



*Board of Adjustments and Appeals*  
*Oldham County Planning and Development Services*  
*Application for Variance*

Oldham County  
 DEC 10 25  
 Planning &  
 Development

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ For Staff Use Only: \_\_\_\_\_ Docket No: L6-24-001 Staff: 3H Fee: \$230

*This application must be submitted in person at the Planning and Zoning Office. CR# 6472*

**General Information:** (A separate application must be submitted for each Board of Adjustments request.)

Name of Applicant(s): Mpp Ventures, LLC

Project Name: LaGrange Duplex at E. Jefferson St.

Project Address: 303 E. Jefferson St.

City: LaGrange Is the project within the incorporated city limits? Y

Subdivision Name: N/A Current Land Use: Res for PVA

Parcel ID: 46-L.6-01-4A Current Zoning: I-1 Lot Size: 0.214 ac

Please explain/describe the requested Variance:

To adjust the front and side yard setback requirements to meet the min standard required for residential. Front yard to be within the average setback of the two adjacent properties

Are there any past or present related Planning and Zoning cases on this property? If yes, please list the cases:

Application for Waiver of Regulations submitted on 11/12/25 to legal use land for Residential

**Signatures:**

Owner(s): Brett Jones  
 Name: Brett Jones

Signature: Brett Jones Authenticating  
Resident - 1

Address: 2185 Mount Olivet Rd. LaGrange, KY 40031

Phone: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

Applicant(s): (if other than owner)

Name: Mpp Ventures LLC

Signature: Alan Peake, Jr., Member

Address: 13000 Shumas Ct., Louisville, KY 40299

Phone: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

**Contact:**

Name: Alan Peake, Jr. (A.J.)

Signature: Al Peake

Address: 13000 Shumas Ct., Louisville, KY 40299

Phone: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

*100 West Jefferson Street ~ LaGrange, Kentucky*

*Ph: 502-222-1476 Fax: 502-222-3213*

*Last Updated 8/30/2015*



**Board of Adjustments and Appeals**  
**Oldham County Planning and Development Services**  
**Application for Variance**

For Staff Use Only:  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Docket No: \_\_\_\_\_ Staff: \_\_\_\_\_ Fee: \_\_\_\_\_

*This application must be submitted in person at the Planning and Zoning Office.*

**General Information:** (A separate application must be submitted for each Board of Adjustments request.)

Name of Applicant(s): Mpp Ventures, LLC

Project Name: LaGrange Duplex at E. Jefferson St.

Project Address: 303 E. Jefferson St.

City: LaGrange Is the project within the incorporated city limits? ✓

Subdivision Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Current Land Use: \_\_\_\_\_

Parcel ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Current Zoning: \_\_\_\_\_ Lot Size: \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain/describe the requested Variance:

---

---

**Signatures:**

**Owner(s):**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**Applicant(s): (if other than owner)**  
Name: Mpp Ventures LLC Signature: Alan Peake Jr., Member

Address: 13000 Shamus Ct., Louisville, KY 40299

Phone: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

**Contact:**  
Name: Alan Peake, Jr. (A.J.) Signature: APB

Address: 13000 Shamus Ct., Louisville, KY 40299

Phone: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

Check box original copy  
of signatures

***Board of Adjustments and Appeals***  
***Application for Variance***  
***(Page 2)***

*See Next Pg. w/ Responses*

***Justification:***

The Board of Adjustments and Appeals requires that each applicant respond to the following four questions (Please refer to the attached checklist for further explanation):

1. What are the specific conditions related to this request that are unique only to the applicant's land and do not exist on other land in the same general vicinity, or in the same zoning district?

---

---

---

---

2. If this variance were not granted, how would this deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the land in a manner equivalent to uses permitted to other landowners in the same zoning district?

---

---

---

---

3. Are the unique conditions and circumstances a result of actions of the applicant taken after the adoption of the zoning regulations from which relief is sought?

---

---

---

---

4. How will the variance preserve, and not harm, the public safety and welfare of the public and maintain the essential character of the neighborhood?

---

---

---

---

***Justification:***

**The Board of Adjustments and Appeals requires that each applicant respond to the following four questions (Please refer to the attached checklist for further explanation):**

**1. What are the specific conditions related to this request that are unique only to the applicant's land and do not exist on other land in the same general vicinity, or in the same zoning district?**

- a. The parcel at 303 E. Jefferson St. is substantially smaller than typical lots intended for I-1 zoning under standard development patterns, making the 100' front yard and 35' (or 75') side yard setbacks unreasonably large relative to the lot size.
- b. The parcel is located in a context where adjacent properties are residential lots with much shorter setbacks (e.g., the two lots immediately adjacent have buildings set at a typical residential front-yard distance), so the I-1 standard setbacks are out of scale relative to the existing built environment on the block.
- c. The small scale and residential nature of the immediate vicinity mean that applying "industrial-scale" front/side yard setbacks would render the property effectively unusable/undevelopable under I-1 standards, whereas the neighboring lots (in residential use) function well with much smaller setbacks — showing the mismatch is unique to this lot's size and location.

**2. If this variance were not granted, how would this deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the land in a manner equivalent to uses permitted to other landowners in the same zoning district?**

- a. Without the variance (i.e. enforcing the 100' front yard setback), there may be no practical building envelope left on the parcel to accommodate a duplex or any structure, making the land effectively undevelopable despite being zoned I-1 — which would deprive the owner of any reasonable use.
- b. Given the unique constraints (small lot, residential context, existing surrounding development), denying the variance would prevent the owner from using the land in a way that is functionally equivalent to neighboring residential parcels, even though the standard I-1 residential-scale use (a small duplex) would otherwise be reasonable.

**3. Are the unique conditions and circumstances a result of actions of the applicant taken after the adoption of the zoning regulations from which relief is sought?**

- a. No. The existing lot size and shape — and its location in relation to adjacent residential properties — appear to predate the current zoning regulations. The hardship stems from the lot's inherent characteristics (small area in a residential-scale neighborhood) rather than any actions by the applicant (e.g., subdividing, re-platting, or otherwise manipulating the lot after zoning adoption).
- b. Thus, the hardship is not self-created but is a function of the pre-existing conditions that make adherence to the standard I-1 setbacks unreasonable.

**4. How will the variance preserve, and not harm, the public safety and welfare of the public and maintain the essential character of the neighborhood?**

- a. Granting the variance to allow setbacks more in line with the average setback of the two adjacent properties will ensure the new duplex will “blend in” with the existing neighborhood pattern, preserving the character and rhythm of the block (rather than introducing a structure 100 ft back or strongly skewed off-center).
- b. The reduced setbacks (aligned with neighboring residential lots) will likely improve pedestrian scale, street frontage presence, and neighborhood continuity compared to a massive “industrial-setback” building far behind the street — which might appear out of place or underused.
- c. Because the proposed use is residential (a small duplex) rather than industrial, impacts such as heavy traffic, noise, or industrial activity are minimal; therefore, reducing the setback should not compromise public safety or welfare.

---