

**MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING
OF THE LAGRANGE
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS AND APPEALS
Wednesday, January 14, 2026**

At 9:00 a.m. local time, on the above date, this meeting of the LaGrange Board of Adjustments and Appeals, hereinafter, called the Board, was called to order in the Courtroom of the Oldham County Fiscal Court, LaGrange, Kentucky, by Chairman Keith Smith.

The following members were present:

Al Earley
Joe Pierce

Board Member Luke Tomparly was absent.

Others present and sworn in were Planning and Development Services Senior Planner Anna Barge, and Planner John Hine. LaGrange City Attorney Beach Craigmyle was present at the meeting. Christy Edgar was the Secretary for the meeting.

.....
Chairman Keith Smith called and read Docket:

Docket LG-26-001 – An application has been filed requesting a Front Yard and Side Yard Setback Variance for a property located at 303 E. Jefferson St., La Grange.

1. Introduction of the application by staff and questions by the board:

Planner John Hine presented the following:

- Summary of the application.
- Case History (see Exhibit A, Staff Report dated January 14, 2026).
- Site history.
- Aerial Photos of the site.

2. Presentation by the applicant or representative and others in support of the application:

Nick Pregliasco, Bardenwerper, Talbott & Roberts, PLLC, 1000 N. Hurstbourne Pkwy, Louisville, was present and representing the applicant.

- We want to build a duplex.
- The parcel is substantially smaller than typical lots intended for I-1 zoning under standard development patterns.
- Denying the variance would prevent the owner from using the land in a way that is functionally equivalent to neighboring residential parcels.
- Granting the variance to allow setbacks more in line with the average setbacks of the two adjacent properties will ensure the new duplex will blend in with the existing neighborhood pattern and preserve the character.

Brett Jones, 2185 Mt. Olivet Road, LaGrange, was present and sworn in prior to presenting.

- Owner of the subject property.
- I sold the property to Rev. McCall, and I let him use the subject property in exchange for maintaining the subject property.
- The building next door is not on the property line, it is about three feet off.
- When you purchase a piece of property then you should have a survey done.

3. Questioning of the applicant and those in support of the application by the board:

Chairman Smith asked, will the duplex be in the portion of the historic district on this parcel?

Attorney Pregliasco replied, it would not be in the rear of the lot which is where the historic district is shown on the staff's map.

Chairman Smith asked, does the historic district get involved with this since a portion of the property is in historic district?

Planner Hine stated, we were unable to find a legal description of the historic overlay district as of right now they do not have to go through the historic district process unless they decide to build in the overlay portion of the parcel.

City Attorney Craigmyle stated, designated historic district was done by lots.

Board Member Earley, is a duplex commercial?

Senior Planner Barge replied, no, it is residential.

City Attorney Craigmyle asked, if this was zoned C-N what would the setbacks be?

Planner Hine replied, within the C-N zoning there are no defined setbacks except when abutting a residential district and then it takes on those of the abutting district.

4. Testimony and questions by those opposed to the application by the board:

Jamie Hargrove, Hargrove Firm, 12910 Shelbyville Road, Louisville, was present and representing Rev. Casey McCall.

- Mr. Jones only owns a portion of the property.
- The access easement across his property further reduces the lot-size. Public safety risk.
- Building 301 is built on the property line and the proposed building would be seven feet from existing building.
- The portion of the property that has the sheds on it was already sold to my client Rev. McCall.
- Parking for this duplex will be a major problem; there is not enough room for parking, especially if a family has more than two drivers.

5. Questioning of the applicant and those opposed to the application by the board:

Senior Planner Barge stated, the building built on the property line is commercial and it is abutting to industrial so there are no setbacks and the building can be built on property line.

Board Member Earley asked, is there a property line dispute?

Attorney Hargrove replied, yes.

Board Member Earley asked, do we have anything to do here today?

City Attorney Craigmyle replied, it's a title issue.

Board Member Earley asked, can we do this variance if the property lines aren't correct?

Senior Planner Barge replied, keep in mind the GIS is not survey grade.

Board Member Earley stated, but there is a property line dispute, and we cannot decide on a variance if we do not have accurate information.

City Attorney Craigmyle replied, any order that is issued would have to be subject to a clear title and a certified survey.

Attorney Hargrove stated, we are not going against the survey, we are against Mr. Jones selling this property when he already sold a portion to my client.

6. Rebuttal and Final Statement of the Applicant:

Attorney Pregliasco's rebuttal:

- No evidence of the ownership of the property.
- Any residence that would be built there would need setback variances.
- Parking is for the planning commission board to decide.
- No title dispute has been filed as of today.

7. Rebuttal and Final Statement of the Opposition:

Attorney Hargrove's rebuttal:

- We are not disputing the setbacks; we are disputing the multi-family duplex.
- The pastor does not make a lot of money and did not have the money to purchase this track of land, however once the survey came out and the survey shows what he thought he purchased which was the shed and portion of land that the shed sets, then a survey comes out and he does not own it.

Curt Chase, 3313 Shallow Cove Court, Crestwood, was present and sworn in prior to rebuttal.

- Owner at 301, and I am not happy with a two-story building being built that close to my existing building.
- It just seems like we are putting a big square peg in a very small square hole.

Board Member Earley asked, are you disputing the property line?

Attorney Hargrove replied, yes, we are.

8. Board Discussion and Final Decision:

Chairman Smith stated, our option at this time is to table this for 30 days.

**Findings and Decision
Docket Number LG-26-001
Variance
Rear & Side Yard Setback
303 E. Jefferson Street**

Motion was made by Board Member Pierce and seconded by Board Member Earley to table docket LG-26-001 located at 303 E. Jefferson Street.

The vote was as follows:

Yes: Board Members Early, Pierce and Chairman Smith.

Abstain: None

Absent: Board Member Tomparry.

Motion passed for a side yard setback variance on a vote of 3-0.

.....
Approval of Minutes

Motion was made by Board Member Pierce and seconded by Board Member Earley to approve the minutes of November 17, 2025. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

.....
Other Business

None
.....

Motion was made by Board Member Pierce and seconded by Board Member Earley to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 a.m. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Approved by:

Respectfully Submitted by:



Keith Smith, Chairman



Christy Edgar, Secretary