

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Minutes

Mr. Wells, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM on Thursday, April 2, 2009, 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	2009											
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Mark Barnett	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X								
Diane Brown	Erlanger	-	X	X	X								
Barbara Carlin	Kenton Co	X	X	X	X								
Barry Coates	Covington	X	X	X									
James Cook	Kenton Co	X	X		X								
Paul Darpel	Edgewood	X		X	X								
Chuck Eilerman	Covington	X	X	X	X								
Tom France, Vice-Chair	Ludlow	X	X	X	X								
David Hilgefurd	Villa Hills		X	X	X								
Lynn Hood	Crestview Hills	X	X	X	X								
Marc Hult	Covington	X	X	X	X								
Kent Marcum	Fort Wright	X	X	X									
Brandon Raybourne	Elsmere	X	X		X								
Mark Rogge	Crescent Springs	X	X	X									
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X		X								
Maura Snyder	Indepen		X	X	X								
Paul Swanson	Erlanger	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Joe Tewes	Bromley	X	X	X	X								
John Wells, Chair	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X	X								
Gil Whitacre	Lakeside Park	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, Mr. Scott Hiles, Deputy Director, Infrastructure Engineering, Mr. Andy Videkovich, Principal Planner, and Mr. Mike Iona, Associate Planner.

AGENDA:

Mr. Wells noted a request had been received with regard to issue W-701 and moving it to the front of the agenda given the fact that the other Covington issues may take some time. A motion was then made by Mr. Eilerman to amend the agenda. Mr. Barnett seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Raybourne, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown Mr. Tewes, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. France noted with regard to the Covington issue that the commercial tourism zone listed on page 6 items 1 and 3 should be switched. He additionally noted on page 5 in the last paragraph the owner of the vintage clothing store is Julie Boone. There being no further changes to the minutes for March Mr. France then made the motion to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Tewes seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. France, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Hood, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. Mr. Cook, Mr. Raybourne and Mr. Ryan abstained. The motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Mr. Darpel made the motion to accept the report as submitted. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Hood, Mr. Raybourne, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

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.

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

No action required.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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

W-701

LOCATION: A 5.06 acre area located along the south side of Garden Way, approximately 530 feet east of Krueer Court in Edgewood

REQUEST FOR ACTION: to grant waivers to requirements of Section 5.3 of the Kenton County Subdivision Regulations; granting the requests would waive the requirement for sidewalk along both sides of a public street allowing sidewalk to be along only one side, and would waive the requirement for a 25-foot wide street to be located within a 50-foot wide right-of-way allowing the street to be within a 40-foot wide right-of-way

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations presented by Mr. Scott Hiles.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION

To deny the requested Waiver to Section 5.3 and require sidewalk along both sides of Serenity Way.

Bases:

1. Subdivision Regulations Section 5.3 requires sidewalk along both sides of new streets.
2. The modification, as requested, does not include the findings necessary to grant waivers to the regulations as set forth within Section 6.5 A, or B, or C, or D.
3. Sidewalk currently exists along both sides of other streets within this neighborhood. Requiring sidewalk along both sides of Serenity Way would allow for a seamless sidewalk connection to other streets within the neighborhood and allow pedestrian traffic to circulate without requiring that any pedestrians enter and cross a vehicular way.
4. Requiring that sidewalk be constructed along both sides of new streets is consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan for Kenton County. As stated in Chapter 3, “Development plans and subdivision plats should be evaluated to ensure all modes of transportation can be accommodated. (e.g. bus pullouts and/or stops within or connected by pedestrian access; bicycle parking provided; pedestrian access from all roads to buildings with safe routes across parking areas)”. Allowing sidewalk along one side of a new street is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and does not develop a balanced pedestrian circulation system.

Recommendation #2:

To deny the requested Waiver to Section 5.3 and require either:

- a) The proposed street be 25 feet wide within a 50-foot wide right-of-way; or
- b) The proposed street be 22 feet wide within a 40-foot wide right-of-way.

Bases:

1. Subdivision Regulations Section 5.3 requires that proposed streets comply with either option a) or b), above.
2. The modification, as requested, does not include the findings necessary to grant waivers to the regulations as set forth within Section 6.5 A, or B, or C, or D.
3. A 25-foot wide street within a 40-foot wide right-of-way would provide a 7.5-foot space behind each curb for future street maintenance. This 7.5-foot wide space may not be an adequate enough space to allow for effective maintenance of the street.

4. Subdivision Regulations allow a 22-foot wide street within a 40-foot wide right-of-way that permits parking along one side of the street in this application. A 22-foot wide street with parking along one side would essentially function similar to a 25-foot wide street but with the added benefits of allowing more space for maintenance of the street as well as serving as a traffic calming method that would reduce vehicle speeds and improve street safety and livability.

Mr. Jim Berling addressed the Commission and stated you have to understand where this is all coming from. He stated the Quills approached him about the idea of building a home of their own on the property. He stated a big concern of the family is the woods. Mr. Berling noted they would try to minimize the number of trees destroyed.

Mr. Kruer addressed the Commission and stated this property was the original Tewes farm. He stated his family bought a portion a number of years ago and they have been trying to develop this property well. He stated they were very disappointed with the way the previous property was developed whereby all the trees were just blasted away. He further stated they want to do something meaningful with the remaining five acres. He then noted the mayor and the city support their efforts with the development. He additionally noted they did not want a 22 foot street so they are doing a 25 foot street with and requesting a 40 foot right of way. He further stated they are doing this because they don't want to destroy any more trees. He noted there is a large maple tree that was planted by their grandfather and they want that preserved because it is special. It was further noted that there is an old barn on the property that was built stone by stone and it is so sturdy after 80 years that he can't find anyone to take it down. He noted it was built to last forever. He further noted this street is shorter than the Beechwood football field. Mr. Kruer then noted they are giving property to the Kenton County Conservancy and stated if that is not innovative design he doesn't know what is. He stated he realizes the decision is final but stated they are passionately asking for the permission to do something different. He further noted this is not a huge deviation and stated it is only 6 homes on a 100 foot street.

Mr. Darpel then stated he doesn't know how innovative it is to simply mark each tree and doesn't know if there is some way the Commission can be creative. Mr. France noted clearly subdivisions need to be walkable. He stated to go to a 50 foot right of way is only adding 3 more feet on either side. He further stated he can appreciate the fact that he wants to preserve trees, especially ones planted by his grandfather. He noted the sidewalk doesn't have to be built in a straight line and stated the sidewalk could be build around trees. Mr. Kruer then stated it is his understanding trees cannot be in the right of way. He noted he has lived in Edgewood nearly 60 years and this is the only single sidewalk street. He further noted it is important to note the city is in favor of both of the waivers. Mr. Raybourne then asked why that side of the street was chosen for the sidewalk. Mr. Kruer stated it was for topographical reasons. He noted dirt would need to be moved as the property drops away in that location. He noted the fill that would be required to accomplish this would be substantial and a lot of vegetation would be disturbed. Mr. Hult then asked if they would be willing to provide a walking pathway. Mr. Kruer than stated they would be willing to do an alternate type of pathway to provide for a pedestrian walkway.

Ms. Carol Quill addressed the Commission and stated the reason they named this street Serenity Way was because it was her grandmother's favorite prayer and she would say that prayer while

walking on the property. She asked that the Commission go outside the box and allow them to do something different and to create the first green subdivision in the city. She noted they could have put eighteen homes on this property but they feel strongly about doing something different and asked the Commission to allow them to try a different way and to make it a community they are proud of.

The public hearing was then recessed for discussion. Mr. Wells then read a letter from Mr. Roger Rolfes with regard to the issue. A letter from Sherry Karen was also read into the record and both were marked as exhibits on the issue.

Mr. Hilgefurd then stated he can speak with some experience as to living on a street that is 25 feet wide with sidewalks on one side since he has lived on such a street for 25 years. He stated his feeling is the Commission allow both waivers based on his personal experience. Mr. Barnett asked about just leaving the 22 foot wide street to lessen the footprint. Mr. Hilgefurd stated he understands that the city asked for the 25 foot wide street but would be fine with the 22 foot wide street. Mr. Barnett then stated a concern is the precedent it would set and noted the 22 foot street is more in line in being consistent. Mr. Barnett asked if the sidewalk had to be set in ground or if it could be another type of surface. Mr. Hiles then stated it just needs to be a hard surface of asphalt or concrete but it could be a footpath versus a sidewalk. Mr. Hilgefurd stated this is different because they are not scalping every tree that is surrounding it. Mr. Ryan stated he lives in Park Hills and many streets are less than 20 feet wide and it's not a problem so he doesn't see a problem with the 40 foot right of way and a 22 foot street. Mr. Darpel then stated you've got the conservancy district that came in and you've got 25% being set aside for the conservancy. He noted this is about as innovative as you can get. He stated you've also got a letter from the city stating their approval. Mr. Hult then stated the 25 foot street provides an enormous savings in terms of water run off. Mr. Eilerman stated he doesn't fee like this is setting a precedent by allowing the sidewalk on one side with a narrower street. He further stated he feels this is extremely innovative.

The public hearing was then closed. Mr. Hilgefurd made the motion to approve the waiver to allow for sidewalks on one side due to topographical issues on the other side of the street and that the modified design allows for an innovative design. He further added a condition to provide for some sort of pathway in lieu of the sidewalk. It was noted that the applicant is in agreement with providing for an alternative walkway or foot path in lieu of the sidewalk. Mr. Darpel seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Raybourne, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. Mr. Tewes recused himself for any vote on the matter. The motion carried.

Mr. Hilgefurd then made the motion to approve the waiver to allow for the 25 foot wide street within a 40 foot right of way because it is within the conservation area which provides for a modified design. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Hilgefurd, Mr. France, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Hood, Mr. Raybourne, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. Mr. Tewes recused himself from any vote on the matter. Mr. Ryan voted against. The motion carried.

*Mr. Darpel had to leave the meeting prior to this issue being heard.

1959R

APPLICANT: City of Covington, per Denny Bowman, City Mayor
REQUEST: a proposed text amendment to the Covington Zoning Ordinance modifying the off-street parking requirements for infill residential development in all RU (urban residential) zones

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Mr. Mike Iona.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION

To approve the proposed text amendment modifying the off-street parking requirements for infill residential development in all RU (urban residential) zones.

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 text amendment modifying the off-street parking requirements for infill residential development in all RU (urban residential) zones to allow for off-site parking is allowed to be included within the text of the zoning ordinance as authorized by Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS) 100.203 (1).
2. The proposed text amendment modifying the off-street parking requirements for infill residential development in all RU (urban residential) zones to allow for off-site parking is reasonable. The proposed text amendment only applies to those areas that are zoned RU. These areas are typically the older areas of the city with smaller lot sizes. As such, allowing for off-site parking alleviates the problem of not being able to meet the on-site parking regulations of Infill Development due to deficiency in lot size.
3. The proposed text amendment requires applications for off-site parking to be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Board to ensure proper integration into existing character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wolfe Bertling addressed the Commission and stated an issue is accessibility. He then stated they are promoting the text amendment and are in favor.

Mr. Klein registered to speak but passed.

The public hearing was then recessed for discussion. Mr. Eilerman stated he thinks it is a good idea. Mr. France stated anything that encourages infill development is great. The public hearing was then closed. Mr. Eilerman made the motion to approve the amendment based on Staff's recommendation the fact that it is compliance with the comprehensive plan. Ms. Hood seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Hood, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgeford, Mr. Raybourne, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. The motion carried.

*At this time (8:10 p.m.) a ten minute break was taken.

1960R

APPLICANT: City of Covington per Denny Bowman, Mayor
LOCATION: an approximate 7.2-acre area located immediately south of the Roebling Suspension Bridge in Covington—bounded on the north by East 3rd Street; on the south by East 4th Street; on the east by Sanford Alley; and, on the west by Scott Street
REQUEST: a proposed map amendment to the Covington Zoning Ordinance adding the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HP-O) to the existing zoning classifications—RU-0.5 (an urban residential zone with a maximum density of 62.2 dwelling units per net acre) and CG-3P (a general commercial zone with a lot and building intensity of 3 and a pedestrian character standard)

Staff recommendations and Staff presentations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To approve the proposed map amendment from RU-0.5 and CG-3P to RU-0.5 (HP-O) and CG-3P (HP-O).

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 amendment is consistent with Recommended Land Use Map of the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*, which identifies the site in question for Residential Development at a density of over 30.0 dwelling units per net acre, Commercial – Office Uses, and Other Community Facilities. The proposed map amendment will continue to allow for a variety of office, commercial, and high density residential uses in an area recommended for Commercial – Office and Residential Development.
2. The recommendation of approval is consistent with a previous recommendation of approval made by the NKAPC staff and the KCPC:

On June 16, 1988, the City of Covington, per Robert Horine, submitted an application to the Kenton County Planning Commission for review and recommendation on a proposed map amendment to the Covington Zoning Ordinance for an approximate 250-acre area, directly adjacent to the south and east of the site in question, adding the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HP-O) to the existing zoning classifications. On July 1, 1988, the NKAPC staff recommended approval of the proposed map amendment. On July 7, 1988, following a public hearing, the KCPC recommended approval of adding the

HP-O Overlay Zone to the existing zoning classifications.

3. The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Goals and Objectives within the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*.

To ensure the most efficient and reasonable utilization of the area's physical resources while ensuring that any short-term uses of man's environment will be to the long-range benefit of all.

...It should also encompass an effort to preserve, conserve, and enhance unusual man-made projects or natural features, which have some unique historical, architectural, or natural value...

The proposed map amendment will allow for the regulation and preservation of historically significant structures and places administered through the City of Covington staff and the City's Urban Design Review Board.

4. The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Land Use Element of the *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026*.

“Historic preservation and the establishment of historic districts play an important role in Kenton County. Historic properties are cultural resources that provide more benefits than merely preserving our past for future generations to experience and enjoy. They provide economic development and tourism opportunities that otherwise may not exist within our urban areas.”

5. The *Comprehensive Plan Update 2006-2026* provides for three Quality of Life Components – Capacity Planning, Contemporary Places, and Green Infrastructure. The Development Concepts that are contained within the comprehensive plan were developed with these three Quality of Life Components in mind. The proposed map amendment is consistent with the following Land Use Development Concept which helps to implement the Capacity Planning and Contemporary Places, Quality of Life components:

The preservation and restoration of housing should be encouraged in selected areas. Such a concept would provide quality housing for the existing and future population, and would preserve structures which have architectural and/or historical significance. Such a concept would aid in preserving a valuable resource, provide much needed variation in residential types and densities, and maintain and enhance the viability of such urban areas.

Mixing of residential and commercial use is desirable. It is imperative that such mixing be well planned.

In such instances, critical attention needs to be paid to off-street parking needs/requirements and continuous assurance of compliance with all regulations of commercial use type changes within such structures. Shared parking provisions should be encouraged to ensure efficient use of our land resources.

Commercial concentrations should be developed as planned areas containing the general

characteristics of a “unified shopping area”.

Such a concept would minimize traffic control problems and safety hazards thus maximizing consumer shopping convenience. Some criteria would include: (a) Shared parking; (b) Coordinated signage; (c) Access points with adjoining developments.

The proposed map amendment will continue to permit a variety of residential uses, mixed-use buildings, and a variety of commercial and office uses. In addition to the underlying zoning requirements, the HP-O Overlay Zone will ensure that any alterations of appearance, new construction, demolitions and relocations conform to the Covington Historic Design Guidelines.

6. The HP-O designation is appropriate for preserving the historical character of the site in question.

In 2008, Progress with Preservation submitted an application to the Urban Design Review Board for review and recommendation for an approximate 7.2-acre area bounded on the north by East 3rd Street; on the south by East 4th Street; on the east by Sanford Alley; and, on the west by Scott Street, to designate the site in question as Historic. On October 13, 2008, the Historic Preservation Officer recommended approval of the submitted request. On October 20, 2008, following the public hearing, the Urban Design Review Board tabled the issue so the affected property owners could review the Covington Historic Design Guidelines. On December 15, 2008, following the public hearing, the Urban Design Review Board recommended approval of designating the site in question as Historic. On February 24, 2009, the Covington City Commission adopted Ordinance Number O/R-43-09, accepting the Urban Design Review Board’s recommendations and designated the site in question as Historic.

While 19 out of the 24 buildings have been identified as contributing, and the City of Covington has already designated the site in question as Historic, the Covington Historic Design Guidelines can only be required if a specific property has the HP-O Overlay Zone.

Ms. Lisa Sower addressed the Commission and stated this area is in the gateway area of the city. She stated historic preservation zones provide guidelines that protect existing property owners while preserving the area and increase property values. She noted they are concerned about what would happen to properties that have been renovated in the future. She noted this designation preserves those properties for the future. She then submitted a petition signed by 46 residents and 13 business owners who are in favor of the issue. She further stated this is important for the economic development of Covington.

Ms. Regina Estes addressed the Commission and stated she wanted to stress the importance of working within the comprehensive plan as far as retaining cultural elements of the city. She then noted without the historic preservation zone there is no chance of being able to argue whether something can be torn down or not. She noted without the zone those properties can’t be protected.

Mr. Damian Sells addressed the Commission and stated in the past 22 years he and his wife have

personally renovated homes in Covington. He stated without guidelines in place they could use any color when renovating a home. He noted the request is beneficial to property owners and the neighborhood as a whole and he urges approval.

Mr. John Riker addressed the Commission and stated if you want to keep this district in 20 or 30 years something needs to be done now to preserve it,. He noted the current property owners might not be here and things could be changed.

Mr. Larry Klein noted he would wait until the end the applicant's rebuttal for his testimony.

Mr. Ralph Grieme addressed the Commission and stated he was on the NKAPC for 25 years and chairman for 17 of those years. He noted he has been a real estate broker since 1972. He noted they are consultants to the Covington Square LLC. He noted this is an attempt to stop development planned for this area by his client. He stated back in 1988 this area wasn't included in the original designation because it did not fit. He then stated this is the first time ever that he has spoken against a historic preservation zone because he has always been in favor. He stated they are not opposed to filling in but this is an attempt to stop the demolition of many buildings his client has spent millions of dollars acquiring. He then submitted a copy of his proposal for an overlay zone and asked the Commission to turn it down to review what they have suggested. He then noted they have spent millions while being encouraged by the city to tear the buildings. He noted now the rules are changing mid-stream. He stated no one from the Covington Architect Commission is even present to discuss this. He then noted the Commission is the only entity that can send it back to the city for review. In closing he distributed a building survey of the property on Park Place.

Mr. Shannon Stexton addressed the Commission and stated he is a co-owner of a building on Park Place. He stated he spent hard earned money to renovate his building. He noted he collected 36 signatures of property owners and business owners and he couldn't find one property owner that was in favor of this application. He asked shouldn't his opinion matter more than a developer or a resident that doesn't even own property in the area. He noted he feels lost in the shuffle and humbly requests that this be denied and to trust the people that are there every day and have taken care of their buildings.

Mr. John Elfers addressed the Commission and stated there he has never seen one complaint by the city of the property where he has practiced law for 47 years at 107 Park Place. He stated the property owner has continued to improve it. He stated at the public hearing on the matter no one was for the issue except for the two women present who spoke in favor of it.

Mr. Bill Batson addressed the Commission and stated he is one of the owners of 310 Greenup Street. He stated he is opposed because he is an owner and the work he does being an architect he answers to the State of Kentucky. He stated he wanted to publicly state the choice and decision should be made by the property owner.

Mr. Justin Dean addressed the Commission on behalf of Martin and Marilyn Wade. He stated they strongly oppose this amendment. He further stated this historic designation adds a tremendous amount of cost and deters people like them to come into an area and revitalize it. He then stated they want to continue to do that and in the economy if this is passed they won't be

able to do that.

Mr. John Barnwell addressed the Commission on behalf of Greenup Towne Properties. He stated based on square footage they are the second largest property owner in the area. He then stated the market will determine the development. He further stated he hopes the Commission turns down the application.

Mr. John Carl addressed the Commission and stated he would like to remind the Commission that the city did not bring the amendment. He stated no one contacted him regarding this overlay zone and he was quite shocked. He stated not one person on the petition submitted is a property owner in the area. He then asked that it be denied and sent back to the city.

Mr. Ralph Drees addressed the Commission and stated in this particular block of the jail there aren't a whole lot of historic buildings. He noted he has been involved in the area and has seen a lot of great things. He stated he is not a Covington resident but it behooves the city to not improve because it will benefit all of Kenton County. He then stated his dream is to build a new jail in the same area but with grass around it and trees. He noted he is asked from the standpoint of Kenton County that this be turned down or have the city review it further.

Mr. Larry Klein addressed the Commission and stated he would ask for a recommendation back to the city for their review to make a decision. He stated it is his understanding even a contributing building can be demolished if one or more of several criteria are met. He stated in addition that nothing to his knowledge has been submitted for review. He stated there may have been discussions of potential developers but nothing has been submitted. Mr. Klein also stated every property owner was made aware of this with not one but two public hearings. He stated he thinks there has been plenty of discussion both by the proponents and the opponents.

Ms. Sower addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated she worked with the city to develop the historic preservation zone. She stated there is not unanimity on this issue and feels the decision should be made by the government of Covington. She further stated she doesn't feel burdened by the renovations of her 150-year old home when it was renovated under the historic preservation zone. She stated she believes it is something consistent with the City of Covington and it should be approved and sent back to the city. She further stated that all the property owners were contacted with regard to this issue numerous times so when they say to the contrary it is simply not true.

Mr. Grieme stated in rebuttal that this can't be all one-sided. He stated you can still have a review by the review board and realize some are going to stay and some are going to go. He stated this process was stated earlier to stop the development and an attempt to stop their client from doing something they have been planning on for five years. He then noted they haven't had a chance to discuss this with the new city administration and that's the problem. He noted the process doesn't have to be this difficult.

The public hearing then recessed for discussion. Mr. Wells then read letters into the record both for and against the issue. They were marked as exhibits and made a part of the record on the matter. Mr. Hilgefurd then stated every month the Commission is asked to restrict property owners in some way. He stated it is their job. he stated the notion of some of the residents not

living in the area doesn't make any difference. He then noted that he makes decisions every month on Independence and other cities and he doesn't live in Independence. He then noted he doesn't feel the properties in this area are not of significant historical value. He further stated those three blocks do not deserve to be in an historic overlay zone. Mr. Barnett stated he hasn't heard anything from either side with regard to planning and that's what this commission does. He further stated he has not heard any compelling evidence to include this area in an historic overlay zone. He noted as a planning commission more evidence is needed before a decision can be made. The public hearing was then closed.

Mr. France made the motion to deny based on the testimony heard and the fact that there needs to be more discussion before such a major change is made. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. France, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Barnett, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Raybourne, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Brown, Mr. Tewes, Mr. Wells and Mr. Hult in favor. The motion carried.

Old and Unfinished Business:

Reports from Committees:

By-Laws – Nothing to report.

Executive- No meeting held.

Model Zoning Ordinance – Nothing to report.

Subdivision Regulations Review – Nothing to report.

Report from legal counsel – Nothing to report.

Announcements from Staff – Nothing to report.

Correspondence – Nothing to report.

New Business: Mr. Ryan comment briefly on the small area study being performed for Park Hills and the redevelopment. He noted there would be four more meetings in the month of April.

Public Comments: None.

There being nothing further to come before the Commission, Mr. Ryan made a motion to adjourn with Ms. Hood seconding the motion. The meeting then adjourned at 10:56 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair

Date