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne Lane through Meijer store parking lot.

Note that the 365 people who signed the petition to move this development to a night meeting all are opposed to the development in one or several ways but mainly cited development is too large for amount of land and people planned to occupy it.

Thank you,
David Loran

Sent from my iPhone

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Judy HARDEN <jg3132@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 11:11 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Cathy Heck; Cheryl Sparks
Subject: Concerns re: Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

My name is Judy Harden and I am a resident of Nachand Springs, a community of 72 patio homes. Our property is adjacent to the proposed Hurstbourne Commons project. Our community is made up of at least 95 percent older (age 65+) residents.

Of course, many of us are concerned about increased traffic and noise as this will be an enormous change to the current property. There are also several of us that are very concerned that the trees lining the division between the properties will be destroyed. My understanding is that we did not get an answer from the developers to our question about the tree line.

Besides the obvious need to not only keep, but expand Louisville's tree canopy, the existing tree line will help with reducing noise but also ensure that Nachand Springs will keep a privacy border from the new development. This is both a privacy and security concern.

We appreciate you giving these concerns your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,
Judy Harden
8102 Spring Orchard Court
Louisville, Kentucky 40218
502-491-7657
Jg3132@bellsouth.net

Sent from my iPad

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Jeff Gumer <jjeffgumer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:08 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I oppose this development in its present form because:

- *the expansion of the as-presented number of multi-family units
- *building office buildings when so many square feet sit empty in area strip malls
- *no word on the wonder tree line that is a natural boundary between Nachand Springs and the proposed development
- *no study on the traffic nightmare that will ensue

Jeffrey Gumer
3901 Bluestem LN
Louisville, KY 40218
502 749 5566

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Amy Harpring <aeharpring@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Development.

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

We are opposed to the zoning changes proposed to the Hurstbourne Commons Development from R-4 to OR-1 and from R-4 to R-6 multi family units in the area. We are in favor of more R-4 single family housing. Adding multi family units does not fit our neighborhood. The number of 600 plus units is simply too dense for the area. We already have in this area an abundance of multi family units, and most have vacancies. We also have two senior assisted living facilities in our area. We also have medical facilities (hospitals, doctors office, and soon urgent care facilities) within 5 miles of our neighborhood. The amount of traffic this would create in our neighborhood would be a nightmare. Drainage would also be a problem.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely
Everett and Amy Harpring.
8106 Hidden Brook Court (Nachand Springs Patio Homes) Louisville, Ky 40218

Sent from my iPad

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Becca Pennington <rebeccaanne1982@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:20 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: James Pennington
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons proposed development changes
Attachments: image001.png

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Dear Joel,

I am a concerned about the updated proposed development called Hurstbourne Commons. I live in Ridgehurst place and am very concerned with the continuous changes being made to the proposal as well as the fact that we have the required signatures for a NIGHT meeting but I learned that the next meeting is during the work day. Making it VERY hard on me to get off in order to attend. I would appreciate if those handling this case would work with us since we have more than met the quota for night meetings.

I want to voice that I am opposed to the rezoning from R-4 to R-6 development of multi-family housing on the site. There is an overabundance of established and under construction multi-family units in the area. We are in favor of more R4 or R5 single family housing not R-6. The acreage available was originally designed for around 200 homes. The density of adding the R-6 multi-family housing doesn't fit the surrounding neighborhoods and will be disconnecting current neighborhoods from each other.

Also, 600 plus units is too dense for an area which is already too congested today. The number was 550 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 498 apartments! Why is this development 83% apartments? What about adding small park within the development of all single family homes and retaining the assisted care facility? Will this number continue to increase without notice to the adjoining property owners or neighborhood groups? For example, the residents of the Brookhollow Subdivision were not contacted even though the neighborhood is adjacent to Brody Lane. And the traffic on Brookhollow Drive will increase since it is a cut through street to Six Mile Lane.

Ridgehurst is already a VERY busy road and this will exponentially increase that traffic. We deal with speeding now and the worry for kids playing. This fear is going to increase with this many more units being added to this area. More lights to Hurstbourne lane will need to be added in order to accommodate this traffic influx and that road is already over-laden with lights. For this reason I am opposed to changing the Zoning from R4 to OR-1 in tract one and two of development. This will allow for the possibility of three story offices to be developed which do not match neighborhoods surroundings which are comprised of houses not offices. Preservation of single family homes and neighborhood

1

1

disconnection are a concern. Future concern includes the 10 acre tract of adjacent land. Once offices are developed and then the 10 acres is purchased at a later date this allows for more validity to build even more offices. Single family homes are in high demand vs commercial office space. The Hurstbourne corridor has many unused offices available that could serve the community. Also medical offices are going to be developed in the old Kmart in Hikes Point which will fill a close by need for any neighbors in area. However, I'm in favor of development of R5 single family homes or keeping the R4 zoning designation. There is ample offices to accommodate these needs without adding more and increasing traffic in this area.

Thank you for taking my opposition and concerns under consideration. I hope that they are not dismissed.

Becca Pennington

IT Business Systems Analyst - Leader | IT Business Analysis | LG&E and KU
220 West Main Street Louisville, KY 40202
M: 502.781.0922 | O: 502.497.1751
lga@ku.com



The information contained in this transmission is intended only for the person or entity to which it is directly addressed or copied. It may contain material of confidential and/or private nature. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is not allowed. If you received this message and the information contained therein by error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your/any storage medium.

2

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Dock, Joel
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:47 AM
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
Cc: Harrington, Scott; David Loran
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0620 Hurstbourne Commons

Your comments have been received and incorporated into the record, forwarded to the applicant, and provided for the Planning Commission's consideration.

KRS Chapter 100.213 provides the following criteria for granting the proposed form district change/rezoning.

- 1. The proposed form district/rezoning change complies with the applicable guidelines and policies Plan 2040; OR
- 2. The existing form district/zoning classification is inappropriate and the proposed classification is appropriate; OR
- 3. There have been major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated in Plan 2040 which have substantially altered the basic character of the area.

To receive electronic communications on this project please sign up for Louisville Metro GovDelivery at :

<https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/KYLOUISVILLE/subscriber/new>

I have provide some response in RED below

Joel P. Dock
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Develop Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 10:31 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>

1

Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; David Loran <davidlorandesign.com>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel Dock,

I have attended both meetings at Woodhaven Country Club since we live in the Brookhollow Subdivision and know this development will greatly affect our property. It was very easy to collect the 365 signatures concerning this project. Every person I spoke to is opposed to the density and apartment units. The plan needs to be modified.

The developer has failed to do a thorough or adequate impact study on the traffic and density this project will have on the surrounding area.

600 plus units is too dense for an area which is congested today. The number was 550 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 498 apartments! Why is this development 83% apartments? Will this number continue to increase without notice to the adjoining property owners or neighborhood groups? A revision from the approved plan, if approved, would be required. Notice would be required to adjoining property owners and those registers to receive electronic communication via GovDelivery. I know the residents of the Brookhollow Subdivision were not contacted even though our neighborhood is adjacent to Brody Lane. And the traffic on Brookhollow Drive will increase since it is a cut through street to Six Mile Lane.

Two office buildings were originally proposed at the two public Woodhaven Country Club meetings. These have been changed to an assisted care facility and a 60 unit apartment building, both 3 stories tall. How many people will be housed in the assisted care facility? 100 units are proposed. Is there an estimate of the number of workers in this building? The 60 unit building is NOT labeled senior housing on the drawing. A new public meeting at Woodhaven is needed to inform the public of these changes. Office-Residential districts were proposed on the pre-application plan. Office Residential allows a combination of professional offices and residential living, including assisted living or senior living. Senior living with the exception of reduced parking is treated similarly to multi-family dwellings. I'm sure most people are not aware that Hurstbourne Commons is 83% apartments. As Business First said this is a massive plan with 32 buildings.

Changing the planned 3 story apartment units to 2 story condominiums would win the endorsement of property owners in the area. It would also help with the density problems created by this development. A decreased density will also help with the existing stream flooding that has occurred in the Laurel Spring Drive area. When this flooding becomes worse the taxpayers will have to correct this preventable problem through increased MSD fees.

At both meetings there was objection to connecting the development with a road through Watterson Heights. The developer needs to provide a new alternative for a road leading out to Nachand Lane. The development should NOT include a connector to Watterson Heights through Brownwood Drive or Whitfield Drive. There is no need to develop an ingress and egress that will drastically change the dynamic of a small quiet neighborhood with less than 70 R4 zoned houses that sees little traffic. There are no sidewalks in this neighborhood to connect to the development.

What analysis has been conducted on traffic signals especially onto Hurstbourne Parkway? None of the existing traffic signals in the area are located where residents need to make a left hand turn. It will be impossible to add additional traffic signals to handle left hand turns. Any additional signals will be too close to existing signals. The Zimmerman traffic study does not address this problem and is inadequate. The study shows no new traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive.

All 4 exit/enter points have problems.

One -- Mejer

2

Page 3 of the Zimmerman traffic study states that Watterson Trail has 4 foot shoulders and sidewalks along the north side. This is not true for most of Watterson Trail (to Bardstown Road). More importantly, the study shows only minimal rush hour traffic from the Breckenridge Lane area to Nachand Lane and onto Watterson Heights or Brody Lane. It shows no rush hour traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. This is another major flaw in the study.

Also:

Current drainage backups were mentioned at the Woodhaven meetings. The water and sewer lines may not be able to suppose the added load of over 600 units. This added stress could greatly affect existing homes.

As others have mentioned, there is plenty of apartment and commercial space available. The proposed 3 story apartment and assisted care buildings need to be 2 floors only in keeping with the surrounding area. The 10 acre tract near Watterson Trail (Tract 7) will be left undeveloped at this time. How tall will those future buildings be?

Single family homes are in high demand now and will always be. This American dream is not dead. Parents want a yard for their children. If the planned apartment buildings cannot be changed to single family homes then condominiums are needed. There is a need for more senior oriented condo living in this area. NOT apartment living. The senior community Greenhurst Condominiums next to this proposed development has a WAITING LIST today. We all know the population is aging. There is plenty of undeveloped land for apartment development on recently extended South Hurstbourne Parkway (from Bardstown Road/South of GE).

Our existing residents including seniors need to feel safe. Apartments experience crime at a higher rate than houses or condos. The existing communities don't need additional transients in the area. There are enough existing problems with the InTown Suites Extended hotel near Mejer.

No one wants to walk through a dense apartment area. This development does NOTHING to enhance a more WALKABLE neighborhood. It does nothing to establish an open PARK area. A THIRD of this open land SHOULD be developed into a neighborhood park. The closest park is the Des Pres Park 4-5 miles away. There are no existing parks in this area suitable for walking or biking.

When residents are informed of Plan 2040, they are opposed to it. Property owners were not involved in the development of the 118 pages of Plan 2040. Please see pages 16-19 of Plan 2040 for community engagement in Plan 2040. If we wanted density we would not be living in this area. 83% apartments are TOO dense. Plan 2040 also encourages proximity to parks and walking. Hurstbourne Commons FAILS to conform to the Plan 2040 stated guidelines in these two areas.

This whole process strongly FAVORS the developer. This laborious process is not conducive for the average person to present input or changes to a development. Even though property owners go through the appropriate avenues, this system is not set up to influence changes to a development. For example, there is no provision for a person to point to a map and describe where the additional traffic will flow.

It is hard to express frustration in a letter. Taxpayers don't want to finance problems made worse due to poor planning and automatic approvals. This development will create new problems that will have to be fixed later with additional burdens on the taxpayer.

Think through the impact of this development on the people in this area especially the impact of hundreds of cars. Remember the 365 approved signatures are just a small sample of the affected people. The adjoining districts are affected also since many travel daily on Hurstbourne Parkway.

Sincerely,

Nancy Willenbrink

4

The proposed entrance/exit near Mejer has no provision for a left turn signal onto north Hurstbourne Parkway. Any proposed traffic signal would be too close to the existing signal in front of Mejer at Hurstbourne Crossings Drive and Hurstbourne Parkway at Watterson Trail.

There is no certainty that Mejer will agree to this new proposed road through its property. The developer has not solved this major issue and this is unacceptable. Area residents need to be confident that this problem is solved if the Mejer signal problem and detailed designs are not adequately addressed this project should be put ON HOLD.

Two -- Brody Lane

The Brody Lane extension provides access to Ridgehurst Place. There is no traffic signal to turn left onto Hurstbourne Parkway from Ridgehurst Place. There are many accidents at this intersection near the Ken Towery the slow today and the additional traffic will make this intersection much worse. When traveling north on Hurstbourne from Mejer it is difficult to turn left onto Ridgehurst Place today. A new signal would be too close to the existing signal at Ambrose Lane near the Sonic restaurant and the Mejer entrance.

Traffic will drive on Brody to Ridgehurst and on to Brookhollow Drive to get to Six Mile Lane. One of the major flaws in the Zimmerman traffic study is that it shows no increased traffic on Brookhollow Drive. The left hand turn from Brookhollow Drive to Six Mile Lane is difficult today much less with increased traffic. Traffic backs up multiple times a day in this area due to slow railroad traffic. No signal can be placed here because it would be too close to the railroad tracks.

After crossing the Six Mile Lane railroad, traffic will be stopped at Summerfield Drive/Manner Dale Drive traffic signal and this congestion easily backs up to the railroad tracks.

The 89 page Zimmerman traffic study does not show a Trip Distribution Percentage on page 10 for the Brody Lane/Ridgehurst Place intersection. This study does not address the existing route through the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. Common sense says that traffic will greatly increase and a new bottleneck hazard will be created on Six Mile Lane at Brookhollow Drive.

If the Zimmerman study on Page 16 is to be believed the Ridgehurst Place at Brody Lane intersection gets an A rating. Common sense knows that this is not correct. At the minimum of 23 to 26 cars at rush hour on a short residential street, the rating should be an F. This alone brings into question the whole Zimmerman traffic study. Another traffic study needs to be requested with realistic ratings.

Three -- Watterson Trail

A left turn from the development onto Watterson Trail would be dangerous. The curve on Watterson Trail is too sharp for an exit left hand turn. Any new signal would be too close to the existing Watterson Trail/Hurstbourne signal near Culvers.

New turning lanes are planned from Watterson Trail and Laurel Spring Drive into the development. Will the developer pay for this turning lane and widening of Watterson Trail and the drainage work? Where is this issue addressed in the planning documents? How much is this widening and turning lane costing the taxpayer?

Four -- Watterson Heights (Roswell Way, Wenwood Dr, Brownwood Dr, Whitfield Dr)

Earlier maps had the Watterson Heights Subdivision exit/entrance as Whitfield. When was this changed to Brownwood Drive?

The exit/entrance onto Brownwood Drive per page 1 of the LDT Staff Report would put additional traffic onto an existing NARROW residential streets with NO sidewalks. A traffic signal will be needed at the intersection of Nachand Lane and Watterson Trail. All of Watterson Trail is a NARROW 2 lane road and heavily traveled today. Traffic will proceed to Bardstown Road near the shopping center where Cox's Spirit Shoppe is located. Long waits today at the Watterson Trail/Bardstown Road traffic signal were mentioned at the neighborhood meetings.

For traffic turning right onto Nachand Lane, cars will process to the dangerous intersection of Nachand Lane/Breckenridge Lane near the railroad overpass. It is very hard to turn left onto Breckenridge Lane today. A new signal at this intersection would be difficult due to the hill and the existing signal at Breckenridge Lane/Six Mile Lane near the railroad overpass. Also, Breckenridge Lane at the railroad overpass floods easily today.

3

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Harrington, Scott on behalf of Kramer, Kevin
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:41 PM
To: joanbrotzge@gmail.com, Dock, Joel
Subject: Re: Contact Councilman Kevin Kramer [#1403]

Ms. Brotzge,

I'm forwarding your comments to Joel Dock, the case manager, so he can add your comments to the official zoning record.

Thank you!

Scott Harrington, Councilman Kramer's legislative assistant

From: Councilman Kevin Kramer <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:39 PM
To: Kramer, Kevin <Kevin.Kramer@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Contact Councilman Kevin Kramer [#1403]

Name * Joan Brotzge

Address
* 4115 Nachand Lane
Louisville, KY 40218
United States

Phone (502) 491-1188

Number *

Email * joanbrotzge@gmail.com

Comments *

I have concerns about rezoning for the Hurstbourne Commons project # 20-ZONE-0020 at 8217 Watterson Trail.

I. The density of the project does not fit the adjoining area. No more than 50% of the current plan due to the increased traffic in the area including the residential streets adjoining the property should all be R-5 or R-6, no need for R-7 zoning that does not match any adjoining properties. Too many rental units, 312 is excessive and will create massive surface water runoff on my property and those next to me as well as all those downstream. I have not seen any

1

remediation other than a couple of basins which will freely run into all the adjoining properties

2. There is no plan for MSD to extend sewers to Watterson Trail from Nachand Lane. MSD promised this would happen within 5 years when Nachand was rebuilt in 1998. So Watterson Heights and south Nachand is just ignored while there are sewers all around us. Why?

3. The proposed intersection from the development directly onto Watterson Trail is on a dangerous curve with limited visibility

4. I have concerns that Mr. Thieneman mentioned possible commercial use of the building adjacent to the assisted care/senior living facilities. There is a glut of commercial property in this area with every development having space for rent in a 1 mile radius.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joan Brotzge
4115 Nachand Lane
Louisville, KY 40218

2

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Joan Brotzge <joanbrotzge@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Zoning objection for Case Number 20-Zone-0020

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I have concerns about rezoning for the Hurstbourne Commons project at 8217 Watterson Trail.

1. The density of the project does not fit the adjoining area. No more than 50% of the current plan due to the increased traffic in the area including the residential streets adjoining the property. Should all be R-5 or R-6, no need for R-7 zoning that does not match any adjoining properties. Too many rental units, 312 is excessive and will create massive surface water runoff on my property and those next to me as well as all those downstream. I have not seen any remediation other than a couple of basins which will freely run into all the adjoining properties.

2. There is no plan for MSD to extend sewers to Watterson Trail from Nachand Lane. MSD promised this would happen within 5 years when Nachand was rebuilt in 1998. So Watterson Heights and south Nachand is just ignored while there are sewers all around us. Why?

3. The proposed intersection from the development directly onto Watterson Trail is on a dangerous curve with limited visibility.

4. I have concerns that Mr. Thieneman mentioned possible commercial use of the building adjacent to the assisted care/senior living facilities. There is a glut of commercial property in this area with every development having space for rent in a 1 mile radius.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joan Brotzge
4115 Nachand Lane
Louisville, KY 40218

1

Dooley, Rachel M

From: Jean <fccacc@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 1:20 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: Development on Watterson Trail at Hurstbourne

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

We live on Laurel Spring Drive and our entrance will be right across from this new one. We are concerned about traffic getting in and out onto Watterson Trail. And with 600 plus units?? That number is crazy and is way too dense for an area which is already too congested today. The number was 550 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 498 apartments! Why is this development 83% apartments?

What about adding small park within the development? I used to rent barn space from Mrs. Elaine Paodock (original owner, John's mother) and rode horses on this property for years. She was very protective of her property! I wish her memory could be honored and have a small park there, (Paddock Park?) one where families could enjoy the property she held onto for so long. We need more greenspace and there are enough offices and stores now that stand vacant. Please reconsider this plan, for all of us who actually live here and will be affected.

Dan and Jean Henie
8209 Laurel Spring Drive
Louisville, KY 40299
502-889-0111

1

To: Joel Dock

From: Cathy Heck

4110 Spring Park Ln. Louisville, KY 40218

Date: February 13, 2020

RE: Proposed Hurstbourne Commons

My property's backyard is on the property line with the proposed Hurstbourne Commons. I attended the first meeting with the developer on January 29, 2020 and plan to attend the second meeting on Feb. 18, 2020. I have several concerns which I will discuss below.

1. There are too many units proposed for 3/4ths of the area. They propose 107 single family homes on small lots with very little green space. Then 126 townhouses and 370 apartment units. That's a total of 603 units on what appears to be about 50 acres. There is very limited green space proposed until the last 17 acres with a proposed assisted living and a separate nursing home facility.
2. There will be too much traffic for the proposed exits from Hurstbourne Commons and surrounding streets. Right now, there are only three (3) proposed exits with the hope of a fourth through the Meijers parking lot. All the single family homes and many of the apartments and townhouses will exit through Brody Ln, a quiet street of ten homes per side of the street. Easily as many as 500 vehicles will suddenly be using this exit/entrance and coming or going onto Ridgehurst Pl, with only stop signs at either end, toward Hurstbourne Ln or Nachand Ln. The other two exits are on Brownwood Dr., winding through a neighborhood on various streets, toward Watterson Trail or Nachand Ln. Or, directly onto Watterson Trail, a few yards from the other exit.
3. They propose to remove all the trees and replace with shrubs along a portion of the property line bordering a condominium development, Nachand Springs, and a single family home and a neighborhood. There is currently a tree line along much of this. I was under the impression Louisville was in desperate need of increasing the number of trees, not removing an acre or two equivalents of trees. There are currently two main tree lines, one runs north to south, perhaps in the middle of the proposed apartments and townhouses, and one east to west.

I acknowledge the trees are amongst brush and trash tree growth. It would be possible to identify trees worth saving and clear around them. That may increase the developer's cost, but it is far better than removing all the established trees.
4. There is no need for apartments or townhouses in this area. A gentleman who does something regarding inspections for the county spoke at the first general meeting. He mentioned two apartment developments in the area, that were stopping development because of lack of potential renters.
5. Drainage will be a problem along several edges of the property. Several people addressed this concern at the meeting. It may be a particularly difficult issue for those on septic tanks in the

neighborhood with Brownwood Dr. There are two proposed retention areas, beside each other. If there is going to be any standing water in the retention areas, mosquito precautions must be part of the developer's responsibility.

6. The developer should be required to put up a vinyl six ft fence around all the sides of the development that border neighborhoods. It would border Greenhurst condominiums, Ridgehurst Place homes, single family homes/farms, Nachand Springs condominiums and west to Watterson Trail, along the neighborhood with Brownwood and Whitfield Drs. The homes and condominiums around the proposed development will be harmed by losing value because of small homes, townhomes, apartments or retention holes in their backyards. It appears from the aerial picture of Hurstbourne Commons my view will change from a mature tree line to a retention hole for example. Would you like that as the view from your screened in porch on your \$250,000 condo?

I urge you to carefully review all of the above concerns and make changes in the developer's proposal. I understand their desire to crowd in as much as possible to maximize their income, however, it is not appropriate to cause harm to all the established, surrounding neighborhoods.

Dooley, Rachel M

From: David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 9:18 AM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: 20-Variance-0074

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,
I am writing in opposition to the height variance request for the proposed Hurstbourne Commons development.

If any buildings are going to be developed they should follow the same code height standards as other R-4 properties adjacent to the proposed development.

Thank you,
David Loran

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lyman Hunt
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Pw: Brownwood Drive connection to Hurstbourne Parkway
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 2:24:08 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Lyman Hunt <lymanhunt49@yahoo.com>
To: joeldock@louisvilleky.gov <joeldock@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2020, 11:14:57 AM EDT
Subject: Brownwood Drive connection to Hurstbourne Parkway

Brownwood Drive located in Watterson Heights has been proposed as a connector street to Hurstbourne Parkway and the proposed Hurstbourne Commons. Our subdivision, Watterson Heights, was developed completely by the mid-sixties. The subdivision has a few street lights, which are paid for by individual residents, and no sidewalks. This was essentially a rural subdivision development. The residents utilize the edge of the street for walking, walking pets and bike riding.

With the potential rezoning upgraded from R-4, this will increase the amount of traffic on our streets and present a public safety issue to our residents and their children. By rezoning this area, it will create a more densely populated development with additional traffic. The proposal includes a healthcare facility, offices and apartments, all of which will create an additional flow of traffic much more than the 200 homes associated with the R-4 zoning. Even with the proposed roundabout intended to divert traffic flow before the entry to our subdivision via Brownwood Drive, drivers manage to find shortcuts to their destinations. The developer's thought was that the connection via Brownwood would present an advantage to our residents to access Hurstbourne Parkway, but we have been accessing it quite well since the Parkway's expansion many decades ago.

Please consider not changing the zoning from R-4. As mentioned before, this will place our residents and their children in an unsafe situation when attempting to use our streets as a walking or biking pathway. With a minimal amount of street lighting, this will also diminish the safety of our neighborhood with the increased traffic and with drivers unfamiliar with our streets. If the development is rezoned, would the Planning Commission please also consider a non-direct connection to Hurstbourne Parkway. By diverting traffic flow directly to our neighborhood, this would potentially create a much safer neighborhood for our residents.

Lyman Hunt
4122 Wrenwood Drive
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

From: Cheryl Bryant
To: Dock Joel
Subject: Case No. 20-ZONE-0020, located at 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 8:46:03 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a homeowner in Ridgehurst Place we oppose the plans for the density of Hurstbourne Commons and the zoning changes to allow for this building project. In addition, we can't imagine in today's pandemic climate with loss of jobs and businesses closing that this would be the appropriate time to approve the building of Senior living and 80 "Age Targeted" apartments, 438 apartment townhomes and 105 homes abutting Ridgehurst Place. This property sitting vacant or partially complete will not serve community needs either.

We've attended the meetings at Woodhaven CC pre-pandemic and provided our email address and contact information. We were told a traffic study was not complete. Said traffic study has not been shared with attendees, and we haven't seen it. However, we were advised by a member of Brookhollow Subdivision that they had seen it, and it accounted for zero cut through or negative effect to the Brookhollow neighborhood. If this is the case, there is no merit to the study findings, and we doubt the reality of what will happen to Brody Lane and Ridgehurst Place is properly reflected.

Current Brody homes, on approximately .25 acres, will not be connected to like sized homes nor similar lot size. There are 18 homes facing Brody Lane who will have to endure the daily trauma of noise, traffic, trespassing, security and potential loss of property value from the 105 homes seen on the last proposal. The road will also be accessible to the townhome and apartment residents who cut through to Six Mile Ln, Nachand and Hurstbourne Ln. There are already issues with the street being wide enough when residents park their car on the street.

The entire Ridgehurst Place neighborhood will feel the negative effects of additional traffic. We have an access road with no speed bumps that will be used even more than it is today which is already a safety issue for those living on it.

Hurstbourne Commons will at a minimum cause traffic issues in an area that currently has pinch points, small side roads and dangerous intersections. Any access to the property should be to Watterson Trail and through Meijer property, since commercial properties thrive on traffic. Last I heard, Meijer had not given permission nor sold right of way.

Brody Lane will depreciate in value with more traffic and that is not acceptable to taxpayers who have lived there the past 25 years. At least with the farmland we could enjoy the wildlife, watch the crops grow and enjoy the coolness coming from the field on a hot summer night.

The 2040 Plan creates issues with drainage, traffic safety, crime and personal and community safety that will cost taxpayers.

Please do not approve the zoning nor this project as it is proposed. It is too many residents homes apartments being added with no solutions to proper access costing taxpayers and not the Developer in the long run.

Charlie & Cheryl Bryant
3811 Ridgehurst Ct
502-533-1034 cell

Sent from my iPhone

From: Karen Garratt
To: Dock Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:27:30 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I am writing in opposition to the proposed building plans for property at 8127 Watterson Trail. There are multiple wildlife that live in the woods surrounding and should not have to loose their homes. There have been multiple apartments built in the area, some of which stopped due to not being able to rent out. The idea of having 3 story buildings would allow those in higher levels to look into backyards that adjoin the property. The traffic during rush hours is already congested enough and backs up at the lights on Watterson Trail and Bardstown, as well as Watterson Trail and Hurstbourne. This is going to cause further congestion, making commutes more challenging. I also feel that a thru road should not be brought through Watterson Heights. It is a very quite and quaint neighborhood that doesn't need to be disturbed. That is the drawing factor to the neighborhood and this will negate that, making selling for difficult and less profitable. There is already issues with water runoff and this would further create flooding concerns for the entire area surrounding the property. There are many other reasons but I think the above is sufficient enough.

Sincerely,
A very concerned property owner,
Karen Garratt

From: Cathy Heck
To: Dock Joel
Subject: RE: 8127 Watterson Trail 20-ZONE-0020
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:45:09 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Mr. Dock, I'd like to add comments regarding the traffic study. Hope I'm not too late.

The Traffic Study for this project can't possibly be accurate. The plan application included 492 multi-family units, 107 single-family lots, that's 599 units. If you only assume one car per unit that's 599 cars coming and going, primarily at morning and evening times to go to work. With only two exits through two neighborhoods and one on very busy Watterson Trail very near Hurstbourne Lane, cars will have to use the two neighborhood exits. This will increase traffic on Nachand Lane and Ridgehurst exponentially, not by 1.1 as cited in the study.

The last modification of the application includes a count of 100 for the proposed nursing home. The staff and visitors will probably use the Watterson Trail entrance. That entrance is too close to the light at Hurstbourne to add a traffic light so a long-left turn lane must be added here long before the project opens. Another left turn lane should be added at Whitfield Dr.

An independent traffic study should be done, not one paid for and selected by the developer.

From: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 10:22 AM
To: Cathy Heck <check1@twc.com>
Subject: RE: 8127 Watterson Trail 20-ZONE-0020

All comments submitted to our office are incorporated into the record for the Committee to consider. Your memo will be included for the Committee. The meeting on Thursday will result in no decision on the merits of the zoning change but whether the plan is technically ready for a public hearing where that discussion will take place.

The Meijer's connection is still an open question with the applicant.

Meeting material is here: <https://louisville.gov/stat.com/departmentdetail.aspx?>

ID=2345&GUID=02555288-13FD-4CCF-88A1-FAA624D4E610

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Cathy Heck <check1@twr.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: 8127 Watterson Trail 20-ZONE-0020

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I have previously submitted comments on this project. Do I need to resubmit for this meeting?
What were the results/where can I find it of the transportation study?
What arrangements, if any, did project come to with using Meijers property as an exit?
If you are not the appropriate person to provide this info, who is? Contact info?

Catherine Heck
4110 Spring Park Ln
Louisville, Ky 40218
502 493 1626

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: David
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Development
Date: Friday, July 10, 2020 9:33:15 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, I am against any height variance for this property, all building should be the same height as surrounding buildings. I would also like to see deceleration lanes on Watterson Trail with left turn lane for Laurel Spring Drive, without these we will have a very unsafe conditions.

Thank You
D.beaven@twc.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: Linda Robbins
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Height Requirements
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2020 2:12:30 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I am writing in opposition to the height variance request for the proposed Hurstbourne Commons development. If any buildings are going to be developed they should follow the same code height standards as other R-4 properties adjacent to proposed development.

Sent from my iPad

From: Harrington, Scott
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Dock, Joel
Cc: David Logan
Subject: Re: 20-ZONE-0020 Questions after July 9 meeting
Date: Monday, July 13, 2020 1:56:59 PM

Mrs. Willenbrink,

The "closed comment portion" comment only pertains to the LD&T meeting. The next time LD&T discusses this case, commissioners will be in business session to decide on the time, place and format of the public hearing (and won't hear new testimony).

At the Public Hearing before the full Planning Commission you, and other residents can bring up any concerns. After the hearing, commissioners will go into business session to make a recommendation to the Metro Council for final action. Once the commissioners vote on their recommendation (at the public hearing) then the case is closed and no new testimony can be entered into the record.

I'll let Joel answer the other questions pertaining to the specifics of the development.

Thanks!

Scott

Scott Harrington
Legislative Assistant to
Councilman Kevin J. Kramer
601 W. Jefferson St.
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-1111

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 11:28 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; David Lorán <david@davidlorandesign.com>
Subject: 20-ZONE-0020 Questions after July 9 meeting

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
I have since learned that the mail gazebo was for mail delivery to the apartments, not houses. Kevin Kramer's newsletter says that the "commissioners closed the comment section of the technical review portion of the zoning case." What does this mean? Does this mean that comments will no longer be allowed in the public record?
Who can we talk to in the Transportation Planning and MSD offices about this particular project?
What are the steps now to get into the Processing Status web page for this project? What is the link to the

July 9 meeting 'chat' notes?
 Cliff Astburner said that Meijer wrote them a letter concerning the road on July 9. What is the link to this letter?
 Who in the Kentucky Department of Traffic will review the Zimmerman traffic study and this project?
 Are the Theineman PowerPoint slides available from the July 9 meeting? If so please send the link?
 How were the peak hour traffic counts collected on December 4 for the Zimmerman traffic study? Were cameras used or some other method?
 Figure 6 on page 14 shows 25 vehicles making a left hand turn from Ridgehurst Place onto Hurstbourne Parkway in the evening. Figure 5 on page 13 shows 67 cars making this in the morning rush hour. Wouldn't the summary of all 4 opposite turns be considered when placing a traffic signal?
 Was the 3 1/2 page long email I sent on July 7 forwarded to the Transportation Planning department? Was this email sent directly to the Commissioners that were on the July 9 call?
 Will all new streets in Hurstbourne Commons be required to have sidewalks?
 Where in the Citizen User Guide does it say that the commissioners expect to hear about "technical" aspects of the project? LD&T should inform the public that the commissioners want "technical" issues discussed. This is another example of the system favoring the developer.
 Nancy Wilenbrink

From: Nancy Wilenbrink
 To: Scott Kerrington
 Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:28 AM
 Subject: 20-ZONE-0620 Hurstbourne Commons

Dear Scott,
 I have several concerns about Hurstbourne Commons. I would like these concerns and questions addressed and placed on file in the records.

ACCESS ROADS:
 There are four access roads aligned to this very large new community, Hurstbourne Commons. They are Watterson Trail, Brownwood, Brody and Meijer.

Brownwood and Brody are neighborhood roads which were designed/sized for residential use. Now these two roads are being asked to help accommodate traffic for approximately 701 living spaces. Who will pay the costs of maintaining the upkeep of these roads with the increase of traffic in the future? Is the burden of cost placed on the subdivisions? The City? Jeffersonstown?

On the LD&T call it was stated Meijer has not given their approval for an access road. Meijer connection status—working out location of road, it has not been determined if the road will be private or public. What is the definition of a private road in this situation? How can new zoning be passed when one of the major routes has not yet been approved?

If Meijer does not approve passage through their property, will this construction be approved with only three access roads?

NEW DESIGN
 A new request has been submitted for a 3 story, 41 to 42 feet high, multi family apartment building. Most homes, patio homes, apartments, office buildings and stores in this area are one to two stories high. Shouldn't the buildings in this area align with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings?

WATER ISSUES:
 It has been pointed out at neighborhood meetings that many of the Ridgehurst residents have water issues. There is concern with so much of the 70 acres now becoming blacktop, where will the runoff

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the contents are safe.

From: Scott Kerrington
 To: Nancy Wilenbrink
 Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:28 AM
 Subject: 20-ZONE-0620 Hurstbourne Commons

Dear Nancy,
 Thank you for your email regarding your concerns about Hurstbourne Commons. I will be sure to address your concerns at the next public hearing. The next public hearing will be held on August 12, 2020 at 7:00 PM. The meeting will be held at the Louisville Metro Council Chamber, 200 N. Third Street, Louisville, KY 40202. The meeting will be held in person, but we will also have a live stream of the meeting on our website. You can find more information about the meeting on our website at <https://www.louisville.gov/development/20-zone-0620-hurstbourne-commons>.

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the contents are safe.

From: Vicki Queenan
 To: Dick Joel
 Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:28 AM
 Subject: 20-ZONE-0620 Hurstbourne Commons

Dear Vicki,
 Thank you for your email regarding your concerns about Hurstbourne Commons. I will be sure to address your concerns at the next public hearing. The next public hearing will be held on August 12, 2020 at 7:00 PM. The meeting will be held at the Louisville Metro Council Chamber, 200 N. Third Street, Louisville, KY 40202. The meeting will be held in person, but we will also have a live stream of the meeting on our website. You can find more information about the meeting on our website at <https://www.louisville.gov/development/20-zone-0620-hurstbourne-commons>.

Hello,
 I have several concerns about Hurstbourne Commons. I would like these concerns and questions addressed and placed on file in the records.

ACCESS ROADS:
 There are four access roads aligned to this very large new community, Hurstbourne Commons. They are Watterson Trail, Brownwood, Brody and Meijer.

Brownwood and Brody are neighborhood roads which were designed/sized for residential use. Now these two roads are being asked to help accommodate traffic for approximately 701 living spaces. Who will pay the costs of maintaining the upkeep of these roads with the increase of traffic in the future? Is the burden of cost placed on the subdivisions? The City? Jeffersonstown?

On the LD&T call it was stated Meijer has not given their approval for an access road. Meijer connection status—working out location of road, it has not been determined if the road will be private or public. What is the definition of a private road in this situation? How can new zoning be passed when one of the major routes has not yet been approved?

If Meijer does not approve passage through their property, will this construction be approved with only three access roads?

NEW DESIGN
 A new request has been submitted for a 3 story, 41 to 42 feet high, multi family apartment building. Most homes, patio homes, apartments, office buildings and stores in this area are one to two stories high. Shouldn't the buildings in this area align with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings?

WATER ISSUES:
 It has been pointed out at neighborhood meetings that many of the Ridgehurst residents have water issues. There is concern with so much of the 70 acres now becoming blacktop, where will the runoff

rain go?
I understand there will be two retention points in the Hurstbourne Commons area, but what if that isn't enough?
Should there be a water issue who will take care of the cost to correct? Has MSD been informed?

Before passing this new zoning please take into consideration all the families that have had homes in this area for 20 years and are already dealing with heavy traffic.

I am not opposed to progress, and would be happy to see this 70 acres become a beautiful Thieneman Single Home subdivision.

Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Brady Lane Resident
502-296-4015

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

Julie P. DeWitt
Chair
Planning & Zoning Services
812-258-0800

Item: [redacted]
Item Number: [redacted]
By: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Agenda Item: [redacted]

- As an advisor to the Planning Commission:
1. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 2. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 3. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 4. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 5. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 6. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 7. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 8. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 9. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
 10. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.

DEVELOP LOUISVILLE
[redacted]

CAUTION: This email contains sensitive information. Do not share links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

My Request:
The "closed comment period" comment only pertains to the LDR meeting. The next time LDR discusses the case, commissioners will be in business session. It's done on the one, plus and format of the public hearing (and most have been before).
At the Public Hearing before the Full Planning Commission you, and other residents can bring up any concerns. After the hearing, commissioners will go into business session to make a recommendation to the Mayor Council for final action. Once the commissioners vote on their recommendation (at the public hearing) then the case is closed as no new questions can be entered into the record.
If it isn't answered the other questions pertaining to the specifics of the development.
Thank you
Scott

Scott Huntington
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

CAUTION: This email contains sensitive information. Do not share links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

1. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
2. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
3. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
4. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
5. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
6. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
7. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
8. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
9. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.
10. The applicant has submitted a preliminary site plan for a proposed 70-acre residential subdivision in the Hurstbourne Commons area. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan for the proposed subdivision.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

Julie P. DeWitt
Chair
Planning & Zoning Services
812-258-0800

Item: [redacted]
Item Number: [redacted]
By: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Agenda Item: [redacted]

CAUTION: This email contains sensitive information. Do not share links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

- The following is the agenda for the meeting. Questions or comments should be directed to the contact listed. Thank you for your interest in this meeting.
1. [redacted]
 2. [redacted]
 3. [redacted]
 4. [redacted]
 5. [redacted]
 6. [redacted]
 7. [redacted]
 8. [redacted]
 9. [redacted]
 10. [redacted]

DEVELOP LOUISVILLE
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

CAUTION: This email contains sensitive information. Do not share links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 11:12:00 PM

The "leave comments" option is available on the LDT meeting. The next one LD&T discusses the case. Commissioners will be in business session to discuss the case prior and during the public hearing on each case respectively.

At the Public Hearing before the full Planning Commission you and other residents can bring up any concerns. After the hearing, commissioners will go into business session to make a recommendation to the Metro Council for their action. Check the commissioners vote on their recommendation (at the public hearing) then the case is closed and no new testimony can be entered into the record.

Please answer the other questions pertaining to the specifics of the development.

Thank you

Scott

Scott Harrington

City of Louisville
1000 North 2nd Street
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 11:30 AM
To: Scott Harrington <sharrington@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

David,
I responded to what I can in RED below.

From: David Lorán <david@louisville.gov>
To: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Cc: Joel Dock <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 11:12:00 PM

David,
I responded to what I can in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: David Lorán <david@louisville.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 12:35 PM
To: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Cc: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisville.gov>; Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>; Liu, Emily <emily.liu@louisville.gov>
Subject: Re: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

For Dock, Kramer, Harrington and Commission members:

The Meijer non confirmation of any agreement should stop this development until we have details of ingress and egress.

Why didn't Kramer's office oppose this because of this reason alone? Or for that matter the case manager or commission? The project will be reviewed based on proposed/available access. Staff has preliminarily reviewed the zoning change during pre-app and again provided at LD&T that more information concerning this access is desired. Again, the applicant may move forward with or without this access point and the project will be reviewed given the availability of information. LD&T was not responsible for considering the merits of the zoning. The councilperson office may respond if they chose but ordinarily a council person does not take an official position on zoning changes that will come before the council.

I have called Council Kramer's office to discuss this and not received a call back. Scott Harrington made it clear and told us at the beginning of this development process that they are to be impartial but yet on the LDT call on July 9, Councilwoman Fowler called in from her beach vacation about concerns she had for the development of RacTrac and citizens concerns in her district. This is NOT

an impartial role.

Apparently Kramer's silence shows no concerns for the 365 people/citizens/taxpayers/voters who signed the petition for a night hearing and the citizens concerns about the development as a whole and does indeed prove that he is not impartial but favors the project. We are not being represented properly by our councilman's office.

I asked Joel Dock about binding elements and I believe the reply is LDT doesn't like for citizens to request these? Please explain this and how can it be possible? My response on 7/10/20: ...if you have ideas for binding elements please let me know. Please note that staff does not support use restrictive binding elements and will advise against if one is proposed. PC and Metro Council will consider.

How do I request a binding element that Whitfield Drive will never have an ingress or egress to development? This is my request. I'll note this request. This point was previously discussed and it was determined that the connection would not be required per LDC 5.9.2.A.1.a

Also, LDT did not address my concern about rezoning tract 1 and 2 for OR-1, when there isn't ANY plans on the development shown in drawings for separate buildings for OR-1 designation. I believe this to be a requirement, is this true? The project will be reviewed based on the requested zoning districts. An analysis of this will be provided in the staff report published prior to the public hearing.

The attorney for the development said they want to move forward with original plans for tract 1 and 2. Then, why grant rezoning to OR-1 if there are no plans for building separate office buildings on it? Where is the justification? The project will be reviewed based on the requested zoning districts. The appropriateness of the zoning district per the below is the matter at hand for the Planning Commission:

KRS Chapter 100.213 provides the following criteria for granting the proposed form district change/rezoning:

1. The proposed form district/rezoning change complies with the applicable guidelines and policies Plan 2040; OR
2. The existing form district/zoning classification is inappropriate and the proposed classification is appropriate; OR
3. There have been major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the area involved which were not anticipated in Plan 2040 which have substantially altered the basic character of the area.

An analysis of this will be provided in the staff report published prior to the public hearing.

There is a proposed 6' shadow box fence to be constructed along/next to Bischoff property.

I am requesting a 6' shadow box fence to be constructed on tract 1 and 2 next to Watterson Heights neighborhood. How do I request this? Through Joel Dock, Kramer's office or developer? This is my

request. Received.

I officially request mature trees be saved along property lines. There are many along Hester's and Whites property next to proposed development. And there are many near Morrison property. And many along Nachand Springs and Ridgehurst. Save Louisville's tree canopy, these trees have taken over 60 years to grow.

Also was told by Joel Dock that since my name is designated on the petition, that I would be contacted regarding the details how we are to move forward with a night hearing meeting. I have yet to hear any feedback. Is this information going to be determined today and then feedback sent? Because we have not needed to discuss venues outside government facilities, it was not necessary to reach out. Typically, we would reach out to discuss fees and security associated with non-government facilities.

I have strong concerns about virtual meetings and effectiveness. The sound and video and connectivity quality are not reliable and many either don't have access or have the technical knowledge on how to connect to a virtual meeting.

The delay in audio and video quality is a main concern, missing out on people's comments. How do we know if the LTD commissioners heard everything? Are they required to read transcripts from virtual meetings? LD&T is provided all citizen comments and material in advance of the hearing. The LD&T members are required to review the minutes of their meeting and approve those minutes at the next meeting. Meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.

From the last virtual meeting with LTD, there were citizens who tried to speak in opposition but were either not given the chance or were ignored and not recognized, or didn't know how to request to oppose, some people just opted to comment in chat mode. This is a serious concern, Citizens not being allowed to oppose in a proper way.

We were blocked in some cases to see which citizens were actually on the call. The storm passing through cut some off from the end of the meeting.

The spreading of Covid-19 prevents us from meeting in person and this should be discussed in further detail as the spread continues to grow.

The nighttime hearing meetings are designed in part so large groups of people who oppose developments can gather in person and can be heard and express concerns collectively and effectively. Virtual meetings lose impact of intense opposition and fall heavily in favor for developer.

I call on Emily Liu to come up with a solution that will allow crowds to meet when the pandemic is over. This development should be placed on hold until the citizens can truly voice opinions in person with unity.

Kind Regards,
David Loran

WATER ISSUES:

It has been pointed out at neighborhood meetings that many of the Ridgehurst residents have water issues.

There is concern with so much of the 70 acres now becoming blacktop, where will the runoff rain go?

I understand there will be two retention points in the Hurstbourne Commons area, but what if that isn't enough?

Should there be a water issue who will take care of the cost to correct? Has MSD been informed?

Before passing this new zoning please take into consideration all the families that have had homes in this area for 20 years and are already dealing with heavy traffic.

I am not opposed to progress, and would be happy to see this 70 acres become a beautiful Thieneman Single Home subdivision.

Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Brody Lane Resident
502-296-4015

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 22, 2020, at 10:23 PM, Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,
I have several concerns about Hurstbourne Commons. I would like these concerns and questions addressed and placed on file in the records.

ACCESS ROADS:

There are four access roads aligned to this very large new community, Hurstbourne Commons.
They are Watterson Trail, Brownwood, Brody and Meijer.

Brownwood and Brody are neighborhood roads which were designed/sized for residential use.
Now these two roads are being asked to help accommodate traffic for approximately 701 living spaces.

Who will pay the costs of maintaining the upkeep of these roads with the increase of traffic in the future?

Is the burden of cost placed on the subdivisions? The City? Jeffersonstown?

On the LD&T call it was stated Meijer has not given their approval for an access road. Meijer connection status-- working out location of road, it has not been determined if the road will be private or public.

What is the definition of a private road in this situation?

How can new zoning be passed when one of the major routes has not yet been approved?

If Meijer does not approve passage through their property, will this construction be approved with only three access roads?

NEW DESIGN

A new request has been submitted for a 3 story, 41 to 42 feet high, multi family apartment building.

Most homes, patio homes, apartments, office buildings and stores in this area are one to two stories high.

Shouldn't the buildings in this area align with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings?

From: Townes, Jared M.
To: Kyle Smith
Cc: Dock, Joel
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons Proposal
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 5:51:43 PM
Attachments: image001.png

Kyle,

Thank you for reaching out to Councilman Engel's office.

Thank you for providing your concerns about the additional traffic and density of the proposed Hurstbourne Commons project. We will keep your concerns on file. Councilman Engel will review all concerns submitted to our office before this case comes before the Planning and Zoning Committee.

We are connecting Joel Dock, the case manager for this project, on this email so that he can add your concerns to the official record.

Best Regards,



Jared M. Townes
Legislative Assistant to
Councilman Robin Engel
District 22
Louisville Metro Council
City Hall - 2nd Floor
601 W. Jefferson St.
Louisville, KY 40202
Phone: (502) 574-3467
Email: jared.townes@louisvilleky.gov

From: Kyle Smith <kkylesmith@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 9:49 AM
To: Engel, Robin <Robin.Engel@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Fw: Hurstbourne Commons Proposal

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links

or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

From: [Cathy Reed](#)
To: [Dock, Joel](#)
Subject: [8127 Waterson Trail 20-ZONE-0020](#)
Date: [Saturday, August 8, 2020 11:28:54 AM](#)

Mr. Engel:

Please see below the message that I forwarded to Mr. Kramer regarding the Hurstbourne Commons project. I understand from previous correspondence from your office that the property is just outside of your district, but you are monitoring the situation. My wife and I actually have houses in your and Mr. Kramer's district. The one inside your district is located on Walnut Hills Drive, which runs off of Laurel Springs Drive, and therefore would also be negatively impacted by the increased traffic flow that would be dumped onto Waterson Trail by this project.

I would appreciate your opposition to the rezoning, at least at the density level currently proposed.

Thank you.

Kyle Smith

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kyle Smith kysmith@jcsd.com
To: "Lisa M. Leland" <lisa@lmsd.com> <lisa@lmsd.com> <lisa@lmsd.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020, 02:24:59 PM EDT
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Proposal

Mr. Kramer

Thank you for the update. I reviewed the Traffic Impact study and found the conclusions therein laughable. Building 50+ residences (and who knows how many businesses) on that 70 acres, with the existing traffic issues, will have a "minor" impact? Come on. I assume the developer paid for that study.

My view is that, unfortunately, the land will be developed. Lord knows there can be no green space in this town. However, if there are truly any meaningful considerations of these projects, this one should be scaled way back. Please do whatever you can to help. I do note that I am not alone in my opinion.

Thank You
Kyle Smith

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

We had a meeting with Mr. Thieneman about the tree line on his property behind Nachand Springs development. He said when they submit new plans it will have "LBA" along the entire property line, including the retention basin which borders Nachand Springs. He promised they would not remove trees in the first 15 feet of the property line. Have new plans been submitted? Do new plans need to be submitted before this project proceeds to the next step? Can new plans be submitted at the next step?

From: [Nancy & Jack Willenbrink](#)
To: [Dock, Joel](#); [Harrington, Scott](#); [David Loran](#); [Vicki Queenan](#)
Subject: [20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons](#)
Date: [Thursday, September 3, 2020 11:15:37 AM](#)

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

Joel Dock,

The next planning meeting is September 10 at 1:00 and Hurstbourne Commons is the first item on the agenda.

Has Metro decided how many people can be at a public meeting?

What is the status of the Meijer entrance?

Has the traffic study been shared with the Kentucky Department of Transportation?

Thank you,

Nancy Willenbrink

From: [Dock, Joel](#)
To: [Nancy & Jack Willenbrink](#); [Harrington, Scott](#); [David Loran](#); [Vicki Queenan](#)
Subject: [RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons](#)
Date: [Thursday, September 3, 2020 11:22:00 AM](#)
Attachments: [image01.png](#); [image02.png](#)

The details for scheduling the night meeting have not yet been fully agreed upon. The Policies and procedures committee of the Planning Commission. They are meeting for the 4th week in a row to discuss night hearing procedures. To the best of my knowledge, a process will be finalized at tomorrow's meeting.

No formal plans have been submitted for the connection through Meijer. PDS staff and agencies have been provided a concept plan for the creation of public roadways at this location.

KYTC is typically involved in the process with respect to traffic improvement to state rights-of-way, but Transportation Planning staff/DPOV is the reviewer of the traffic studies and ensures that any requirements of that plan are met.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Develop Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
484 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502.574.5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: [Nancy & Jack Willenbrink](#) <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: [Thursday, September 3, 2020 11:15 AM](#)
To: [Dock, Joel](#) <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; [Harrington, Scott](#) <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; [David Loran](#) <david@davidlorandesign.com>; [Vicki Queenan](#) <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Subject: [20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons](#)

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

Joel Dock,

The next planning meeting is September 10 at 1:00 and Hurstbourne Commons is the first item on the agenda.

Has Metro decided how many people can be at a public meeting?

What is the status of the Meijer entrance?

Has the traffic study been shared with the Kentucky Department of Transportation?

Thank you,

Nancy Willenbrink

From: Dock, Joel
To: Ashburner, Clifford (Clifford.Ashburner@LD&T.METRO.COM); Young@ltd-mv.com
Subject: FW: update status Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:33:00 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

The individual is requesting 2 binding elements. Would you agree to the Whitefield connection prohibition? It's not needed for this plan and the BL can be amended in the future, if necessary.

The second, is a shadowbox fence in place of the required 6' landscape screen. Thoughts?

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Develop Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,
What is the status of my request for a binding element to be added to the Hurstbourne Commons

development?

The binding element request is that Whitfield Dr. will never connect to the development.

I do not see it as public record.

Also what is the status of request for 6" shadowbox fence to be built along tract 1 and 2 of development?

Example is a proposed fence on the rendering next to Bischoff property?

I do not see this on the rendering from applicant on record.

Thank you,

David Loran
502-767-9010

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Harrington, Scott; David Loran; Vicki Queenan
Cc: David, Brian
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 12:44:00 PM
Attachments: image003.png
image002.png

Final meeting details were not finalized last Friday. Another meeting is being held this coming Friday. The subject case will be scheduled for an evening meeting on Thursday (9/10) at LD&T based on the "final draft" to be presented to the Policies and Procedures Committee on Friday. Our office has been in contact with the Jeffersonian for this hearing. We understand that the capacity for the in-person meeting is only limited by the facilities capacity following social distancing guidelines. I believe the number was around 250 for this facility. Virtual capacity is capped at 1,000 participants. The meeting will be conducted as a hybrid meeting allowing for both virtual and physical attendance.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 12:11 PM
To: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Re: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

How many people can be at a public meeting?

Nancy W.

On Thursday, September 3, 2020, 11:22:35 AM EDT, Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov> wrote

The details for scheduling the night meeting have not yet been fully agreed upon by the Policies and Procedures Committee of the Planning Commission. They are meeting for the 4th week in a row to discuss night hearing procedures. To the best of my knowledge, a process will be finalized at tomorrow's meeting.

No formal plans have been submitted for the connection through Meyer. PDS staff and agencies have been provided a concept plan for the creation of public roadways at this location.

KYTC is typically involved in the process with respect to traffic improvement to state rights-of-way but Transportation Planning staff/OPW is the reviewer of the traffic studies and ensures that any requirements of that plan are met.

Joel P. Dock, AICP

Planner II

Planning & Design Services

Department of Develop Louisville

LOUISVILLE FORWARD

444 South Fifth Street Suite 300

Louisville KY 40202

502-574-5860

<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



DEVELOP
LOUISVILLE
LOUISVILLE FORWARD



From: Nancy & Jack Wilenbrink <nwilen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 11:15 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>;
David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenavicki@gmail.com>
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:11:00 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP

Planner II

Planning & Design Services

502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, thanks for your reply. I follow up below.

Does Planning and Design approve the binding element of the applicant/developer (an agree ahead of time and approve)? Who/what agency makes the final decision? **Binding Elements are at the discretion of the Planning Commission and Metro Council. Staff will provide a set of proposed binding elements for consideration. Many of these elements are standard language based on the case type and development plan. We would like to have the applicants agreement but it is not required.**

Either way though, currently the fact is that PDS and DPW have determined Whitfield rd HOA a necessary connector for this development based on their criteria/standards.

Will the privacy style fence that is proposed next to Bischoff property include an evergreen screen? So both elements are incorporated? **The screening can either be 1.) privacy style screen; or 2.) evergreen screen. I sent your request to the applicant to get more information on the property line.**

This is what I am requesting fence and evergreen screens. Do you know how many feet off the property line the fence would measure? Would the evergreen screen sit on the development side of fence or closer to our neighborhood side of fence? Once a fence is installed what are the upkeep conditions. Are there binding elements that need to be requested or included for maintenance of the fence for the development?

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons

Joel Dock,

The next planning meeting is September 10 at 1:00 and Hurstbourne Commons is the first item on the agenda

Has Metro decided how many people can be at a public meeting?

What is the status of the Meyer entrance?

Has the traffic study been shared with the Kentucky Department of Transportation?

Thank you.

Nancy Wilenbrink

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Do we have a decision on Meyer access? Can you please explain the difference between a private road vs. a regular ingress/egress? **Private roads are maintained by private entities and can restrict access. Public roads are maintained by the public for the public's benefit/use.**

Also, I believe Commissioner Carlson stated that "maybe" we should have RTU look into speed humps for Brownwood. As a non regular attendee, how do remarks like this actually come to fruition? Is this something else we need to ask the developer to work with ETC and speed humps? They really would be needed the most on low streets; Brownwood and Wenwood. The Wenwood connector is long enough for traffic to pass in speed. **The applicant and staff will consider the advice and opinions of the Committee in advance of the public hearing and provide any material relevant to that discussion at the public hearing, if necessary. Chief Carlson will most likely follow-up. I believe speed humps are based on warrants of existing traffic, so the problem needs to first exist.**

Thank you,
David Loran
502 767 9010

From: Dock, Joel (Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov)
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Loran David (dloran@ups.com)
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Whitfield drive is a stub connection to the property that is required to connect, unless the directors of PDs and DPW determine it to be unnecessary based on multiple factors. They have done just that. Whitfield Drive may be needed in the future if the development plans change, which will require a public meeting. I generally don't have an issue with the binding element though for this project that said, I have not reviewed a staff report since this initially went to IBET. I will not do so until it is scheduled for a public hearing.

The development on Tracts 1 and 2 will include a 6' privacy style fence or evergreen screen as required by the LDC.

I will forward both of these binding elements to the applicant in an attempt to secure concurrence to these prior to a public hearing.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South 4th Street, Suite 200
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning/design>



From: djloran@ups.com <djloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidorandesign.com
Subject: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,
What is the status of my request for a binding element to be added to the Hurstbourne Commons development?
The binding element request is that Whitfield Dr. will never connect to the development.

I do not see it as public record.

Also what is the status of request for 6" shadowbox fence to be built along tract 1 and 2 of development?
Example is a proposed fence on the rendering next to Bischoff property?

I do not see this on the rendering from applicant on record.

From: djloran@ups.com
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: david@davidorandesign.com
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:21:15 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel, thanks.
More follow up questions

Again, is there a decision on Mejer access, whether it be a private road or public road? I request that we have a definitive answer with public documentation before we move forward with the development. I believe it to have a major impact on area and development.

If Mejer has an option to have a private road with limited access does that mean that Watterson Heights can restrict access and make our roads private as well?

Is ETC required to work with Mejer and developer on this access point?

Also follow up to speed humps. I believe ETC requires 300 cars traveling on the road to qualify. If you multiplied the amount of residency proposed by 1.5 that equals to roughly over a thousand vehicles. If you divided up three entries among new residents that equals over 350 vehicles using these access points not counting employees, deliveries, and cut through traffic. Bredy Lane becoming a major access point to the development will connect to Ridgehurst which already has speed humps. Can you have the developer or Chief consider this or make a call to ETC and explain that this fact is already justification that speed humps will be necessary. Can we ask that the developer pay for these speed humps since we already know they will be necessary.

From: Dock, Joel [<mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:11 PM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <djloran@ups.com>
Cc: david@davidorandesign.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services

Thank you,

David Loran
502-767-9010

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

502-574-5860

From: djloran@ups.com <djloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidorandesign.com
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel, thanks for your reply. Follow up below.

Does Planning and Design approve the binding element or the applicant/developer can agree ahead of time and approve? Who/what agency makes the final decision? **Binding Elements are at the discretion of the Planning Commission and Metro Council. Staff will provide a set of proposed binding elements for consideration. Many of these elements are standard language based on the case type and development plan. We would like to have the applicants agreement but it is not required.**

Either way though, currently the fact is that PDS and DPW have determined Whitfield is NOT a necessary connector for this development based on three criteria/factors.

Will the privacy style fence that is proposed next to Bischoff property include an evergreen screen? So both elements are incorporated? **The screening can either be 1.) privacy style screen; or 2.) evergreen screen. I sent your request to the applicant to get more information on the property line.**

This is what I am requesting fence and evergreen screens. Do you know how many feet off the property line the fence would measure? Would the evergreen screen sit on the development side of fence or closer to our neighborhood side of fence? Once a fence is installed what are the upkeep conditions. Are there binding elements that need to be requested or included for maintenance of the fence for the development?

Do we have a decision on Mejer access? Can you please explain the difference between a private road vs. a regular ingress/egress? **Private roads are maintained by private entities and can restrict access. Public roads are maintained by the public for the public's benefit/use.**

Also, I believe Commissioner Carlson stated that "maybe" we should have ETC look into speed humps for Greenwood. As a non-regular attendee, how do requests like this actually come to fruition? Is this something else we need to ask the developer to work with ETC and speed humps? They really would be needed the most on five streets, Greenwood and Wetmore. The Greenwood connector is long enough for traffic to pick up speed. **The applicant and staff will consider the advice and opinions of the Committee in advance of the public hearing and provide any material**

relevant to that discussion at the public hearing, if necessary. Chief Carlson will most likely follow-up. I believe speed humps are based on warrants of existing traffic, so the problem needs to first exist.

Thank you,
David Loran
502-767-9010

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@ups.com>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Whitfield drive is a stub connector to the property that is required to connect, unless the directors of PDS and DPW determine it to be unnecessary based on multiple factors. They have done just that. Whitfield Drive may be needed in the future if the development plans change, which will require a public meeting. I generally don't have an issue with the binding element though for this project. That said, I have not received a staff report since this initially went to LB&T. I will not do so until it is scheduled for a public hearing.

The development on Tracts 1 and 2 will include a 6' privacy style fence or evergreen screen as required by the LDC.

I will forward both of these binding elements to the applicant in an attempt to secure concurrence to these prior to a public hearing.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello joel,
What is the status of my request for a binding element to be added to the Hurstbourne Commons development?

The binding element request is that Whitfield Dr. will never connect to the development.

I do not see it as public record.

Also what is the status of request for 6" shadowbox fence to be built along tract 1 and 2 of development?

Example is a proposed fence on the rendering next to Bischoff property?

I do not see this on the rendering from applicant on record.

Thank you,

David Loran
502-767-9010

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: dloran@ups.com
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:31:03 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Why? What is holding this up?

And can you address my other questions?

From: Dock, Joel [mailto:Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:24 PM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <dloran@ups.com>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

There has been no final decision on the Meijer access.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:21 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: david@davidlorandesign.com
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel, Thanks.

More follow up questions:

Again, is there a decision on Mejer access, whether it be a private road or public road? I request that we have a definitive answer with public documentation before we move forward with the development. I believe it to have a major impact on area and development.

If Mejer has an option to have a private road with limited access does that mean that Waterson Heights can restrict access and make our roads private as well?

Is KTC required to work with Mejer and developer on this access point?

Also before up to speed humps, I believe KTC requires 300 cars traveling on the road to qualify. If you multiplied the amount of residency proposed by 1.5 that equals roughly over a thousand vehicles. If you divided up three entries among new residents that equals over 350 vehicles using these access points not counting employees, deliveries, and cut through traffic. Brody Lane becoming a major access point to the development will connect to Ridgehurst which already has speed humps. Can you have the developer or Chief consider this or make a call to KTC and explain that this fact is already justification that speed humps will be necessary. Can we ask that the developer pay for these speed humps since we already know they will be necessary.

From: Dock, Joel [<mailto:Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:11 PM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <loran@louisville.gov>
Cc: david@louisville.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: loran@louisville.gov <loran@louisville.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>
Cc: david@louisville.gov
Subject: RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Cc: david@louisville.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION! This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Whitfield drive is a stub connection to the property that is required to connect, unless the directors of PDS and DPW determine it to be unnecessary based on multiple factors. They have done just that. Whitfield Drive may be needed in the future if the development plans change, which will require a public meeting. I generally don't have an issue with the binding element though for this project. That said, I have not needed a staff report since this initially went to D&T. I will not do so until it is scheduled for a public hearing.

The development on tracts 1 and 2 will include a 6' privacy style fence or evergreen screen as required by the IDK.

I will forward both of these binding elements to the applicant in an attempt to secure concurrence to these prior to a public hearing.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Develop Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: loran@louisville.gov <loran@louisville.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>
Cc: david@louisville.gov

Joel, thanks for your reply. I follow up below.

Does Planning and Design approve the binding element or the applicant/developer can agree ahead of time and approve? Who/what agency makes the final decision? **Binding Elements are at the discretion of the Planning Commission and Metro Council. Staff will provide a set of proposed binding elements for consideration. Many of these elements are standard language based on the case type and development plan. We would like to have the applicants agreement but it is not required.**

Either way though, currently the fact is that PDS and DPW have determined Whitfield is NOT a necessary connector for this development based on their criteria/factors.

Will the privacy style fence that is proposed next to Bischoff property include an evergreen screen? So both elements are incorporated? **The screening can either be 1.] privacy style screen; or 2.] evergreen screen. I sent your request to the applicant to get more information on the property line.**

This is what I am requesting fence and evergreen screens. Do you know how many feet off the property line the fence would measure? Would the evergreen screen sit on the development side of fence or closer to our neighborhood side of fence? Once a fence is installed what are the upkeep conditions. Are there binding elements that need to be requested or included for maintenance of the fence for the development?

Do we have a decision on Mejer access? Can you please explain the difference between a private road vs. a regular ingress/egress? **Private roads are maintained by private entities and can restrict access. Public roads are maintained by the public for the public's benefit/use.**

Also, I believe Commissioner Carlson stated that "maybe" we should have P&D look into speed humps for Brownwood. As a non regular attendee, how do remarks like this actually come to fruition? Is this something else we need to ask the developer to work with KTC and speed humps? They really would be needed the most on two streets; Brownwood and Wenwood. The Wenwood connector is long enough for traffic to pick up speed. **The applicant and staff will consider the advice and opinions of the Committee in advance of the public hearing and provide any material relevant to that discussion at the public hearing, if necessary. Chief Carlson will most likely follow-up. I believe speed humps are based on warrants of existing traffic, so the problem needs to first exist.**

Thank you,
David Loran
502-767-9010

From: Dock, Joel [<mailto:Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Loran David (FKX9HMD) <loran@louisville.gov>

Subject: update status Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,
What is the status of my request for a binding element to be added to the Hurstbourne Commons development?

The binding element request is that Whitfield Dr. will never connect to the development.

I do not see it as public record.

Also what is the status of request for 6" shadowbox fence to be built along tract 1 and 2 of development?

Example is a proposed fence on the rendering next to Bischoff property?

I do not see this on the rendering from applicant on record.

Thank you,
David Loran
502-767-9010

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Dock, Joel
To: Harrington, Scott; Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
Cc: David Loran; Vicki Queenan; Ridgehurst Homeowners; Williams, Julie
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting
Date: Monday, September 14, 2020 10:46:00 AM
Attachments: 17043-1-EXHIBIT - DEFINITION 20200722.pdf

From: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 9:27 AM
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>; Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting

All:

The LD&T committee, as a committee of the Planning Commission tasked primarily with deciding whether a case is ready for a public hearing, decided to schedule the public hearing. That committee is aware that a final agreement has not been reached on the connection to Meijer. I provided testimony to this effect at the initial LD&T meeting and in the staff report. LD&T has discretion to schedule and request information between meetings, including additional information regarding connectivity and traffic analysis, and to point out potential issues in technical reports that may arise at the public meeting. I believe they have done just that...No decision has been made on the merits of the change in zoning request, with or without the connection. The applicant is aware of the risk and has decided, at this time, to pursue the public hearing without a formal submittal for the Meijer connection. This may change, but our office cannot force a submittal for adjacent site. If a formal submittal is made for the connection as part of this record, it will be included. I have requested and encouraged such a submittal. At this time, we only have a concept that is not part of the official application, but it is subject to open records. I've provided, see attached.

Prior to the public meeting, our office will produce a staff report based on the information available in the record for this case. Material (traffic studies, justifications, public comments) will be published in advance of the public hearing, typically a week prior. Material is also available digitally throughout the course of the case, at the following link: <https://arc.louisville.gov/arc/Default.aspx>. With respect to binding elements, those are at the discretion of the Planning Commission and Metro Council. Binding elements do not have to be discussed prior to public hearing. They also do not have to be agreed upon by the applicant. The Planning Commission makes a recommendation to Metro Council and Council takes final actions on the zoning change and binding elements. This may include a binding element for connectivity, it may not.

Violation of binding elements can involve monetary penalties as set forth by law. Typically, a connectivity binding elements would be tied to permits or some other mechanism where we can actively hold the development hostage until a connection is made.

Certificates of occupancy are required to occupy the building for the first time after it has been constructed, essentially, certifying that the building has received all permits and inspections and is ready to be habitable.

Let me know if I left out any response to your questions.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

Joel,

I just want to echo Mrs. Willenbrink's concerns. At both the Informational Neighborhood Meetings, the proposed development plans showed 4 access points. The traffic study was also based on traffic volumes with 4 connection roads to the site. I understand that the applicant is still working with Meijers on an agreement for a shared road, but if there's no agreement prior to the Public Hearing, will that be communicated to the public? Commissioner Brown eluded to something like a Binding Element that will hold issuances of Certificate of Occupancy if an agreement isn't reached. Without seeing the proposed language for a BE, no one is sure how the case will move forward. Once commissioners vote on the zoning change, that will lock in the density of the development that was based on 4 connection roads. I believe what Mrs. Willenbrink's main point is that IF the applicant can't reach an agreement with Meijer, then that increases the traffic on the other 3 connection roads which is driven by the number of units being proposed. Will the applicant's traffic engineer share with residents a traffic study based on only 3 connection roads IF an agreement with Meijer can't be reached?

Thank you!

Scott

Scott Harrington

Legislative Assistant to

Councilman Kevin J. Kramer

601 W. Jefferson St.

Louisville, KY 40202

502-574-1111

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 9:24 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>

Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel Dock,
The only purpose of the planning conference on Thursday 9-10-20 was to set the date of the night public hearing. However, at the meeting additional information was discussed which has not been shared with the public. Let me summarize and tell you how the meeting went. Let me know if you don't agree with my summary. My comments are in parentheses and I'll mostly use first names. The times shown are approximate minutes into the meeting.
At 6:30 Joel Dock gives a summary of the proposed development.
At 9:30 Cliff Ashburner, Thieneman's lawyer, says that the physical location of the Jeffersonian and date have been discussed. Cliff asks that the date be set.
At 10:00 I asked about the proposed Meijer entrance/exit. (This issue was not going to be discussed. It's called a connection later.)
At 14:30 Cliff mentions that Kevin Young, Thieneman land planner, has a new plan and is having agencies reviewing it. It is something they can address in a binding element by the time they get to a public hearing. (This is the first time a new plan and a binding element is mentioned and he gives no details.)
At 15:30 Jeff Brown, a commissioner, has assumed that the traffic study does not include the Meijer connection traffic.
Cliff says he doesn't know if it is included or not.
I answer that the traffic study shows traffic at all entrances/exits. I comment that I think the overall traffic study is short by 100 cars (160 vs 250). (This is a large amount and means that the whole traffic study is distorted and wrong.)
At 17:00 Jeff Brown says that yes the traffic is shown at the Meijer connection on page 11 and 12. He mentions a binding element or certificates of occupancy until the connection is made. (We don't know what assumptions the other commissioners have made.)
At 18:00 Cliff is asked by Marilyn Lewis if Diane Zimmerman will be at the public meeting. He says yes. Cliff now says that the binding element is something they were planning to propose at the public meeting or before. He says they were working with the staff.
At 18:00 the public meeting is set for October 13.
At 38:00 Cliff mentions that they have a "very transparent process" on their projects. (There is no transparency concerning the Meijer connection.)

So the general public today knows that there is a development planned with a Meijer entrance/exit. This plan was submitted, presented and reviewed with a Meijer connection before the public meeting date was set for October 13. The early public meetings were held and the traffic study done with Meijer as the MAIN connection.
Now the commissioners are being told a binding element is being pursued. Jeff Brown thought that the Meijer connection was NOT included and the other commissions probably think the same thing. The public and the commissioners were sold this project with the idea of a Meijer connection.
Now Thieneman wants a binding element.

My questions:
How and when is this new information (concerning binding elements or certificates of occupancy or permits) going to be shared with the public? How is the public to know about changes BEFORE a public meeting?
In an earlier meeting Cliff Ashburner, Thieneman's lawyer, said that Meijer had written a letter to Thieneman concerning the entrance. Was this letter shared with the planning commission? If not, why not? Is this the transparency Cliff mentioned? The planning commission is taking the words of Thieneman

and only hearing one side of any agreement. Who is the Meijer contact on this project?
What and where is this new plan that Thieneman has? How is it to be shared with the public before the public meeting?
Who is looking at the details of the Zimmerman traffic study and making sure that it is realistic? Why shouldn't the traffic study be recalculated? What is Jeff Brown's email and telephone number?
I think I know what a development binding element is but could you explain how it is used in a development like this?
How many times has a binding element NOT been followed by Thieneman?
What happens if Thieneman doesn't follow thru with what the binding element says? If the penalty is monetary, who sets the amount owed?
What are certificates of occupancy? What else is being discussed that the public doesn't know about?
Can you get back to me with answers to all these questions?
Nancy Willenbrink

From: Nancy & Jack Wilenbrink
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Davis, Logan; Vicki Quisenberry; Budgetural Homeowners; Williams, Julia
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons - summary 9-10-20 meeting
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 11:01:25 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel Dock,

Please add the follow to the public record for case 20-Zone-0020 Hurstbourne Commons.

The LD&T meeting on 9-10-2020 was the first time to my knowledge a binding element was mentioned to the public (you had to be on the conference call to know it was even revealed) concerning the Meijer entrance. Cliff Ashburner spoke very quickly so I went back to hear the details from the meeting. Details of binding elements are not being shared with the public. The public is intentionally being kept in the dark. This is another example of the process favoring the developer.

The only purpose of the conference on Thursday 9-10-20 was to set the date of the night public hearing. However at the meeting, additional information was discussed which has not been shared with the public. Let me summarize and tell you how the meeting went. Let me know if you don't agree with my summary. My comments are in parentheses and I'll mostly use first names. The times shown are approximate minutes into the meeting.

At 6:30 Joel Dock gives a summary of the proposed development.

At 9:30 Cliff Ashburner, Thieneman's lawyer, says that the physical location of the Jeffersonian and date have been discussed. Cliff asks that the date be set.

At 10:00 I asked about the proposed Meijer entrance/exit. (This issue was not going to be discussed. It's called a connection later.)

At 14:30 Cliff mentions that Kevin Young, Thieneman land planner, has a new plan and is having agencies reviewing it. It is something they can address in a binding element by the time they get to a public hearing. (This is the first time a new plan and a binding element is mentioned and he gives no details.)

At 15:30 Jeff Brown, a commissioner, seems to assume that the traffic study does not include the Meijer connection traffic. (We don't know what assumptions the other commissioners have made.)

Cliff says he doesn't know if it is included or not.

I answer that the traffic study shows traffic at all entrances/exits including Meijer. I comment that I think the overall traffic study is short by 100 cars (160 vs 250). (This is a large amount and means that the whole traffic study is distorted and wrong.)

At 17:00 Jeff Brown says that yes the traffic is shown at the Meijer connection on page 11 and 12. He mentions a binding element limiting building permits or certificates of occupancy until the

connection is made.

At 18:00 Cliff is asked by Marilyn Lewis if Diane Zimmerman will be at the public meeting. He says yes.

Cliff now says that the binding element is something they were planning to propose at the public meeting or before. He says they were working with the staff.

At 19:00 the public meeting is set for October 13.

Later at 39:00 Cliff mentions that they have a "very transparent process" on their projects. (There is no transparency concerning the Meijer connection.)

So the general public knows that there is a development planned with a Meijer entrance/exit. This plan was submitted, presented and reviewed with a Meijer connection before the public meeting date was set for October 13. The two earlier public meetings were held and the traffic study done with Meijer as the MAIN connection.

Now the commissioners are being told a binding element is being pursued. Jeff Brown thought that the Meijer connection was NOT included and the other commissions probably think the same thing. The public and the commissioners were sold this project with the idea of a Meijer connection. Now Thieneman has a new plan and an unknown binding element is involved.

Thank you for adding this to the public record.

Nancy Wilenbrink

From: Nancy & Jack Wilenbrink
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Davis, Logan; Vicki Quisenberry; Budgetural Homeowners; Williams, Julia
Subject: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 11:26:01 AM

Nancy Wilenbrink

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel Dock,

I have reviewed in detail your 9-14-20 email. It is interesting that a binding element does not have to be agreed upon by the applicant.

Could you confirm the number of folks the Jeffersonian can hold? If there is a problem that night fogging into the meeting will a telephone number be provided for assistance?

When will Thieneman be required to post signs on the property advertising the date and time of the public meeting?

LD&T should have a file of the approved 365 signatures and there addresses which requested a night public hearing. Can you send this file?

Cliff Ashburner, Thieneman's lawyer, said at the 9-10-20 meeting that he had a new plan being reviewed by agencies so your office should have access to this plan. Is this information available to the public? What is the file name?

HOW is the public to know about changes a week before a public meeting?

In an earlier meeting Cliff Ashburner said that Meijer had written a letter to Thieneman concerning the entrance. Was this letter shared with the planning commission?

Information is only being provided by Thieneman. Do you know who the Meijer contact is on this project?

LDC 5.9.2 requires the extension of residential stubs to serve new development. Nachand Springs patio home community and Greenhurst condominiums have residential stubs. Why are they not being utilized?

Who is looking at the details of the Zimmerman traffic study and making sure that it is realistic?

Will the traffic study be recalculated since it appears to be short 100 vehicles and only one intersection is assigned an F rating?

Is Jeff Brown's email and telephone number available to the public? If so what are they?

What MSD document addresses the flooding concerns in the Laurel Spring Drive area?

Has the traffic study been shared with the Kentucky Department of Transportation? Who is that contact?

You mention violation of binding elements can involve monetary penalties as set forth by law or tied to permits, etc. that can hold up a development. What does the law say about WHO sets the amount of any monetary penalty owed? When will these details be decided? Is it after the public meeting? Who will be responsible for future enforcement?

How many times has a binding element NOT been followed by Thieneman?

What else is being hidden from the public?

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
Cc: Harrington, Scott; David Loran; Vicki Queenan; Ridgehurst Homeowners; Williams, Julia
Subject: RE: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 9:24:00 AM
Attachments: 17053-1-EXHIBIT - DEDICATION:20200724.pdf

Response in RED below.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 6:15 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisville.gov>
Cc: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisville.gov>; David Loran <david@davidlorandesign.com>; Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>; Ridgehurst Homeowners <ridgehursthomeowners@gmail.com>; Williams, Julia <Julia.Williams@louisville.gov>
Subject: Re: 20-Zone-0020 Questions after 9-10-20 meeting

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
Will you be able to answer these questions this week?
Thank you,
Nancy Willenbrink

On Friday, September 18, 2020, 11:25:33 AM EDT, Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net> wrote

Joel Dock,

I have reviewed in detail your 9-14-20 email. It is interesting that a binding element does not have to be agreed upon by the applicant.

Could you confirm the number of folks the Jeffersonian can hold? If there is a problem that night logging into the meeting will a telephone number be provided for assistance? A telephone # is provided to allow for call in. I recall that the Jeffersonian could hold 200+ with social distancing applied.

When will Thieneman be required to post signs on the property advertising the date and time of the public

hearings that are consistent with the requirements of KRS 100.401 to 100.419. (1) Conduct hearings to determine whether there has been a violation of a binding element. (2) subpoena alleged violators, witnesses, and evidence to its hearing. Subpoenas issued by the planning commission may be served by any land use enforcement officer. (3) Take testimony under oath. The chairman of the planning commission may administer oaths to witnesses prior to their testimony before the planning commission on any matter. (4) Make findings and issue orders that are necessary to remedy any violation of a binding element. (5) Impose civil fines as authorized in the ordinance on any person found to have violated any binding element that the planning commission is authorized to enforce.

How many times has a binding element NOT been followed by Thieneman? I do not have this information.

What else is being hidden from the public? Our records are open to the public and available online. Additionally, communications are subject to open records law.

Nancy Willenbrink

meeting? PDS post the signs on the subject property.

LD&T should have a file of the approved 365 signatures and there addresses which requested a night public hearing. Can you send this file? The signatures are part of the record and available online. Please search by case # at the following link: <https://aca.louisville.gov/comp/jmg/Default.aspx>

Cliff Ashburner, Thieneman's lawyer, said at the 9-10-20 meeting that he had a new plan being reviewed by agencies so your office should have access to this plan. Is this information available to the public? What is the file name? I believe that I provided a conceptual road layout for the Meijer connection in a prior email. If not it is attached. No formal review of any plan for connectivity has been applied for.

HOW is the public to know about changes a week before a public meeting? Public meeting material is typically posted 7 days in advance of the hearing.

In an earlier meeting Cliff Ashburner said that Meijer had written a letter to Thieneman, concerning the entrance. Was this letter shared with the planning commission? I do not recall receiving this letter but it could be wrong.

Information is only being provided by Thieneman. Do you know who the Meijer contact is on this project? At this time, Meijer is not an applicant on the project.

LDC § 9.2 requires the extension of residential studs to serve new development. Nanchand Springs patio home community and Greenhurst condominiums have residential studs. Why are they not being utilized? These are both developments served by private roads. Greenhurst has no stub roadways. Nanchand has the appearance of a stub roadway but the connection would be inappropriate because the public has no right to use the roadways. Further there are environmental constraints on the subject property that restrict this connection.

Who is looking at the details of the Zimmerman traffic study and making sure that it is realistic? The Planning Commission and Planning and Design Services' Transportation Planning review staff reviews the traffic study 0665.

Will the traffic study be recalculated since it appears to be short 100 vehicles and only one intersection is assigned an F rating? Revisions may be requested at the discretion of staff and the Commission.

Is Jeff Brown's email and telephone number available to the public? If so what are they? Jeff Brown is the Assistant Director of Public Works and can be reached at 574-0665 or Jeffrey.brown@louisville.gov. A discussion on this case may not be appropriate except for specific technical questions related to the traffic study. For questions on the traffic study, I would encourage you to reach out to Beth Stuber, Transportation planning supervisor at 574-3675.

What MSD document addresses the flooding concerns in the Laurel Spring Drive area? I do not have an answer for this but I'll reach out to MSD to see if there is one.

Has the traffic study been shared with the Kentucky Department of Transportation? Who is that contact? See above response for contact information for transportation planning. The traffic study is typically coordinated with KYTC.

You mention violation of binding elements can involve monetary penalties as set forth by law or fee to permits, etc. that can hold up a development. What does the law say about WHO sets the amount of any monetary penalty owed? When will these details be decided? Is it after the public meeting? Who will be responsible for future enforcement? KRS 100 covers binding elements. Specifically KRS 100.407 discusses the Commission's authority.

100.407 Specific powers of planning commissions to enforce binding elements. Each planning commission which is given the authority by the local government to enforce binding elements shall have the power to: (1) Adapt rules and regulations to govern its operation and the conduct of its

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Harrington, Scott; Brown, Jeffrey E.; David Loran; Vicki Queenan; Ridgehurst Homeowners; acaford@louisville.gov; Edwin.Friedlander@louisville.gov; Boona.Sencher@louisville.gov
Subject: Re: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, September 25, 2020 11:43:53 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The attached was emailed to Joel Dock on July 7. Please make sure that it is included in the official public comments. The concerns in July are still true today.

Note especially the section that starts:

All 4 exit/enter points have problems.

Left hand turns are a problem. The other intersections I mention are still a problem. I'm glad that someone is finally listening to a neighbor who is familiar with the area and finally looking at some of the details in the traffic study.

Nancy Willenbrink

On Tuesday, July 7, 2020, 10:30:59 AM EDT, Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net> wrote

Joel Dock,

I have attended both meetings at Woodhaven Country Club since we live in the Brookhollow Subdivision and know this development will greatly affect our property. It was very easy to collect the 365 signatures concerning this project. Every person I spoke to is opposed to the density and apartment units. The plan needs to be modified.

The developer has failed to do a thorough or adequate impact study on the traffic and density this project will have on the surrounding area.

600 plus units is too dense for an area which is congested today. The number was 550 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 486 apartments! Why is this development 63% apartments? Will this number continue to increase without notice to the adjoining property owners or neighborhood groups? I know the residents of the Brookhollow Subdivision were not contacted even though our neighborhood is adjacent to Brudy Lane. And the traffic on Brookhollow Drive will increase since it is a cut through street to Six Mile Lane.

Two office buildings were originally proposed at the two public Woodhaven Country Club meetings. These have been changed to an assisted care facility and a 60 unit apartment building. Both 3 stories tall. How many people will be housed in the assisted care facility? Is there an estimate of the number of workers in this building? The 60 unit building is NOT labeled senior housing on the drawing. A new public meeting at Woodhaven is needed to inform the public of these changes. I'm sure most people are not aware that Hurstbourne Commons is 63% apartments. As Business First said this is a massive plan with 32 buildings.

Changing the planned 3 story apartment units to 2 story condominiums would win the endorsement of

properly owners in the area. It would also help with the density problems created by the development. A decreased density will also help with the existing stream flooding that has occurred in the Laurel Spring Drive area. When this flooding becomes worse the taxpayers will have to correct the preventable problem through increased MSC fees.

At both meetings there was objection to connecting the development with a road through Watterson Heights. The developer needs to provide a new alternative for a road leading out to Nachand Lane. The development should NOT include a connector to Watterson Heights through Brownwood Drive or Whitfield Drive. There is no need to develop an ingress and egress that will drastically change the dynamic of a small, quiet neighborhood with less than 70 R4 zoned houses that sees little traffic. There are no sidewalks in this neighborhood to connect to the development.

What analysis has been conducted on traffic signals especially onto Hurstbourne Parkway? None of the existing traffic signals in the area are located where residents need to make a left hand turn. It will be impossible to add additional traffic signals to handle left hand turns. Any additional signals will be too close to existing signals. The Zimmerman traffic study does not address this problem and is inadequate. The study shows no new traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive.

4 exit/enter points have problems

One -- Mejer

The proposed entrance/exit near Mejer has no provision for a left turn signal onto north Hurstbourne Parkway. Any proposed traffic signal would be too close to the existing signal in front of Mejer at Hurstbourne Crossings Drive and Hurstbourne Parkway at Watterson Trail.

There is no certainty that Mejer will agree to this new proposed road through its property. The developer has not solved this major issue and this is unacceptable. Area residents need to be confident that this problem is solved. If the Mejer signal problem and detailed designs are not adequately addressed this project should be put ON HOLD.

Two -- Brody Lane

The Brody Lane extension provides access to Ridgehurst Place. There is no traffic signal to turn left onto Hurstbourne Parkway from Ridgehurst Place. There are many accidents at this intersection near the Ken Towery tire store today and the additional traffic will make this intersection much worse. When traveling north on Hurstbourne from Mejer it is difficult to turn left onto Ridgehurst Place today. A new signal would be too close to the existing signal at Ambrose Lane near the Sonic restaurant and the Mejer entrance.

Traffic will drive on Brody to Ridgehurst and on to Brookhollow Drive to get to Six Mile Lane. One of the major flaws in the Zimmerman traffic study is that it shows no increased traffic on Brookhollow Drive. The left hand turn from Brookhollow Drive to Six Mile Lane is difficult today much less with increase traffic. Traffic backs up multiple times a day in this area due to slow railroad traffic. No signal can be placed here because it would be too close to the railroad tracks.

After crossing the Six Mile Lane railroad, traffic will be stopped at Summerfield Drive/Manner Dale Drive traffic signal and this congestion easily backs up to the railroad tracks.

The 85 page Zimmerman traffic study does not show a Trip Distribution Percentage on page 10 for the Brody Lane/Ridgehurst Place intersection. This study does not address the existing route through the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. Common sense says that traffic will greatly increase and a new bottleneck hazard will be created on Six Mile Lane at Brookhollow Drive.

If the Zimmerman study on Page 16 is to be believed the Ridgehurst Place at Brody Lane intersection gets an A rating. Common sense knows that this is not correct. At the minimum of 23 to 26 cars at rush hour on a short residential street, the rating should be an F. This alone brings into question the whole Zimmerman traffic study. Another traffic study needs to be requested with realistic ratings.

Three -- Watterson Trail

away. There are no existing parks in this area suitable for walking or biking.

When residents are informed of Plan 2040 they are opposed to it. Property owners were not involved in the development of the 118 pages of Plan 2040. If we wanted density we would not be living in this area. 83% apartments are 100 dense. Plan 2040 also encourages proximity to parks and walking. Hurstbourne Commons FAILS to conform to the Plan 2040 stated guidelines in these two areas.

This whole process strongly FAVORS the developer. This laborious process is not conducive for the average person to present input or changes to a development. Even though property owners go through the appropriate avenues, this system is not set up to influence changes to a development. For example, there is no provision for a person to point to a map and describe where the additional traffic will flow.

It is hard to express frustration in a letter. Taxpayers don't want to finance problems made worse due to poor planning and automatic approvals. This development will create new problems that will have to be fixed later with additional burdens on the taxpayer.

Think through the impact of this development on the people in this area especially the impact of hundreds of cars. Remember the 365 approved signatures are just a small sample of the affected people. The adjoining districts are affected also since many travel daily on Hurstbourne Parkway.

Sincerely,

Nancy Willenbrink

A left turn from the development onto Watterson Trail would be dangerous. The curve on Watterson Trail is too sharp for an exit left hand turn. Any new signal would be too close to the existing Watterson Trail/Hurstbourne signal near Culvers.

New turning lanes are planned from Watterson Trail and Lauren Spring Drive into the development. Will the developer pay for this turning lane and widening of Watterson Trail and the drainage work? Where is this issue addressed in the planning documents? How much is the widening and turning lane costing the taxpayer?

Four -- Watterson Heights (Roswell Way, Wenwood Dr., Brownwood Dr., Whitfield Dr.)

Earlier maps had the Watterson Heights Subdivision entrance as Whitfield. When was this changed to Brownwood Drive?

The exit/entrance onto Brownwood Drive per page 1 of the LDI Staff Report would put additional traffic onto an existing NARROW residential streets with NO sidewalks. A traffic signal will be needed at the intersection of Nachand Lane and Watterson Trail. All of Watterson Trail is a NARROW 2 lane road and heavily traveled today. Traffic will proceed to Bardstown Road near the shopping center where Cox's Sprint Shop is located. Long waits today at the Watterson Trail/Bardstown Road traffic signal were mentioned at the neighborhood meetings.

For traffic turning right onto Nachand Lane, cars will process to the dangerous intersection of Nachand Lane/Breckenridge Lane near the railroad overpass. A traffic signal will be needed at the intersection of Nachand Lane and Watterson Trail. A new signal at the intersection would be difficult due to the hill and the existing signal at Breckenridge Lane/Six Mile Lane near the railroad overpass. Also, Breckenridge Lane at the railroad overpass floods easily today.

Page 3 of the Zimmerman traffic study states that Watterson Trail has 4 foot shoulders and sidewalks along the north side. This is not true for most of Watterson Trail (to Bardstown Road). More importantly the study shows only minimal rush hour traffic from the Breckenridge Lane area to Nachand Lane and onto Watterson Heights or Brody Lane. It shows no rush hour traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. This is another major flaw in the study.

Also

Current drainage backups were mentioned at the Woodhaven meetings. The water and sewer lines may not be able to suppose the added load of over 600 units. This added stress could greatly affect existing homes.

As others have mentioned, there is plenty of apartment and commercial space available. The proposed 3 story apartment and assisted care buildings need to be 2 floors only in keeping with the surrounding area. The 10 acre tract near Watterson Trail (Tract 7) will be left undeveloped at this time. How tall will these future buildings be?

Single family homes are in high demand now and will always be. This American dream is not dead. Parents want a yard for their children. If the planned apartment buildings cannot be changed to single family homes then condominiums are needed. There is a need for more senior oriented condo living in this area, NOT apartment living. The senior community Greenhurst Condominiums next to this proposed development has a WAITING LIST today. We all know the population is aging. There is plenty of undeveloped land for apartment development on recently extended South Hurstbourne Parkway (from Bardstown Road/South of GE).

Our existing residents including seniors need to feel safe. Apartments experience crime at a higher rate than houses or condos. The existing communities don't need additional transients in the area. There are enough existing problems with the InTowne Suites Extended hotel near Mejer.

No one wants to walk through a dense apartment area. This development does NOTHING to enhance a more WALKABLE neighborhood. It does nothing to establish an open PARK area. A THIRD of the open land SHOULD be developed into a neighborhood park. The closest park is the Des Pres Park 4.5 miles

From: Donna Fancher
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
Cc: Don, Joel, Maximilian, Scott, Blown, Jeffrey, E, David, Leticia, Vicki, Quernati, Ridgehurst Homeowners, sullivan@hillsouth.net, Yahu, Tennessee
Subject: Re: 20-ZONE-0020 Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, September 25, 2020 4:19:05 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Nancy has done a great job outlining the major concerns/issues pertaining to the proposed development. Agree with 99% of this.

However, I don't believe an exit onto Nachand Lane is a viable option. It is not exceedingly wide and will undoubtedly have increased traffic on it when persons coming off Bardstown Rd. opt to use Nachand to avoid increased traffic on Watterson Trail headed toward Hurstbourne.

Donna Fancher

On Fri, Sep 25, 2020, 11:43 AM Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@hillsouth.net> wrote:
The attached was emailed to Joel Dock on July 7. Please make sure that it is included in the official public comments. The concerns in July are still true today.

Note especially the section that starts:

All 4 exit/enter points have problems

Left hand turns are a problem. The other intersections I mention are still a problem. I'm glad that someone is finally listening to a neighbor who is familiar with the area and finally looking at some of the details in the traffic study.

Nancy Willenbrink

On Tuesday, July 7, 2020, 10:30:56 AM EDT Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@hillsouth.net> wrote:

Joel Dock,

I have attended both meetings at Woodhaven Country Club since we live in the Brookhollow Subdivision and know this development will greatly affect our property. It was very easy to collect the 365 signatures concerning this project. Every person I spoke to is opposed to the density and apartment units. The plan needs to be modified.

The developer has failed to do a thorough or adequate impact study on the traffic and density this project will have on the surrounding area.

600 plus units is too dense for an area which is congested today. The number was 560 plus units with 312 apartments. Now the number is 456 apartments. Why is the development 83% apartments? Will

the number continue to increase without notice to the adjoining property owners of neighborhood groups? I know the residents of the Brookhollow Subdivision were not contacted even though our neighborhood is adjacent to Brody Lane. And the traffic on Brookhollow Drive will increase since it is a cut through street to Six Mile Lane.

Two office buildings were originally proposed at the two public Woodhaven Country Club meetings. These have been changed to an assisted care facility and a 60 unit apartment building, both 3 stories tall. How many people will be housed in the assisted care facility? Is there an estimate of the number of workers in this building? The 60 unit building is NOT labeled senior housing on the drawing. A new public meeting at Woodhaven is needed to inform the public of these changes. I'm sure most people are not aware that Hurstbourne Commons is 83% apartments. As Business First said this is a massive plan with 32 buildings.

Changing the planned 3 story apartment units to 2 story condominiums would win the endorsement of property owners in the area. It would also help with the density problems created by this development. A decreased density will also help with the existing stream flooding that has occurred in the Laurel Spring Drive area. When this flooding becomes worse the taxpayers will have to correct this preventable problem through increased MSD fees.

At both meetings there was objection to connecting the development with a road through Watterson Heights. The developer needs to provide a new alternative for a road leading out to Nachand Lane. The development should NOT include a connector to Watterson Heights through Brownwood Drive or Whitfield Drive. There is no need to develop an ingress and egress that will drastically change the dynamic of a small quiet neighborhood with less than 70 R4 zoned houses that see little traffic. There are no sidewalks in this neighborhood to connect to the development.

What analysis has been conducted on traffic signals especially onto Hurstbourne Parkway? None of the existing traffic signals in the area are located where residents need to make a left hand turn. It will be impossible to add additional traffic signals to handle left hand turns. Any additional signals will be too close to existing signals. The Zimmerman traffic study does not address this problem and is inadequate. The study shows no new traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive.

All 4 exit/enter points have problems.

One -- Meijer

The proposed entrance/exit near Meijer has no provision for a left turn signal onto North Hurstbourne Parkway. Any proposed traffic signal would be too close to the existing signal in front of Meijer at Hurstbourne Crossings Drive and Hurstbourne Parkway at Watterson Trail.

There is no certainty that Meijer will agree to this new proposed road through its property. The developer has not solved this major issue and this is unacceptable. Area residents need to be confident that this problem is solved. If the Meijer signal problem and detailed designs are not adequately addressed this project should be put ON HOLD.

Two -- Brody Lane

The Brody Lane extension provides access to Ridgehurst Place. There is no traffic signal to turn left onto Hurstbourne Parkway from Ridgehurst Place. There are many accidents at this intersection near the Ken Towery tire store today and the additional traffic will make this intersection much worse. When traveling north on Hurstbourne from Meijer it is difficult to turn left onto Ridgehurst Place today. A new signal would be too close to the existing signal at Ambrose Lane near the Sonic restaurant and the Meijer entrance.

Traffic will drive on Brody to Ridgehurst and on to Brookhollow Drive to get to Six Mile Lane. One of the major flaws in the Zimmerman traffic study is that it shows no increased traffic on Brookhollow Drive. The left hand turn from Brookhollow Drive to Six Mile Lane is difficult today much less with increased traffic. Traffic backs up multiple times a day in the area due to slow railroad traffic. No signal can be placed here because it would be too close to the railroad tracks.

Single family homes are in high demand now and will always be. This American dream is not dead. Parents want a yard for their children. If the planned apartment buildings cannot be changed to single family homes then condominiums are needed. There is a need for more senior oriented condo living in this area. NOT apartment living. The senior community Greenhurst Condominiums next to this proposed development has a WAITING LIST today. We all know the population is aging. There is plenty of undeveloped land for apartment development on recently extended South Hurstbourne Parkway (from Bardstown Road/south of GE).

Our existing residents including seniors need to feel safe. Apartments experience crime at a higher rate than houses or condos. The existing communities don't need additional transients in the area. There are enough existing problems with the InTowne Suites Extended hotel near Meijer.

No one wants to walk through a dense apartment area. This development does NOTHING to enhance a more WALKABLE neighborhood. It does nothing to establish an open PARK area. A THIRD of this open land SHOULD be developed into a neighborhood park. The closest park is the Des Pres Park 4-5 miles away. There are no existing parks in this area suitable for walking or biking.

When residents are informed of Plan 2040, they are opposed to it. Property owners were not involved in the development of the 116 pages of Plan 2040. If we wanted density we would not be living in this area. 83% apartments are TOO dense. Plan 2040 also encourages proximity to parks and walking. Hurstbourne Commons FAILS to conform to the Plan 2040 stated guidelines in these two areas.

This whole process strongly FAVORS the developer. This laborious process is not conducive for the average person to present input or changes to a development. Even though property owners go through the appropriate avenues, this system is not set up to influence changes to a development. For example, there is no provision for a person to point to a map and describe where the additional traffic will flow.

It is hard to express frustration in a letter. Taxpayers don't want to finance problems made worse due to poor planning and automatic approvals. This development will create new problems that will have to be fixed later with additional outlays on the taxpayer.

Think through the impact of this development on the people in this area especially the impact of hundreds of cars. Remember the 355 approved signatures are just a small sample of the affected people. The adjoining districts are affected also since many travel daily on Hurstbourne Parkway.

Sincerely,

Nancy Willenbrink

After crossing the Six Mile Lane railroad, traffic will be stopped at Summerfield Drive/Manner Dale Drive traffic signal and this congestion easily backs up to the railroad tracks.

The 89 page Zimmerman traffic study does not show a Trip Distribution Percentage on page 10 for the Brody Lane/Ridgehurst Place intersection. This study does not address the existing route through the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. Common sense says that traffic will greatly increase and a new bottleneck hazard will be created on Six Mile Lane at Brookhollow Drive.

If the Zimmerman study on Page 16 is to be believed the Ridgehurst Place at Brody Lane intersection gets an A rating. Common sense knows that this is not correct. At the minimum of 23 to 26 cars at rush hour on a short residential street, the rating should be an F. This alone brings into question the whole Zimmerman traffic study. Another traffic study needs to be requested with realistic ratings.

Three -- Watterson Trail

A left turn from the development onto Watterson Trail would be dangerous. The curve on Watterson Trail is too sharp for an exit left hand turn. Any new signal would be too close to the existing Watterson Trail/Hurstbourne signal near Culvers.

New turning lanes are planned from Watterson Trail and Laurel Spring Drive into the development. Will the developer pay for this turning lane and widening of Watterson Trail and the drainage work? Where is this issue addressed in the planning documents? How much is this widening and turning lane costing the taxpayer?

Four -- Watterson Heights (Roswell Way, Wenwood Dr, Brownwood Dr, Whitfield Rd)

Earlier maps had the Watterson Heights Subdivision exit/entrance as Whitfield. When was this changed to Brownwood Drive?

The exit/entrance onto Brownwood Drive per page 1 of the LDT Staff Report would put additional traffic onto an existing NARROW residential street with NO sidewalks. A traffic signal will be needed at the intersection of Nachand Lane and Watterson Trail. All of Watterson Trail is a NARROW 2 lane road and heavily traveled today. Traffic will proceed to Bardstown Road near the shopping center where Cox's Spirit Shoppe is located. Long waits today at the Watterson Trail/Bardstown Road traffic signal were mentioned at the neighborhood meetings.

For traffic turning right onto Nachand Lane, cars will proceed to the dangerous intersection of Nachand Lane/Breckenridge Lane near the railroad overpass. It is very hard to turn left onto Breckenridge Lane today. A new signal at this intersection would be difficult due to the hill and the existing signal at Breckenridge Lane/Six Mile Lane near the railroad overpass. Also, Breckenridge Lane at the railroad overpass floods easily today.

Page 3 of the Zimmerman traffic study states that Watterson Trail has 4 foot shoulders and sidewalks along the north side. This is not true for most of Watterson Trail (to Bardstown Road). More importantly, the study shows only minimal rush hour traffic from the Breckenridge Lane area to Nachand Lane and onto Watterson Heights or Brody Lane. It shows no rush hour traffic on the cut through street of Brookhollow Drive. This is another major flaw in the study.

Also

Current drainage backups were mentioned at the Woodhaven meetings. The water and sewer lines may not be able to support the added load of over 600 units. This added stress could greatly affect existing homes.

As others have mentioned, there is plenty of apartment and commercial space available. The proposed 2 story apartment and assisted care buildings need to be 2 floors only in keeping with the surrounding area. The 10 acre tract near Watterson Trail (Tract 7) will be left undeveloped at this time. How tall will those future buildings be?

Chat comments from LD&T virtual meeting on 07/09/20:

from Kathy Tieskotter to all panelists:

I'm Kathy Tieskotter, 4120 Wenwood Dr., 40218. I agree with Ms. Bryant and Ms. Willenbrink. I live in Watterson Heights. To get to the development from Watterson Trail, you have to turn from Watterson Trail onto Whitfield, then onto Brownwood. The Watterson Heights neighborhood does not have sidewalks. There are only a couple of streetlights which are paid for by the residents on whose property the lights are located. The proposed plan poses safety and pollution concerns due to the increased traffic thru the Watterson Heights neighborhood.

from Karen Garrett to all participants:

A park would be a wonderful idea.

from Karen Garrett to all participants:

Definitely instead of apartments and townhouses.

from Sharon Wideman to all panelists:

Traffic study did not mention Ridgehurst Place is a school bus route, would Brody become a bus route for new homes and apartments? Children getting on and off buses?

from Kathy Tieskotter to all participants:

I'm Kathy Tieskotter, 4120 Wenwood Dr., 40218. (sorry, I only sent this to "panelists" previously). I agree with Ms. Bryant and Ms. Willenbrink. I live in Watterson Heights. To get to the development from Watterson Trail, you have to turn from Watterson Trail onto Whitfield, then onto Brownwood. The Watterson Heights neighborhood does not have sidewalks. There are only a couple of streetlights which are paid for by the residents on whose property the lights are located. The proposed plan poses safety and pollution concerns due to the increased traffic thru the Watterson Heights neighborhood.

from Sharon Wideman to all panelists:

my address is 3813 Ridgehurst Ct. 40299. thank you.

from Sharon Wideman to all panelists:

my address is 3813 Ridgehurst Ct. 40299. thank you.

from Sharon Wideman to all panelists:

Thank you for your time.

from Karen Garrett to all panelists:

the country club did just fine last time.

from Karen Garrett to all panelists:

there are 2 very close.

from Scott Harrington to all panelists:

Libraries are still closed so we can't meet there.

from Brian Davis to all participants:

Jeffersontown is also not scheduling meetings at any of their venues.

from Scott Harrington to all panelists:

Jtown Library is too small of location.

Dock, Joel

From: Dock, Joel
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Marissa Beard
Subject: RE: 20-ZONE-0020
Attachments: 17043-concept-building2.pdf; 20-ZONE-0020_Development Plan_revised 110220.pdf

Marissa,

Tract 2 was initially labeled as "age-targeted" or "senior living" but has since been revised to multi-family apartments. Our office is not involved with the setting or consideration of rental rates or home value. I've attached the current development plan and a concept rendering of the development on Tract 2.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Marissa Beard <rissa.beard@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 7:09 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Re: 20-ZONE-0020

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a follow up email, I have some questions I have been unable to find answers to. I see on a map for tract 2 it says "age-targeted apartments." What age group is being targeted? What is the anticipated amount to be charged for rent? Will brick/vinyl or a combination be used for the apartments?

Thank you.

On Sat, Feb 13, 2021, 9:18 AM Marissa Beard <rissa.beard@gmail.com> wrote:

Good Morning,

I am writing to you today to express my deep concerns regarding the rezoning at 8127 Watterson Trail (Case Number 20-ZONE-0020). My concerns are focused solely on Tract 2. I recently moved to this neighborhood with my husband and we were thrilled to have a safe and quiet location to raise our son. The day we closed on our house I was distraught to learn that this was all subject to change. I do not agree with or understand why a 3-story apartment complex could belong in this area. It would be in the middle of residential homes and blocked in by the commercial stores on Hurstbourne Lane and the senior living facility at Watterson Trail. This space makes much more sense for single-family homes as it is already surrounded by them. An apartment complex with so many additional people could bring additional crime, lower the neighborhood's property values, deteriorate our street with construction, pollution and noise, and bring additional traffic through our street. Brownwood Drive does not have sidewalks or street lamps. Many

members of this neighborhood walk daily along the street as it is currently a dead end and limited to only neighbors/local traffic. Connecting this street to the proposed development without addressing this would be grossly negligent to the safety of the existing people living on this street, including my 2 year old son. My first hope would be that the apartment complex be transitioned to single-family homes that fit the style of the existing surrounds so as not to decrease property values with street lamps and sidewalks added for safety. If this cannot be obtained and the zoning is approved for a 3-story apartment complex, I strongly request and urge that the street at Brownwood Drive NOT be connected and a concrete wall or similar barrier be installed. I understand that land development is part of our society as our city continues to grow, but I urge all those involved to think of the people who have already put their hopes and money into their homes in the existing surrounding areas. It is the safety, finances, happiness and way of living for my family and those around us that are at risk.

Thank you,

Marissa Dries

From: Dan Smith
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Dana Hester
Subject: Proposed zoning changes at 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Thursday, June 25, 2020 2:27:41 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a nearby resident of the proposed Hurstbourne Commons development, I wish to voice my opposition to the proposed zoning changes from R4 to OR-1 in tracts one and two. The possibility of multi-story offices being added to the neighbor is not consistent with the hundreds of single family homes in the neighborhood. There are already many unused office spaces in the nearby areas of Hurstbourne Lane, Bardstown Road, Breckenridge Lane and Hikes Point, to name just a few. I am also concerned about increased traffic congestion in an area that already sees a high volume of traffic throughout the day, and for the safety of our neighborhood children on the sidewalks and streets that have no existing sidewalks.

I am very much in favor of single family homes and keeping the R4 zoning designation, matching the surrounding neighborhoods. Thank you.

Dan Smith
4002 Bluestem Lane
Louisville, KY 40218
dis1251@gmail.com

From: Dock, Joel
To: Vicki Queenan
Subject: RE: Case 20ZON0020 known as Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Monday, May 11, 2020 9:00:00 AM

Vicki,
The zoning has not been approved or docketing for a public meeting.

Brody Lane is a Public Road; therefore, it can be used by the public and for the public to connect as it was provided as the public roadway connection for future development. The comprehensive plan calls for access to higher density development to be obtained primarily from areas of similar intensity. This point of access would be S.Watterson Trail and ideally the Meijer access road but that connection is uncertain at this time.

The development plan shows connections to Watterson Trail, Brody, Brownwood, and Meijer. The connectivity to Meijer has not been resolved. I have been provided no additional information on the Meijer connection.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
502-574-5860

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Case 20ZON0020 known as Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,

I live on Brody Lane the proposed street that will be one of the access points for the new "Hurstbourne Commons". I have been informed many times that Brody was always aligned to be an access street. I feel that when Brody was listed as the covenant access it was for a neighborhood of homes not a mini community which is being built called "Hurstbourne Commons".

Can you tell me has there been any updates on this case:
Zoning approved?
Are there still the same four accesses for "Hurstbourne Commons"?

There is on access going through Meijer, has Meijer approved that?

..
Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Ridgehurst Subdivision
502-296-4015

From: Tina Hester
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Tina
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons concerns
Date: Thursday, January 30, 2020 4:51:40 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,
We attended the meeting last night and still have many concerns about the development. Drainage is the biggest concern for those of us that are still on septic tanks. If you take away a natural area that is used as drainage and replace it with concrete what will happen to our property's? The answer we got last night was it's your problem. This is not our problem, we didn't create this problem. Yes you are creating the problem. Traffic is the next issue. This area does not need any more traffic issues. We can barely turn left out of Whitfield now. Adding an entrance off of Watterson Trail to this just adds to the problem. You are asking for accidents to happen. We live here, we use these roads daily, we know the problems we already have. I have many concerns but what about the wildlife in the area? What happens to them? Just run away, find a new home, good luck crossing Hurstbourne and Watterson Trail. We do not need this in our area. It's all about the almighty buck, just because the Tennessean's have the bucks doesn't make it right. Please help us fight this.
Thank you

Tina Hester

From: Dock, Joel
To: Nick Wideman
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, January 31, 2020 8:24:00 AM
Attachments: image002.jpg
image003.png

Your comments have been received, forwarded to the applicant, and incorporated into the record of the Planning Commission.

To receive electronic communications on this project please sign up for Louisville Metro GovDelivery at:

<https://zodcflo.govdeliberty.com/fac.comms/881005VILL15/SubscribePage>

With respect to the Brody Lane connection, it is a required connection as if it is a roadway stub. This connectivity is not subject to relief, unless there is a significant issue with constructibility or it increases the classification of the roadway (Land Development Code, section 5.9.3A.1.a.g). The legislative body (metro council) may approve an alternative plan for connectivity but at this point it is early in the process and a full review of the plan has not yet occurred.

Joel P. Dock
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development Louisville
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South 14th Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design>



From: Nick Wideman [mailto:nswide91@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 6:16 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Re: Hurstbourne Commons

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is

From: Cathy Heck
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: check1@bwc.com
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2020 5:22:10 PM
Attachments: Memo to Joel Dock re Hurstbourne Commons concerns.docx

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

I have attached a memo of my concerns regarding the proposed Hurstbourne Commons. I can be contacted as follows -

Cathy Heck
4110 Spring Park Ln.
Louisville KY 40218
heckc1@bwc.com
502-493-1626

safe

Hi Joel,

I have a comment for the record: I've been told by multiple people there are at least two Bald Eagles on the proposed property to be developed which need to be located and protected

How can I stop Brody Ln. from going through into this new development? Is there someone I can contact or a petition I need to file?

Thank you,

Nick Wideman
502-298-2164

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0504 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Monday, February 17, 2020 2:36:52 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,

I am a residence at Ridgehurst Subdivision.

I would like to know if zoning is approved for Hurstbourne Commons and as they begin development, builders find that they have to blast to remove rock etc.

- Would our neighborhood be informed before blasting begins?
- Would the builders be responsible for cracks, settlement and or damage that may occur to our homes due to the blasting?

Thank You,

Vicki Queenan
502-495-6344

From: Dock, Joel
To: Vicki Queenan
Subject: RE: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:55:00 AM

State law sets out standards for blasting. I am not familiar with all of the requirements. I do know that adjoining residents have a responsibility in properly documenting the conditions prior to blasting. I can forward your questions to the applicant and see if a blasting element/land use restriction can be worked out in the form of a pre-blast survey.

From: Vicki Queenan <queenanvicki@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2020 2:30 PM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Case Number 20-ZonePA-0004 8127 Watterson Trail

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,

I am a residence at Ridgehurst Subdivision.

I would like to know if zoning is approved for Hurstbourne Commons and as they begin development, builders find that they have to blast to remove rock etc.

- Would our neighborhood be informed before blasting begins?
- Would the builders be responsible for cracks, settlement and/or damage that may occur to our homes due to the blasting?

Thank You,

Vicki Queenan
502-495-6344

From: Dock, Joel
To: adam embry
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:55:00 AM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

Good comments! I might suggest reaching out to the council person on side street speed humps. There are warrants and you've touched on those so I'm not sure what can be done but it's worth another conversation given potential new development.

The applicant will perform a traffic study and I will forward these comments to them for consideration.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner III
Planning & Design Services
Department of Economic Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502.574.5860
<https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning-design/>



From: adam embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

859-699-6323

From: Dock, Joel
To: Adam Embry <adamembry@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:55:00 AM

For your records, please consider the potential impact

From: adam embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

859-699-6323

From: Dock, Joel
To: adam.embry
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:42:00 AM
Attachments: image002.jpg
image003.jpg

Adam,

I'll forward this to our Purple Works folks as well to get some thoughts. Again, I'll also pass these comments along to the applicant.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South 14th Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40203
502-574-5866
https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning_design



From: adam.embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 10:39 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Re: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

Thank you for the response. I have had many pleasant conversations with Councilman Kramer and a number of other individuals over the past few years, all whom were helpful. The quick summary:

- According to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and Ridgehurst Place (side portion) are technically two separate roads that just happen to have the exact same name
- Per the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) Ridgehurst Place (side portion) would be required (among other things) to have an average volume of 300 cars per day, which it currently does not

The new development will unquestionably bring more traffic to this area, which is fine. I just want to make sure traffic deciding to bypass the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) is accounted for on the study. After speaking with representatives at the meeting, their assumption was any initial assessments for the traffic study would have only considered traffic on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and not have considered the traffic increase on Ridgehurst Place (side portion) from cars attempting to bypass the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion).

Currently cars already do this, bypassing the speed humps on Ridgehurst Place (main portion) and driving faster on Ridgehurst Place (side portion).

I'm not sure if factoring in the assumed traffic increase for Ridgehurst Place (side portion) would be projected to meet or exceed an average volume of 300 cars per day.

Adam Embry

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 20, 2020, at 9:55 AM, Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov> wrote:

Good comments! I might suggest reaching out to the councilperson on side street speed humps. There are warrants and you've touched on those so I'm not sure what can be done but it's worth another conversation given potential new development.

The applicant will perform a traffic study and I will forward these comments to them for consideration.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South 14th Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40203
502-574-5866
https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning_design
<image001.jpg>

<image002.jpg><image003.jpg>

From: adam.embry <embry.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 11:27 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons/Ridgehurst Place Side Road

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I was informed I should contact you regarding my question/concern for the Hurstbourne Commons development. I have no issues with the development, I think it will be great for the city overall. My concern is with a traffic aspect that I don't believe is being considered.

- Ridgehurst Place has two different sections, a main portion and a side portion. (Technically two separate roads with the same name per MUTCD)
- The main portion has 5 speed humps placed on it. The side portion does not have any speed humps at all.
- Currently there are a number of vehicles that will fly down the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass most of the speed humps.
- I am curious to know if any consideration has been taken into account for the increased traffic exiting Brody Lane, going directly across to the side portion of Ridgehurst Place in an attempt to bypass the speed humps.

It would appear logical that cars wouldn't travel this portion unless they live on it, however that isn't the case at all.

With this development my hope is that something can be done to deter drivers from traveling the side portion of Ridgehurst Place, such as additional speed humps. Based on the current requirements the side portion of Ridgehurst Place doesn't qualify for speed humps. It doesn't meet the 300 car average per day volume. I don't know if it will meet this with the new development either. What I do know without question is there will be an increase in drivers traveling at a high rate of speed down the side road. The only reason you would travel this side portion would be to go faster than you're able to on the main portion or if you live there.

I have two small children that cross this road to get to and from their bus stop. There have been multiple occasions where they were nearly hit.

I am happy to discuss this with anyone, as I know the regulations in great detail, having worked on this for a few years now.

Adam Embry

859-699-6323

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: BEAB
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 11:38:24 AM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

I am Brian Gobin and live on 8207 Laurel Spring Dr, Louisville, KY 40299.

I have attended both of the neighborhood meetings at Woodhaven and have made comments there. I wanted to ensure that my concerns are entered and addressed.

1. Minor concern - The road that is projected to come out opposite of Laurel Spring Drive on Watterson Trail will make it extremely difficult for residents form Laurel Spring drive and Walnut hills to turn left (south) on Watterson trail. We already have long wait times due to traffic during peak rush hour times. I expect this to be a safety concern with a substantial increase in accidents. Turning lanes and/or traffic light may be required.

2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern.

3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments,... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems.

Please respond that you have received this email.

Thanks,
Brian Gobin

From: Dock, Joel
To: BEAB
Subject: RE: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 12:25:00 PM

MSD provided a couple responses in reed to your questions. Keep in mind that this project is in the early stages and has not been fully finalized.

2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern. Retention will be provided so that the pre developed flow rate will not be increased in the next developed condition.

3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments,... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems. We have requested a downstream facility capacity request for this site. We will evaluate the downstream sanitary capacity once they submit the EIC to ensure the increase in sanitary flow will not cause downstream problems.

From: Brian <bgo454@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development proposal on Watterson trail behind Meyers

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,
I am Brian Gobin and live on 8207 Laurel Spring Dr, Louisville, KY 40299.
I have attended both of the neighborhood meetings at Woodhaven and have made comments there. I wanted to ensure that my concerns are entered and addressed.

1. Minor concern - The road that is projected to come out opposite of Laurel Spring Drive on Watterson Trail will make it extremely difficult for residents form Laurel Spring drive and Walnut hills

to turn left (south) on Watterson trail. We already have long wait times due to traffic during peak rush hour times. I expect this to be a safety concern with a substantial increase in accidents. Turning lanes and/or traffic light may be required.

2. Minor concern - Drainage from the retention pond at Watterson Trail will dump into Fern Creek that passes through my back yard and back up into my backyard. This is a minor concern due to the retention pond being a metered out drainage, but still a concern.

3. Major concern - From viewing the plans, MSD plans on running most of the developments sewer drainage towards Watterson Trail and connecting to the sewer line that my residence and the other residences on Laurel spring are connected to. A while back the Morning Point Assisted living facility on Hurstbourne was connected to this sewer line and now we are going to have another assisted living, apartments,... connecting in. I question the capacity of this sewer line to accommodate the increase in volume/connections. We already have had in the past issues where water/sewage is coming out of the manhole cover in my backyard. Although I have had no back up in my basement, I am concerned that the increased volume will increase the possibility that the sewer will backup in my basement. The houses on Laurel Spring are the lowest point in the line and the increase in volume will likely cause problems.

Please respond that you have received this email.

Thanks,
Brian Gobin

From: Malika Rizmanova
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons development comments
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 12:16:03 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello,
My name is Malika Rizmanova. I have contacted developer with my comments couple times. Decided to email you as well.

I think This development is too dense and One of the main concerns is that it will add to already very congested traffic in the area.
I think target of this development is older and young generation- apartments, assisted living, smaller homes - retirement like community.

This location is very convenient for working families, access to major roads, highways and shopping stores, close to schools and hospitals. We need more newer single family homes here, including for families with children. We need parks and playgrounds. I believe this has to be taken into consideration. That will benefit and help many growing families, also potentially reduce density of this project and have more positive public opinion.

Since it's already planned to build homes in 2000-2300sqft range, it should also fit to build ones that are say 2500sqft... it will not price out potential home buyers.

Thank you in advance for taking into consideration!

Regards,

Malika

From: Karen Norton
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Case Number: 20-ZONEPA-0004 (Hurstbourne Commons)
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 12:10:13 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As President of the Greenhurst Condominium Association, the following items are of concern to our residents and we would like to see measures taken to address these concerns:

1. Greenhurst has a detention pond with a walking path around it. Despite the no trespassing signs, there is a large amount of foot traffic around the pond that is not Greenhurst property owners. Therefore, we are requesting that a privacy fence be constructed along the property line with Greenhurst and Hurstbourne Commons. This safety measure would be an additional step to keeping all area residents safe.
2. Two additional traffic lights need to be installed along Hurstbourne Lane. A light is needed at the intersection of Ridgehurst Place and Hurstbourne Lane as there are numerous accidents in that location at the present time. A second traffic light will be needed where Brownwood intersects Hurstbourne Lane. With the increased automobile traffic and the present pedestrian traffic from the extended stay hotel crossing to access Mejez and FARC, this intersection will need increased regulation.

Thank you

Karen Norton

President - Greenhurst Condominium Association

Sent from my iPad

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink
To: Dock, Joel; Halington, Scott; @ocean@ups.com
Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40:41 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday.

Thanks,
Nancy Willenbrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 76. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late.

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

From: Halington, Scott
To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink; Dock, Joel; @ocean@ups.com
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00:07 PM
Attachments: @ocean@ups.com

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting. No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16ZONE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. If an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

I will include... all these notes that you mentioned like the heat island you did mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to Council based on your testimony and that of the developers.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments.

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | *Legislative Assistant*
 Office of Councilman Kevin J. Kramer
 Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
 fax: 502.574.4501
 email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
 sign up for District 11's E-newsletter

City Hall
 601 West Jefferson Street
 Louisville, Kentucky 40202

http://www.louisvilleky.gov

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>
 Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40 PM
 To: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; dloran@ups.com
 Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday

Thanks,
 Nancy Willenbrink
 491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

From: dloran@ups.com
 To: Harrington, Scott; willenbrink@bellsouth.net; Dock, Joel
 Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor; and more questions about development
 Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:18:54 PM
 Attachments: image002.png; image004.png

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,

Are these minutes recorded and publicly available for everyone to read the concerns raised from the two meetings at Woodhaven?

I have raised the concerns outlined below (up of both meetings. Not only has the issue NOT been addressed and any attempt to improve, but it has been revealed through the current plan to be much worse than originally anticipated. The latest design calls for zero permanent retention of existing tree canopy to be preserved. See cautions (in below) from developer plan

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 1)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	250,118 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	10% (25,012 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (50,024 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (50,403 S.F.)

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 2)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	227,015 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	2% (4,540 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (45,403 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (46,060 S.F.)

Kevin Young mentioned in the first meeting that every tree that they (developer) can save means that is one less tree that they have to plant according to City/Planning Development recommendations.

According to the 2-ZONE-0020_Plan_022420.pdf file the developers plan calls for NOT keeping any of the trees on planned rezoned areas.

TRACT 1 and 2 contain many 80 ft. tall mature trees. Currently along the property line these trees along with brush after a special fire buffer zone bio-log left none and visible traffic flow on Watters in Trail from the last back of Waterloo Heights. These are not ornamental trees, but mature oaks, walnut, maple, etc. It will take more than half a life time to regrow these trees.

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late.

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

Believe our city's current interest here is in retaining Louisville's tree canopy and replanting as well.

How can this not be a major concern and not be addressed prior to development with suggestions for re-drawing plans?

The city for developer said that they review plans for design to relocate corners to coming at off-body and the street going through the development to have a one-way type of median to slow traffic. As far as I know these redesigns were the only issues addressed. And these solutions were met without much fanfare.

I spoke with Mogen property atty and there is still unanswered questions over the development and traffic flow will look like going through Mogen parking lot. I believe this is a case of DCI being fully informed and another issue where the developer appears to be moving forward without having a full vision of the plan and/or approval from another party or the city itself to extent Weatherstone Lane. Is this going to be treated as a main entrance since it's coming off a major state road and the other access points are through neighborhood? These are just a few items I would like to be addressed beforehand.

Thank you
 David Loran

From: Harrington, Scott [mailto:Scott.Harrington@louisvilleky.gov]
 Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00 PM
 To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>; Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David (CMG2WVW) <dloran@ups.com>
 Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting. No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16Z0NE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. If an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

I will include all these issues that you mentioned if on the heat island you can mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to Council based on your testimony and that of the developers.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments.

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | Legislative Assistant
Office of Councilman Kevin J. Kramer
Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
fax: 502.574.4501
email: scott.harrington@louisville.gov

City Hall
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter

significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

This information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. If it is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it, if you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Nancy & Jack Wiltenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>

From: Nancy & Jack Wiltenbrink <njwillen@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 1:40 PM

To: Dock, Joel <joel_dock@louisville.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisville.gov>; dloran@ups.com

Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday

Thanks,
Nancy Wiltenbrink
491-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 58 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes." I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been

From: Dock, Joel
To: dloran@ups.com; Harrington, Scott; njwillen@bellsouth.net
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor, and more questions about development
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:51:00 PM
Attachments: Inaap003.doc; Inaap005.ppt; Project 20-Zone-0020_Application_522400_2.pdf; Inaap004.ppt; Inaap004.ppt

With respect to the neighborhood meeting, the applicant is required to hold the meeting, produce a sign sheet and produce a summary of the meeting which is submitted with the formal application. The summary submitted is attached.

On tree canopy, it is not uncommon for a developer to indicate 0% proposed canopy and then present a much greater amount at a later date during the landscape plan review phase. I'd review only enough them to meet the minimum required which can be achieved through preservation of all new plantings.

I have not reviewed the most recent plans at this time and do not have a response for your last few access questions beyond the fact that our transportation Planning staff reviews the plan and consultation form path works and review all traffic studies submitted and ensure that the recommendations of those studies are incorporated into the plan.

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD
444 South Fifth Street, Suite 309
Louisville, KY 40202
502-574-5860
<https://louisville.gov/government/planning-design>



From: dloran@ups.com <dloran@ups.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:18 PM
To: Harrington, Scott <Scott.Harrington@louisville.gov>; njwillen@bellsouth.net; Dock, Joel

<Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>

Subject: RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor, and more questions about development

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Scott and Joel,

Are there minutes recorded and publicly available for each case to read their concerns raised from the two meetings at Woodhroon?

I have raised the concern outlined below, clip at both meetings, but only has the issue NOT been addressed and any attempt to improve, but it has been revealed through the current plan to be much worse than originally anticipated. The latest design calls for [removal/reduction of existing trees](#) to be preserved. See calculation clip below from developer plan.

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 1)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	250,118 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	10% (25,012 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (50,024 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (50,400 S.F.)

TREE CANOPY CALCULATIONS (TRACT 2)(CLASS C)

TOTAL SITE AREA	=	227,015 S.F.
EXISTING TREE CANOPY	=	2% (4,540 S.F.)
TOTAL TREE CANOPY AREA REQUIRED	=	20% (45,403 S.F.)
EXISTING TREE CANOPY TO BE PRESERVED	=	0% (0 S.F.)
PROPOSED TREE CANOPY TO BE PLANTED	=	20% (46,060 S.F.)

Kevin Young mentioned in the first meeting that every tree that they (developer) can save means that is one less tree than they have to plant according to City/Planning Department recommendations.

According to the [2-ZONE-0020_Plan_022420.pdf](#) file the developers plan calls for 100% keeping any of the trees on planned retained areas.

TRACT 1 and 2 contain many 80 ft tall mature trees. Currently along the property line these trees along with brush offer a spectacular buffer zone blocking off noise and vehicle traffic flow on Waterloo Street from the back side of Waterloo Heights. These are not ornamental trees, but mature oaks, walnut, maple, etc. It will take more than half a life time to regrow these trees. I believe our city's current interest here is in retaining Louisville's tree canopy and replanting as well.

How can this not be a major concern and not be addressed prior to development with suggestions?

No dates have been set.

The most recent case I can think of is 16ZONE1026 known as Tyler Cover Condos located at 4208 Taylorsville Road where the original plan was for 4 condo buildings and the developer scaled them down to 3 buildings. If an applicant is seeking waivers or variances then it's normal to seek a reduction in density so waivers or variances aren't needed.

The LD&T committee mainly determines if the case is ready to be scheduled for the hearing before Planning Commissioners. If there's issues that haven't been resolved, then you can appear before the LD&T committee and ask that the public meeting not be scheduled until answers are provided. Sometimes the applicant will be able to answer those questions. But you will really express your support or opposition of the development at the Public Hearing.

During the agency reviews, the applicant may need to change plans or address issues identified by the various agencies. Metro won't conduct a traffic study but planning staff may require one of the applicant.

Kind include all these issues that you mentioned like the heat island you can mention in your argument for not supporting the project or for increasing the density. It will be up to the Planning Commissioners to make recommendations to them based on your testimony and that of the developers.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Joel - please feel free to add to my comments.

Scott



Scott W. Harrington | *Legislative Assistant*
Office of Councilman Kevin L. Kearney
Louisville Metro Council | District 11

phone: 502.574.3456
fax: 502.574.4501
email: scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov
sign up for District 11's E-Newsletter

City Hall
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

https://www.louisvilleky.gov/11

From: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <nwillen@wbaa.org>

for redrawing plans?

The city developer said that they redraw plans for design to re-route corners for coming off Broadway and the street going through the development to be widened to have a curb type of median to slow traffic. As far as I know these redesigns were the only issues addressed, and these solutions were met without much fanfare.

I spoke with Meigs property atty and there is still unanswered questions like the development and traffic flow will not be going through Meigs parking lot. I believe this is a case of NOT being fully informed and another issue where the developer appears to be moving forward without having a full version of the plan and/or approval from another party or the city itself to extend Westbourne Lane E. Is this going to be treated as a main entrance since it is coming off a major state road and the other access points are through neighborhoods? These are just a few items I would like to be addressed before-hand.

Thank you
David Loran

From: Harrington, Scott [<mailto:scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 2:00 PM

To: Nancy & Jack Willenbrink <nwillen@wbaa.org>; Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Loran David (CMG2WVW) <dloran@wbaa.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the organization. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.

Ms. Willenbrink,

Thanks for letting me know to check NextDoor. I don't always check that site so I appreciate it when someone tells me that's something I need to respond to.

Here's what I replied:

David Loran, a resident, is circulating a petition for 300 signatures required to have the public hearing before the Planning Commission in the evening at a convenient location. The petition for night hearing is due no later than 15 days prior to a scheduled public meeting.

Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2020 3:40 PM

To: Dock, Joel <joel.dock@louisvilleky.gov>; Harrington, Scott <scott.harrington@louisvilleky.gov>; dloran@wbaa.org

Subject: Unanswered questions from NextDoor

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel/Scott,

The following write up was posted on NextDoor and we have not received any answers. Maybe Joel can assist with this. It would be helpful to review any answers before Saturday

Thanks,
Nancy Willenbrink
481-5225

Scott, thanks for the links. The Project 2040 document is 118 pages long. It looks like this document encourages density and ignores other factors in a development. If we wanted density we would not be living in the suburbs. What about a park, livability and our quality of life? (Adding - What about helping to improve Louisville heat island effect?)

The second link shows meetings on Day 59 and Day 78. Scott, can you give us (removed - all) the next date now?

The third link is the Citizen User Guide. At the end of Step 1 it says the "proposal will be reviewed by several agencies (e.g., MSD and the Highway Department) who will make their own recommendations and changes". I'm guessing metro government will not be doing an independent traffic study and that the public has no input to these agencies. As Step 2 reads "the procedure moves along fairly rapidly" for a reason. How many people conduct the Site Inspection? It looks like this evaluation does not include concerned citizens at all. (Adding - Approximately, what is the cost of a traffic study?)

Step 3 says the LD&T (Land Development & Transportation Committee) is the first place to make your case and that they have "wide latitude". Maybe Scott can cite examples where a proposal has been significantly revised by LD&T? I would think by that time, it's too late.

This project 20-Zone-0020 is too dense (550 units vs 200), has apts, and the existing infrastructure can't handle the increase in traffic and drainage. Our only input seems to be emails to a Case Manager. Scott, can you name a project that was substantially downsized merely due to comments made to the Case Manager?

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Ashburner, Clifford
To: Dock, Joel
Subject: Fwd: Comment cards for Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, March 27, 2020 2:35:14 PM
Attachments: image002.png
image003.png

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Joel:

Please see our responses in green below. Let me know if you have further questions.

Cliff

From: Dock, Joel <Joel.Dock@louisvilleky.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 10:54 AM
To: Ashburner, Clifford <Clifford.Ashburner@DINSMORE.COM>; 'young@ltd-inc.com' <young@ltd-inc.com>
Subject: Comment cards for Hurstbourne Commons

Throughout the comments cards provided in the formal application several individuals posed questions. Many will be addressed through plan revisions - drainage requirements, etc., but others may require specific attention:

1. I sent you an email some time back that asked that your group consider a pre-listening survey/binding element and I have not yet received a response. I'm assuming that...
2. There were other questions concerning connectivity to sewers for residents currently on...

septic. Will these individuals or neighborhoods be able to tie-in to the development to connect to sewers [maybe an MSD question as well]? Any progress on design through connectivity? Do we require that, otherwise, will they be required to provide their own septic system? Do we require that, otherwise, will they be required to provide their own septic system?

3. Please also note that in both neighborhood meeting summaries a 20' buffer around the peninsula was referenced, but a 10' TBA is shown. Was a 10' requirement, however, shown in the meeting materials?
4. Any consideration in placing barriers to prevent access to Greenhurst walking path, around detention? We note that the structure of the Penetration is very similar to the pen, the cul-de-sac, and the parking structure. How do we address the problem of access to the walking path? Any consideration in placing barriers to prevent access to the walking path around detention?
5. What route will construction traffic use? Do we require that the construction traffic use a specific route to the site?
6. Any consideration for green roofing or white roof systems to reduce heat island? Do we require that the construction traffic use a specific route to the site?
7. Has your group reached out to individuals with specific questions in the comment cards? Do we require that the construction traffic use a specific route to the site?

I'll have comments compiled later today for the development plans.

Thanks,

Joel P. Dock, AICP
Planner II
Planning & Design Services
Department of Development
LOUISVILLE FORWARD

444 South Fifth Street, Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202
502.574.4560

https://louisvilleky.gov/government/planning_design



The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission from the law firm of Dinsmore & Shohf may constitute an attorney-client communication that is privileged at law. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail, so that our address record can be corrected.

From: Vicki Queenan
To: Dock Joel
Subject: Case 2020EP4-0004 known as Hurstbourne Commons
Date: Friday, May 8, 2020 5:08:08 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Hello Joel,

I live on Brody Lane the proposed street that will be one of the access points for the new "Hurstbourne Commons". I have been informed many times that Brody was always aligned to be an access street. I feel that when Brody was listed as the covenant access it was for a neighborhood of homes not a mini community which is being built called "Hurstbourne Commons".

Can you tell me has there been any updates on this case:
Zoning approved?
Are there still the same four accesses for "Hurstbourne Commons"?
There is an access going through Meijer, has Meijer approved that?

--
Thank You,
Vicki Queenan
Ridgehurst Subdivision
502-296-4015

From: Karen Norton
To: Dock Joel
Subject: Case Number: 20-200EP4-0004 (Hurstbourne Commons)
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 12:10:13 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As President of the Greenhurst Condominium Association, the following items are of concern to our residents and we would like to see measures taken to address these concerns:

1. Greenhurst has a detention pond with a walking path around it. Despite the no trespassing signs, there is a large amount of foot traffic around the pond that is not Greenhurst property owners. Therefore, we are requesting that a privacy fence be constructed along the property line with Greenhurst and Hurstbourne Commons. This safety measure would be an additional step to keeping all area residents safe.
 2. Two additional traffic lights need to be installed along Hurstbourne Lane. A light is needed at the intersection of Ridgehurst Place and Hurstbourne Lane as there are numerous accidents in that location at the present time. A second traffic light will be needed where Brownwood intersects Hurstbourne Lane. With the increased automobile traffic and the present pedestrian traffic from the extended stay hotel crossing to access Meijer and TARC, this intersection will need increased regulation.
- Thank you,
Karen Norton
President - Greenhurst Condominium Association
Sent from my iPad

From: Marilyn Hicks
To: Dock Joel
Subject: Hurstbourne Commons Expansion
Date: Friday, June 26, 2020 7:17:42 PM

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

As a resident of Nachand Springs Patio Community, I am oppose to the changing of the Zoning from residential development to commercial medical office space. I agree that we have enough empty spaces along the Hurstbourne corridor now that could offer medical office space. With Watterson Trail being only two lanes and traffic has a problem with backing up as it is, this would pose a problem.

M. Hicks

From: Cecil C. Webber, Jr.
To: Dock Joel
Subject: 20-200EP4-0004(Fwd: Planned development behind Meijer - Saturday meeting - Meet Your Legislators
Date: Saturday, March 7, 2020 12:42:32 PM
Attachments: Meet Your Legislators.pdf

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Continuing email from Clay and Debbie Webber.

Our questions about number of units being reduced and the quality of the apartments.

We understand those might have been out of scope of Stuart Benson but hoping you might be able to answer.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: donotreply@cincsystems.net
Date: March 5, 2020 at 4:52:17 PM EST
To: Clay Webber <Cwebberjr@gmail.com>
Subject: Planned development behind Meijer - Saturday meeting - Meet Your Legislators

Good Afternoon,

This email is an FYI from the Board of Directors at Brookhollow Homeowners Association:

A 70-acre mixed-use development named Hurstbourne Commons is planned for the property behind Meijer on Hurstbourne Parkway. It will consist of approximately 550 residential housing units including 312 apartments. One of the access points is Brody Lane off of Ridgehurst Place which is next to Greenhurst Drive. Brody is a dead end street today. Traffic will proceed onto Ridgehurst Place and therefore Brookhollow Drive. An application for zoning changes has been submitted.

District 11 Metro Council member Kevin Kramer, his Legislative Assistant, Scott Harrington and others will be at a "Meet Your Legislators" meeting Saturday, March 7 from 9:00-10:00 at the Jeffersontown library on 10635 Watterson Trail. See the attachment. Kevin Kramer will be voting on this zoning change but cannot participate in off the record conversations since it is in his district. District 20 Metro Council member Stuart Benson is scheduled to attend also.

If you have concerns about the density and increased future traffic of this development, the meeting on Saturday is an opportunity to share them.

Also, your comments on case 20-ZONE-0020 can be sent to the Planning and Design Case Manager Joel Dock at Joel.Dock@LouisvilleKy.gov.

Powered by [CINC Community Association Management Software](#)