

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Minutes

Mr. Wells, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM on Tuesday, August 7, 2008, and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance and an invocation by Mr. Eilerman. The meeting was held in the Commission Chambers of the NKAPC Building in Fort Mitchell. Attendance of members (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date) was as follows.

Member	Jurisdiction	2008											
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Mark Barnett	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	Xx	X		X	X				
Barbara Carlin	Kenton Co	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X				
Barry Coates	Covington	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X				
James Cook	Kenton Co	X	X		Xx	X		X	X				
Paul Darpel	Edgewood	X		X	Xx		X	X	X				
Chuck Eilerman	Covington	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X				
Tom France	Ludlow	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X				
David Hilgefurd	Villa Hills	X	X	X	x	X			X				
Lynn Hood	Crestview Hills	X	X	X	Xx	X			X				
Kent Marcum	Fort Wright	X			Xx	X			X				
Brandon Raybourne	Elsmere	X	X	X	Xx	X	X						
Mark Rogge	Crescent Springs	-	-	X	x	X	X	X	X				
Phil Ryan	Park Hills		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Maura Snyder	Indepen	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				
Paul Swanson, Treasurer	Erlanger	X		X	Xx	X			X				
Joe Tewes	Bromley	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X				
John Wells, Vice Chair	Fort Mitchell	X	X		Xx		X	X	X				
Alex Weldon, Chair	Covington		X	X	Xx	X		X					
Bernie Wessels	Crescent Springs	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gil Whitacre	Lakeside Park	X	X		X	X	X		X				

“X” denotes attendance at the regular meeting and “x” denotes attendance at the continuation meeting.

“*” denotes arrival after roll call was taken.

“-“ denotes not on the planning commission.

Also present were Mr. Matt Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following NKAPC staff: Michael Schwartz, AICP, Deputy Director for Current Planning.

AGENDA:

There were no changes noted to the agenda for the evening. Mr. Tewes made a motion to accept the agenda. Mr. Eilerman seconded. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Tewes, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Rogge, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Whitacre, Mr. Marcum, Mr. Swanson and Mr. Wells in favor. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Eilerman to accept the minutes from July. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Rogge and Mr. Wells in favor. Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Whitacre, Mr. Marcum and Mr. Swanson abstained. The motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

There were no questions or comments with regard to the financial report.

ACTIONS SINCE LAST MEETING:

The memorandum regarding the actions taken by Staff over the past month was distributed for informational purposes only. There were no questions or comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1922R

APPLICANT: Kenton County Planning Commission, per Alexandra K. Weldon
REQUEST: Proposed text amendments to the zoning ordinances of all Kenton County jurisdictions: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations (this issue was tabled at the Commission's June 5th meeting)

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations presented by Mr. Michael Schwartz.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION

To approve the proposed text amendments: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations.

Comprehensive Plan Documentation:

- Date of Adoption by the Kenton County Planning Commission: December 13, 2006.

Supporting Information/Bases for Recommendation:

1. The proposed text amendments: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations are allowed to be included within the text of the zoning ordinance as authorized by Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS) 100.203(1).
2. The Kenton County Planning Commission carries out the powers and duties of a planning commission for the legislative bodies within Kenton County.

As part of its role in serving these local governments, the Planning Commission provides model zoning, subdivision, and related ordinances for consideration, possible modification, and, in the discretion of the governing bodies, adoption by those legislative bodies.

Since 2006, the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission has been engaged in updating the Kenton County model zoning ordinance. In the course of updating the model zoning ordinance, the NKAPC determined that it should also update the sign regulations. Parts of the current sign regulations have been published and in use by many legislative bodies since the early 1980's, although it received an update in the early part of 2006, following litigation involving several of the legislative bodies.

To assist it in updating the sign regulations, the NKAPC retained Eric Damian Kelly, J.D., Ph.D., FAICP, of Duncan Associates, a nationally regarded expert in sign law, the author of several publications on the subject, a consultant to many communities in updating their sign ordinances, and a consultant who has worked previously with the Area Planning Commission and knows the area and the context for its work.

The Planning Commission provides these model ordinances to assist the legislative bodies in implementing the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*, which was adopted in 2006.

One of the goals of the 2006 plan is:

To preserve a pleasant environment for the population.

Constant effort should be made to ensure that all areas are provided with adequate light and air and pleasing surroundings. This will require adequate control and monitoring of all potential contributors to all forms of pollution (air, water, visual, noise, etc.). Provision of sufficient open space in conjunction with all types of new development and redevelopment will also be necessary if this objective is to be achieved.

The management of the size, height, number, lighting and other characteristics of signs is essential to achieve this goal throughout the County.

Throughout the Goals and Objectives element of the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*, there is an emphasis on avoiding incompatible land uses. Signs that are too numerous, too large, or too tall, or that are garishly-lighted or use sound or motion to communicate messages are incompatible with most other land uses, and that signs that may be compatible with certain types of land uses may be too large or otherwise incompatible with other land uses. For that reason, the sign standards in the proposed

text vary by zoning district, to attempt to provide signage that is compatible with the context of each district.

Very large and very tall signs are particularly intrusive in the environment. Billboards located on sites without buildings are particularly notable for their visual impact on the character of the County. It is noted that billboards are typically installed along Interstate highways and other major thoroughfares that serve as gateways to the community and that define the visual character of the community for many people, and that the placement of billboards in such locations is inconsistent with the character that the community and its leaders hope to maintain and which are established in the comprehensive plan.

It is necessary to balance these aesthetic considerations against the needs of residents and visitors for way-finding help in identifying the locations of various businesses with signs located at those businesses. Businesses located in Kenton County are particularly dependent on signs at their businesses as a means of advertising, because the County is part of the metropolitan Cincinnati, Ohio, media market, in which it is very expensive for an individual business to purchase television, radio or newspaper advertising. Prohibiting billboards while allowing other commercial and noncommercial signs—a practice that has been in place for decades—is a reasonable way to balance these competing concerns, ensuring that businesses located in the County can identify themselves and advertise their goods and services and that people can freely express their views on a variety of noncommercial subjects, while limiting the number of additional signs that could be added to the environment through the installation of more billboards in the County.

3. The proposed text amendments: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations will bring the regulations into conformity with current federal court rulings.

Dr. Kelly has provided his recommendations for bringing the model sign ordinance into conformance with constitutional principles, as recently construed by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, and the federal and state courts in Kentucky.

In the process of pursuing his review, Dr. Kelly informed the Planning Commission that apparent constitutional issues arising from the existing model sign ordinance are common in local sign ordinances, because the cases establishing and, in some cases, clarifying the limitations on local sign ordinances are relatively recent, beginning with a case decided in the Northern District of Ohio in 2000 (*North Olmsted Chamber of Commerce v. Village of North Olmsted*, 86 F. Supp. 2d 755 (N.D. Ohio 2000)); and evolving in the Eleventh Circuit beginning in about 2002, with *Granite State Outdoor Advertising, Inc., v. Village of Clearwater*, 213 F. Supp. 2d 1312 (M.D. Fla. 2002), *aff'd in part and rev. in part*, 351 F.3d 1112 (11th Cir. 2003).

Upon the recommendation of Dr. Kelly, with the review and advice of its own counsel, the proposed text should be recommended to the legislative bodies that depend on it, and that they adopt the new model sign ordinance, to modernize the regulations and to bring them into line with current constitutional principles.

It is the desire and intent to provide model regulations that conform to applicable constitutional limits and that fall within the scope of authority granted to its local governments by the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

4. Dr. Kelly has made the Planning Commission aware that research on the link between traffic safety and billboards is mixed, with some studies finding a clear relationship between billboards and traffic accidents and other studies finding no direct relationship.

Although the evidence regarding traffic safety is mixed, the intent of billboard advertisers is to attract the attention of drivers, thus distracting them from their driving task and creating an increased risk of accidents.

There is a relationship between traffic safety and the regulation of signs and a particular relationship between traffic safety and large signs and billboards. Signs not only serve commercial purposes but they offer an easy method for providing site-specific information and an inexpensive way for people to express their opinions on matters of public interest and their support for particular causes or events. For that reason, it is both necessary and appropriate to provide more liberally for noncommercial signs than for commercial ones, but that noncommercial signs, like commercial ones, should be subject to significant limitations in size and height.

5. It is recognized that some businesses may choose to use permitted commercial signs to communicate noncommercial messages and believed that businesses and others should be free to do that.
6. It is both necessary and appropriate as part of its program of providing model regulations to the various legislative bodies in Kenton County, with the general purpose of preserving and protecting the public health, safety and welfare in the physical development of the community, to approve and recommend the adoption of the submitted model sign ordinance.
7. The proposed text amendments: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations are reasonable and appropriate in that they will provide Kenton County's jurisdictions with a set of regulations that:
 - a. follows the "content neutral" standard established through numerous federal court decisions; regulates a sign's size, height, and location, not what it says, in keeping with First Amendment guarantees for free speech;
 - b. exempts certain signs that are not legible from public rights of way or adjacent properties;
 - c. contains provisions for menu boards for drive-through facilities;
 - d. continues to prohibit billboards and other off-site commercial signage;
 - e. contains provisions for changeable copy and electronic message signs;
 - f. provides for permanent neighborhood entrance signs;
 - g. provides for signage for institutional uses, including the use of changeable copy;
 - h. regulates the number and sizes of signs permitted on each occupied lot in single and two-family zones (e.g., yard sale signs, for sale signs, political signs)
 - i. provides for directory signs;

- j. permits electronic signs in office zones, highway commercial zones, limited highway service zones, limited service commercial zones, shopping center zones, and industrial zones;
 - k. includes provisions to address signage in Covington's downtown and historic districts;
 - l. requires master signage plans; and
 - m. includes illustrations to provide clarity and a better understanding of its regulatory provisions.
8. The proposed text amendments: (1) deleting all current definitions pertaining to signage; (2) deleting all current sign regulations; (3) adding new definitions pertaining to signage; and (4) adding new sign regulations will provide for a single set of regulations that will result in the uniform administration, permitting, and enforcement of signage within the county.

Additional Information:

- 1. The proposed amendments are intended to be a model set of sign regulations for use throughout the county. As such, it is understood that individual modifications will be necessary to incorporate the various zoning districts each legislative body has within its zoning ordinance. These modifications will not constitute a major change from the submitted application as they will not alter the basic intent, principles, and purpose of the regulations. Therefore, these changes will not be required to come before the planning commission prior to adoption.

Mr. Smith stated Mr. Tom Nienaber would be sitting in due to a conflict of interest with Mr. Smith's firm. Mr. Schwartz noted he would like the entire minutes regarding this issue be made a part of the record in the matter. He additionally stated Staff provided the chair with summaries of the studies and other documents relating to the issue to be marked as exhibits and made a part of the record. Mr. Wells then marked those documents as exhibits.

Mr. Meyer addressed the Commission as the mayor of Crestview Hills. He presented the vice chair with a resolution by the city relating to the issue. Mr. Meyer stated he would like the amount of linear footage to be either one foot or two square feet. He then noted he would like the cities to have the option of having either one. He noted the city does not want new billboards and that they would like a total ban. He then noted many cities have a ban in place regardless of what is voted on at this meeting.

Mr. Jim Collett addressed the Commission as the mayor of Crescent Springs. He noted several cities in Kenton County recently took to court this issue which then stood the text of the courts. He stated they were successful in defending their position. He noted the ordinance give every city a model to decide what is best for their city and to help maintain some standards. He stated the billboards are unsightly and he asked the Commission for a favorable decision.

Mr. Frank Warnock addressed the Commission as city solicitor of Covington. He stated the Staff report does an excellent job of outlining the laws and the ordinance. He stated the city passed a resolution in June in favor of the issue and submitted same as an exhibit. He noted most of the cities have already effectively banned billboards so this is nothing new. He noted all the existing

billboards have been grandfathered in. He further noted the Supreme Court stated cities do have the right to determine what is best for their city and he asked for approval by the Commission.

Mr. Guy Taft addressed the Commission for Lamar and stated a total ban can be adopted or a reasonable option to place these billboards in certain areas. He noted there are areas where billboards have a valid function. He then stated there are many studies that show these billboards do not cause accidents. He noted Lamar has never been sued for having caused an accident involved the billboards. He additionally noted under the proposed regulations if you have a business or own property along the 75 corridor you cannot advertise your goods and services. He stated the Commission does not have the information before them to ban all billboards. He stated what they would like to do is to get Dr. Kelly back to draft a reasonable alternative so Covington and other cities can decide on the issue.

Mr. Butler addressed the Commission and stated he reiterated the same thoughts as stated previously.

Mr. Tom Norton addressed the Commission and stated his family has done business for sixty years in the area. He stated he has been denied the opportunity to build billboards in northern Kentucky which has hurt his business. He noted they would like it regulated but not prohibited. He noted he is asking the Commission to think differently on the issue because it would be beneficial to the industry.

Mr. Knapp addressed the Commission and stated a total ban would hurt the local businesses since 80% is local advertising. He stated it is depriving property owners to maximize their businesses. He asked what traffic studies were done by the planning commission as far as the safety of billboards in this area. He noted it is a billion dollar industry having billboards and stated unfortunately most of the information presented by Dr. Kelly is based on opinion and not fact.

Mr. Walter Blair addressed the Commission and stated he is a consultant that works with Crestview Hills and others. He stated the billboards are equal to chaos and they try to bring order to the chaos. He noted the question is it seems to him is that the city wants to save some trees. Mr. Schwartz then referenced a newspaper article from the Courier Journal on July 31st that stated why the governor of Kentucky withdrew a bill relating to billboards. He cited safety concerns as a reason and felt that needed to be looked into. He then reiterated the proposal is nothing more than a decade's old policy which has been in place and than many of the sitting commissioners voted on back in 2006. Ms. Carlin then asked Staff if the cities would have the ability to change the text amendment if they so choose. Mr. Schwartz stated it is like any other text amendment that comes before the Commission. The cities can take out part, leave it in, take it all, etc. Mr. Darpel stated these are good sign regulations. He stated he thinks it needs to go to the cities because they want to take action on it. He then noted he would have liked to have seen alternatives offered to cities to allow them to have them if they choose.

Mr. Taft addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated Dr. Kelly made it clear that he could come up with alternatives for billboards. He stated the idea of the planning commission is to provide regulations for the cities to adopt and this does not provide for regulations regarding this issue. He stated all they were asking for was alternatives on the issue. He stated there have been studies that stated these billboards are not safety hazards. He noted they are asking for opportunity to have alternatives to present to the cities so they can decide what they want to do.

Mr. Wells read a resolution into the record from the city of Edgewood regarding the issue and marked it as an exhibit. At this time the public hearing was recessed to discuss the matter further. Mr. Hilgefurd stated he finds the arguments on safety to be bogus. He further noted he did not feel it was the Commission's job to provide alternatives and stated to do so would be going down a slippery slope. He stated a model zoning is just what it says and it is a suggestion to the cities and a guideline to follow. Mr. Barnett stated for every study showing billboards are dangerous you can find a similar study stating they are not. He stated people can advocate fairly on both sides of the issue. Mr. Eilerman stated he feels there is a fairly strong advocate to continue the more than 20 year ban and he feels it should move forward. Following additional discussion amongst the commissioners the public hearing was then closed. Mr. Hilgefurd made the motion to accept the ordinance by Staff based on Staff's report and the evidence presented. Mr. Barnett seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. Barnett, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Rogge, Mr. Whitacre, Mr. Marcum, Mr. Swanson and Mr. Wells in favor. Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook and Mr. Darpel voted against. Mr. Ryan had to leave the meeting prior to roll being taken. The motion passed with a vote of 13-3.

*Mr. Darpel recused himself from the following issue due to a conflict of interest.

1930R

APPLICANT: Daffin Jolly Investments per Barry Jolly
LOCATION: an approximate 1.8-acre area located at the southwest corner of Erlanger-Crescent Springs Road and Croley Street and more precisely described as follows: Area A (approximately 1.1 acres in Crescent Springs) is located at the southwest corner of the intersection; Area B (approximately 0.5 acre in Erlanger) is located on the east side of Erlanger-Crescent Springs Road, approximately 600 feet southwest of the intersection; and, Area C (approximately 0.2 acre in unincorporated Kenton County) is located on the west side of Croley Street, approximately 600 feet southwest of the intersection
REQUEST: proposed map amendments to the Crescent Springs, Erlanger, and Kenton County Zoning Ordinances changing Area A from IP-2 (an industrial park zone) to NC (a neighborhood commercial zone); changing Area B from IP-1 (an industrial park zone) to NC (a neighborhood commercial zone); and, changing Area C from IP (an industrial park zone) to NC (a neighborhood commercial zone)

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations presented by Mr. Michael Schwartz.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION

To disapprove the proposed map amendments from IP-2, IP-1, and IP to NC.

Comprehensive Plan Documentation:

- Date of Adoption by the Kenton County Planning Commission: December 13, 2006

Supporting Information/Bases For NKAPC Staff Recommendation:

1. The proposed map amendments from IP-2, IP-1, and IP to NC are not consistent with the Recommended Land Use Map of the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026* which identifies the site in question as being part of a larger area extending to the south, west, and northwest of the site in question for Industrial use. The proposed NC Zone would allow non-industrial development to occur in an area recommended for industrial uses.
2. The existing IP-2, IP-1, and IP Zones are appropriate and the proposed NC Zone is inappropriate. The existing IP-2, IP-1, and IP Zones are consistent with the Recommended Land Use Map of the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*. Rezoning the site in question to the NC Zone would not decrease the number of nonconforming uses in the existing building. Under the current zoning, there are three (3) permitted uses (including a conditional use) and three (3) nonconforming uses. Under the proposed NC Zone, there would still be three (3) permitted uses and three (3) nonconforming uses:

Use	IP-2, IP-1, IP	NC
Alcohol Distribution	P	NC
Appraisal Office	NC	P
Architectural Concrete Distribution	P	NC
Adult Day Care	NC	NC
Karate School	NC	P
Montessori School	CU	P
P - Permitted Use		
NC - Nonconforming Use		
CU - Conditionally Permitted Use		

Additionally, the number of existing off-street parking spaces may not be sufficient to accommodate retail/service activity on the site in question. It already appears, based on signs located on the site in question, that parking is insufficient for the current uses on the site in question. Based on the requirements of Article XI in the Crescent Springs, Erlanger, and Kenton County Zoning Ordinances, a retail and personal service shopping center containing 19,000 square feet would be required to have a minimum of seventy-six (76) off-street parking spaces. There are currently fifty-two (52) off-street parking spaces provided for the existing structure.

3. There have not been any major changes of an economic, physical, or social nature within the vicinity of the area that were not anticipated in the adopted comprehensive plan to warrant the proposed map amendment.
4. Article XVII of the Crescent Springs, Erlanger, and Kenton County Zoning Ordinances state that the zoning map shall not be amended, changed, or modified in such manner as to create a free standing zone of less than five (5) acres, except where specific area restrictions are stipulated in this ordinance, or as outlined in the adopted comprehensive plan by the planning commission. There is nothing in the adopted comprehensive plan that addresses the size issue of this area of Crescent Springs, Erlanger, or Kenton County.

The proposed map amendment, when including half of the rights-of-way of the adjacent streets, would result in a free standing NC Zone approximately three (3) acres in size.

Additional Information

1. Although the staff is recommending disapproval of the proposed map amendments, if the planning commission or legislative bodies take action to approve the proposed map amendments, it should be done with the condition that all three jurisdictions adopt the proposed map amendment.

Mr. Jim Collett addressed the Commission and stated he is the mayor of Crescent Springs. He stated he was approached by the owner of the property in question and the city looked into a way to help the property owner. He stated they really don't see this area as industrial anymore. He further stated there is retail in the area and stated retail developers have been coming to the area but the area is stagnant. He stated he feels the NC zone is appropriate and the city is in support of the zone change. He further stated they feel it is a step in the right direction and they are asking for the Commission's support.

Mr. Brueggeman addressed the Commission and submitted an exhibit to be made a part of the record. He stated there is a vacant unit and they have a proposed tenant of a hair salon for the space. He stated the area is non-conforming for the use but is appropriate for sexually oriented businesses. He stated this area is a wise choice for retail because you do need a buffer for the residential. He stated it is not appropriate for industrial and that none of the existing uses are operating as industrial uses. He noted there really is no rationale for keeping this area IP2. He noted he feels the issues raised by staff can be resolved. He then noted major changes have been made to the area and that the industrial uses that were there have trended toward commercial now. He further noted there is enough parking currently for the usage proposed.

Mr. Daffin addressed the Commission and stated they purchased the property four years ago. He stated it has not been an easy sell because as an IP zone you cannot get a semi truck in for delivery. He noted the proposed hair salon is more of a commercial use for the site and the map amendment is really an attempt to clean up the zone. He noted most of the current tenants are retail and not industrial uses.

Mr. Brueggeman stated this IP zone has been carved out for reasons that no longer exist. Mr. Hilgefurd then asked the applicant if they would consider tabling the issue to allow them to go back and contact the other two property owners to avoid the spot zoning issue and to possibly come up with that five acre minimum as well. Mr. Brueggeman noted he was hoping for the condition because basically it's a denial anyway if the condition can't be met. Following a brief discussion the applicants stated they would table the issue. Mr. Hilgefurd then made the motion to table for a period not to exceed six months. Staff then stated the deadline for getting the item on next month's agenda was one week from the meeting. In lieu of this information the applicant then decided to withdraw their request to table and go forward with the vote. At this time the public hearing was closed. A motion was then made by Mr. Hilgefurd to disapprove for the reason that it has less than the appropriate acreage for a free-standing zone in a NC zone. Mr. Eilerman seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Barnet, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Marcum, Mr. Swanson and Mr. Wells in favor. Mr. Rogge and Mr. Whitacre voted against. Mr. Darpel abstained. The motion carried with a vote of 12-2.

Old and Unfinished Business:

Reports from Committees:

Subdivision Regulations Review – No meeting held.

By-Laws – Nothing to report.

Model Zoning Ordinance – No meeting held.

Executive- Nothing to report.

Report from legal counsel – Nothing to report.

Announcements from Staff –

Correspondence – Nothing to report.

New Business:

Mr. Whitacre brought up the issue of issues to be brought before the Commission. He stated it should be something that is a major issue and not an everyday regular request that comes before the commission. Mr. Darpel stated it could almost be left up to Staff to decide the issues this would involve. Mr. Smith stated it is done this way in Boone county. Mr. Darpel then stated he's been through Boone county and there are pluses and minuses to it. He further stated he felt they should know what having and issue heard separately prior to doing something like that. Mr. Wells then stated he would send an email out regarding the issue raised.

Public Comments: None.

There being nothing further to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair

Date