

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Minutes

Mr. Darpel, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM on Thursday, April 5, 2012, 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.

		2012												
Member	Jurisdiction	J a n	F e b	M a r	A p r	M a y	J u n	J u l	A u g	S e p	O c t	N o v	D e c	
Ms. Diane Brown	Erlanger	X	X	X	*									
Barbara Carlin	Kenton Co	X	X	X	X									
Barry Coates	Covington	X	X	X	X									
James Cook	Kenton Co	X	X	X	X									
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X	X	X	X									
Chuck Eilerman	Covington	*	X	X	X									
Tom France, V.Chair	Ludlow	X	X	X	X									
David Hilgeford	Villa Hills	X	X	X										
Lynne Hood	Crestview Hills	X	X	X	X									
Marc Hult	Covington	X	X	X	X									
Mark Hushebeck	Lakeside Park		*		*									
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere	X	X	X	X									
Stan Porter	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X									
Mark Rogge	Crescent Spgs	X	X	X										
Dan Ruh, Treasurer	Fort Wright	X	X	X										
Shad Sletto	Fort Mitchell	X	*		*									
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X	*	X									
Joe Tewes	Bromley	X	X		X									
Melissa Worstell	Park Hills		X	X										

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

meeting.

“\*” denotes arrival after roll call was taken.

Also present were Dan Hunt, Legal Counsel, and the following NKAPC staff: Scott Hiles, Dep. Director for Infrastructure Engineering, Mr. Andy Videkovich, Principal Planner and Mr. Mike Ionna, Associate Planner.

**AGENDA:**

Mr. Darpel stated item 2066R and W-646 would be heard together as they are related. He then asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Eilerman made the motion to approve the amended agenda. Mr. France seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sletto, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

Mr. Darpel noted on page two there was a duplication in the sixth line down that needs to be removed. There were no other comments or questions. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve as amended. Mr. Cook seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Cook, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sletto and Mr. Darpel in favor. Mr. Tewes abstained. The motion carried.

**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:**

There were no questions or comments with regard to the financial statement. Ms. Snyder made the motion to accept. Mr. France seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. France, Ms. Brown, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried.

**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:**

**2064R:**

**APPLICANT:** City of Edgewood per Doug Beckham, City Administrator

**REQUEST:** Proposed text amendments to the Edgewood Zoning Ordinance: (a) amending the regulations for the installation, design and construction of flashing , moving, and changeable copy signs, and; (b) amending the regulations for institutional signs located in conservation, agricultural, and rural zoning districts; and, (c) amending the regulations for institutional signs located in single-family and two-family residential zoning districts.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Mr. Mark Ionna.

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

**NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

(Request #1 and #3 were withdrawn by the applicant)

Request #2: Approval of the proposed text to allow automatic changeable copy signage for institutional land uses located within the conservation, agricultural, rural, single-family, and two-family zoning districts.

Mr. Douglas Beckham addressed the Commission and gave some background on the issue. He stated the sign ordinance was redone in 2007 to allow for St. Pius to have a sign similar to what was already in existence in the city. He stated he was recently contacted by St. Pius with regard to installing a changeable sign and they got in touch with him. He stated under the regulations they were not able to have the type of sign they wanted so therefore a proposed amendment was suggested. He stated in his opinion the 100 foot setback is arbitrary and that less than fifty feet is acceptable. He stated this was a compromise in order to meet the needs of the church. He then showed Dixie Heights High School as an example of the sign that St. Pius was interested in installing. He further noted there are several around the city. He noted the sign at the city building is ten times more effective than the newsletter that the mayor sends out and it is not sitting back 100 feet. He also noted the Dixie Heights sign actually faces a residential home and there have never been any complaints about it. He further stated you can get so much information out to the public. He further noted that all the city is requesting is with regard to amending the existing automatic changeable copy signage and that they have withdrawn requests one and three. He additionally added the same manufacturer that did the Dixie Heights sign is going to do the St. Pius sign.

All others registered to speak had nothing to add.

The public hearing was recessed for discussion. There being none, the public hearing was then closed. Mr. France then asked for a motion. Mr. Sletto then made the motion to approve Request #2 based on Staff's recommendations. Mr. Pannunzio seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Sletto, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Brown, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Cook, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Porter, Ms. Snyder and Mr. Tewes in favor. Mr. Darpel refrained from voting due to a conflict. The motion carried.

**2065R**

**APPLICANT:** City of Lakeside Park per Mayor David Jansing

**REQUEST:** A proposed text amendment to the Lakeside Park Zoning Ordinance reducing the minimum required front yard in the R-1G Zone from 25 to 10 feet.

Mr. Darpel noted a request to table had been received with regard to this issue. He stated the request was to table the matter for 30 days. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion to table. Mr. Hult made the motion. Ms. Snyder seconded. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Hult, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried. Mr. Darpel noted this would be placed on the May agenda.

\*Issues 2066R and W-646 will be heard together following issue 2067R.

**2067R**

**APPLICANT:** American Kendall Properties LLC per J.R. Kendall on behalf of David Kaiser and Theo and Betty Dupont, Trustees

**LOCATION:** 3758 Turkeyfoot Road; an approximate 23-acre located on the west side of Turkeyfoot Road, between Autumn Road and Industrial Road, approximately 3,000 feet north of Industrial Road in Elsmere.

**REQUEST FOR ACTION:** a proposed map amendment to the Elsmere Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1F (a detached single-family residential zone with a maximum density of 7.2 dwelling units per net acre) and IP-1 (an industrial park zone) to R-3 (a two-family and multi-family residential zone with a maximum density of 21 dwelling units per net acre).

**NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Favorable recommendation to change an approximate 23-acre area located on the west side of Turkeyfoot Road, between Autumn Road and Industrial Road, approximately 3,000 feet north of Industrial Road from R-1F (a detached single-family residential zone with a maximum density of 7.2 dwelling units per net acre) and IP-1 (an industrial park zone) to R-3 (a two-family and multi-family residential zone with a maximum density of 21 dwelling units per net acre).

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

Mr. Darpel then read a letter from the president of Triad into the record to be made a part of the record on the matter. He then marked the letter as an exhibit for the record.

Mr. Darpel felt it necessary to note that should this be approved the parking should be looked at to ensure it is sufficient. Mr. Videkovich then stated that aspect was reviewed and it was found to meet the regulations.

Mr. Mike Steedy of American Kendall Properties addressed the Commission on the issue. He stated they have met multiple times with the developers on the issue, city councils, the Sanitation District, local fire departments, and they have also hosted an open house for the public to attend to ask questions and see the proposed development. He stated they have also met with the Kentucky Transportation Department to get their input on the issue as well so they have done a lot of research and gotten a lot of input on the development. He further noted the design of the development will be very similar to the Brookstone Crossing development in Cold Spring. He stated the development is a front to back design in which they will overlook some feature whether it be a brook or a view. He stated it is an extra cost but one they feel is necessary. He gave additional details and specifics on the interior designs of the buildings as well. He additionally stated they offer housing that will bring young professionals back to the community. He further noted these buildings are uniquely designed to sit on the side of hills. He stated they are also designed well to handle the topography. He stated they are agreeable to providing a landscape plan as well as a geotech report and stated they will be happy to share that report with the city as well as the staff. He further noted they will prepare a traffic study to submit and stated again that they have already met with the KDOT with regard to the development. He noted all the drive aisles are 24 feet wide with suitable access for fire apparatus. He stated he would be happy to answer any questions. Mr. Pannunzio asked if the brick is actual brick or just a brick face. Mr. Steedy stated it is actual brick. Mr. Hult stated they are created an entire area that is impervious and asked about retention and detention issues. Mr. Steedy stated this will be designed to get the appropriate run off and there is still an ample amount of green space left over. Mr. Steedy further noted there will be substantial tree replacement to the area as well as preserving as much of the vegetation and green space as

possible.

Mr. Keller is available for any questions or comments.

Ms. Lawrence addressed the Commission against the matter. She stated she is present as a member of the Turkeyfoot Acres Association. She stated they just found out about the development. She stated they don't have anything in that area at the moment and that it is a wooded area. She noted their subdivision has been there since 1962 and the area behind them has always been vacant. She stated they do get a bit of noise from the industrial area but it's not very often they get noise from that area. She noted in another direction there is a mobile home park that is not a part of their subdivision but is accessed by their subdivision. She stated if there is going to be 250 apartments put in there is going to be a lot more traffic to the area. She stated they currently have lots of traffic coming through their subdivision to get to the industrial park. She further stated another concern is their schools and noted they are already almost at capacity. She stated they understand this will add to their schools if the development goes in. She stated they currently have problems with the renters in the mobile homes and their concern is how long the developer plans to own the property. She stated a concern is that they will become low income properties sometime in the future. She noted if this 23 acres gets zoned residential then what will happen with the additional 33 acres on the other side. She stated they really hope that people move in that want to take care of their properties. She stated another concern is the police department because it already does not have the funds to patrol their subdivision so how are they going to handle an additional 252 apartments. She stated they really do not want multi-families this close to their subdivision. She stated they are really concerned and just think of those that have lived there for a long time.

Mr. Darpel then stated he can sympathize with her concerns but asked what is the better alternative. He noted an industrial site is much more difficult to regulate than a residential area. He also stated this is a recommending body and not the final decision on the matter.

Mr. Brefeld, assistant fire chief of the Elsmere Fire Department. He stated he is here to talk about some of his concerns. He stated they have five major concerns with the development. He stated the first one is the lightweight construction the buildings are going to be constructed from. He stated from a fire fighting standpoint the lightweight construction can consume and entire building within five minutes. He stated they would like to talk about some other construction methods or traditional type construction or make markings on the buildings, etc. He stated they have had discussion with Mr. Steedy on that. Another concern is the 24 foot drive. He stated the openings themselves have to be very large and from their perspective these need to be wider and the approaches need to be wider. He further noted they would like to see access to the rear of the building. He stated it would be nice if they can get a fire apparatus around the building so they can do their work. He stated Mr. Steedy stated he doesn't think they will be able to do that. He stated if there was a larger working area so they could do their job in an emergency it would be beneficial. Another concern is another access point into the development. He stated if there is something that happens from the Turkeyfoot Road side they would like to have the opportunity of another way in. He stated if they could have a discussion to have a secure emergency entrance they would be open to discussing that as well. One final point he wanted to make was with the water system and he stated from their perspective a public water system is the better way to go for this project.

Mr. Steedy addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated the lightweight construction is

common practice and the fire codes and building codes address these issues. He also stated even the storage units are sprinkled. He further noted if there is something that can be done to widen the access they will certainly do that. He stated with regard to access to the back they can do what they can do on their side but obviously cannot do anything with the property on the other side. He further noted they will work with the city with marking the buildings, addressing the buildings and naming the streets. He also noted the closest residential building will be 400 feet away, which is over a football field length. He stated they will take steps to ensure that noise is properly contained. He additionally noted this is a transitional use that buffers the area from the industrial area. He stated they will create a character and feel for Turkeyfoot. He further stated as far as schools at the Brookstone Crossing development with 240 units there are between 11 and 13 students dropped off so they don't anticipate a huge demand on the schools in the area. He stated they have tried to answer every question and issue and are asking for a favorable decision on the issue.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the hearing for discussion amongst the commissioners. Mr. Sletto stated he thinks it's a great idea. Mr. France reiterated that the commission is voting on this zone change for this development but if something happens and the development does not go through, any new development would have to go before the commission as an amended plan. The public hearing was then closed. Mr. Darpel asked for a motion on the issue. Mr. Sletto then made the motion to approve the zone change based on Staff recommendations and the fact that it is in compliance with the comprehensive plan. Mr. Eilerman seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Sletto, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Brown, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. France, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried.

At this time (8:30 p.m.) a five minute recess was taken.

#### **2066R**

**APPLICANT:** Fischer Development Company per David Lederman

**LOCATION:** A 55 acre area known as "Maher Meadows," located in unincorporated Kenton County along the north side of Maher Road, approximately, 1,400 feet east of the Kenton County Line.

**REQUEST FOR ACTION:** a proposed amended Stage I Development Plan for the described area of Maher Meadows which is currently zoned R-1C (RCD).

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Martin Scribner.

#### **NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To approve the submitted Stage I Development Plan.

#### **W-646**

**APPLICANT:** Fisher Development Company

**LOCATION:** An approximate 55 acre area located along the north side of Maher Road, approximately 1,400 feet east of Glenhurst Drive in unincorporated Kenton County.

**REQUEST:** To grant a waiver to the requirement of Section 5.3 of the Kenton County Subdivision Regulations; granting the request would waive the requirement for sidewalk along both sides of a public street allowing sidewalk to be along only one side.

**NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To grant the requested Waiver to Section 5.3 and allow sidewalk along one side of Parker Drive from Maher Road to the intersection of Sarah Drive but only subject to the following conditions:

1. That the amended Stage I Development Plan for Maher Meadows (Z-12-03-02/2066R) be approved by the Fiscal Court.
2. That professionally designed and constructed playground equipment and an appropriately graded and seeded open playfield be provided in the area shown on the amended Stage I Development Plan, and that details of such amenities be provided on an amended Stage II Development Plan approved by staff.
3. That the professionally designed and constructed playground equipment and the appropriately graded and seeded open playfield be provided prior to there being 33 remaining lots to be platted.

Basis:

The modification would provide for innovative design layout of the subdivision and the modification will not be detrimental to the public interest nor in conflict with the intent and purpose of these regulations. Staff has further defined the innovative design as follows:

There are no lots that directly abut the east side of Parker Drive from Maher Road to the intersection of Sarah Drive. This is a factor that would contribute to a number of pedestrians that would otherwise utilize this section of sidewalk if it were to be provided. However limited usage of the sidewalk alone is not a contributing factor to what staff considers to be the innovative design layout of this subdivision. Staff's primary factor in the determination of innovative design is the provision of the playground and playfield *in lieu of* a sidewalk along a portion of street that contains no lots which directly abut it. In this case one amenity (a portion of sidewalk which has no lots that directly abut it) is being traded for another amenity (a playground and playfield) for which staff feel is better suited for a subdivision of this type that is likely to contain a number of young families with young children.

Mr. Darpel stated he feels this is setting a precedent and is absolutely against everything the Commission does. He stated the commission is being asked to trade a sidewalk for a playground and was dismayed at the least that Staff would recommend approval. He further noted he wanted to send a clear message in his mind that he is about consistency and this is not what the commission is about. He stated if it is considered innovative to put in a different amenity then he wants no part of it. He stated the commission needs to send a message because the sidewalk issue is something that has been near and dear to our hearts and he's not willing to give that up. Mr. Hult stated removing the walking paths has a more profound impact on the development. Ms. Brown clarified that the area where they are asking to not have the sidewalk is fairly flat. Mr. Scribner stated it was.

Mr. Todd Huss addressed the Commission on behalf of Fischer Development. He stated he was in front of this board on a sidewalk waiver a couple years ago and it was denied and he respects the Commission in their decision. He further noted he feels this is a different case. He stated the first thing they did was sit down with staff and discuss the issue. He stated the bottom line is what they are asking is they are attempting to do was spend the money on amenities that benefit the community that would provide the most pleasure in living in the community. He stated they have done what he feels is a pretty good job of turning things around in the area. He

stated the only amenities in the community were the mulched walking trails and have not been very useful or beneficial for the residents. He stated they then looked at the sidewalk and stated there are no lots on that side of the street and they felt it wasn't a good use of dollars for the residents that are living there. He further stated this is not a net gain in terms of cost. He stated they will probably spend double that on the playground and play areas and the trails they intend to keep. He stated the bottom line is they feel this is a better plan for those that are living in the community.

Mr. Darpel stated the reality is that as a commission in his opinion, they need to be consistent and have regulations they stick by. He stated to trade a playground for sidewalks is setting a precedent and is absolutely one of the biggest mistakes they could make. Mr. Sletto asked if the sidewalk was a trade for the playground. Mr. Huss stated it was and that one would be provided in place of the other. Ms. Brown stated she is a little disappointed that the walking paths are being eliminated in the area that hasn't been developed yet. Mr. Huss then stated they are proposing sidewalks on one side of Parker Road.

Mr. Ledderman then stated he would like to respectfully address this in a different fashion. He stated he does not see this as a dollars issue. He stated he worked with the very talented staff on the issue. He stated the comprehensive plan focuses on the betterment of the community for all ages. He stated their goal is to enhance the project for future home owners and their children and yes they will be spending money. He stated this is something that they believe in and they have worked on and planned out. He stated they looked at their comprehensive plan in preparing the request. He additionally stated the closest schools with playgrounds are over two miles away. He stated they are not trying to pull a fast one and get a bit of a break on the sidewalk. He further stated one of the things discussed with staff is the affordability of the development. He then stated with the pricing of \$120-140,000 he feels this is a reasonable tradeoff. He additionally noted it is \$1,000 a year to maintain the walking paths and \$10,000 every three years. He then noted if they maintain the connection shown in blue on the drawing they are providing excellent circulation for anyone in the development. He stated this is bigger than a waiver in getting a sidewalk. He stated he doesn't feel it fair that you deny this but you want that. He stated they are surrounding the playground with homes. Ms. Brown then asked how removing the sidewalk on one of the street makes for an innovative design. He stated it is all together and that is why they are asking for it collectively. He stated out of the four requirements you only you to satisfy one (for granting the waiver). Mr. Eilerman stated he agrees with the need for consistency but also stated that reasonableness is important too. He stated this is bettering the community and will create a nicer environment for the community. He further stated he is a little concerned procedurally that an argument against their case was made against the issue. He stated he comes down on the side of the staff on this issue. Ms. Snyder stated if we keep talking about connectivity then why not have the sidewalk to provide for that. If they want to provide something for their community then put the playground in just because and to provide the amenity for the residents. She stated why not have the sidewalk to provide the connectivity rather than having the residents cross over to get back to their residences and not keep the complete circle. Mr. Darpel then stated one of the reasons he did bring it up prior to the hearing was because they always ask Staff questions about what they believe are issues before proponents get up (to speak) and this to him is a pretty big issue and he wanted it to be addressed immediately. He stated in his letter to us the applicant is saying they will give a playground if they get a waiver for the sidewalk and he stated this bothers him immensely. He further stated they have stuck to regulation 6.5 as religiously as they could. He then stated he doesn't want to trade playgrounds for sidewalks. Mr. Darpel stated the

comprehensive plan requires that one of the four requirements need to be met to grant the waiver and to do it this way is against everything they stand for. He stated he wants to make it clear that they will not trade sidewalks for playgrounds because he doesn't want Staff to put the commission in this position again. Mr. Hult stated if the request was truly innovative with regard to sidewalks they would provide for an alternative with the sidewalks or the pathways. He further stated if you eliminate the paths you eliminate the innovative aspect of the development. Mr. Ledderman then stated when you talk about innovative design it is objective. He stated he is respectfully requesting what they feel is a unique approach to innovative design. He stated it is comprehensive in nature. He stated his point is this is being approached in a comprehensive manner and he asked how can this be reviewed as a whole. He stated he is asking the commission to review this as a better plan. Mr. Hult stated you could create a better plan if you made the loop permanent as with a sidewalk. He stated if the homeowner's association decides they no longer want the expense of the chipped paths they could eliminate it. He stated the plan could be further improved if they made that footprint permanent. Ms. Carlin asked when they decided the plan wasn't a good one and needed improvement. Mr. Huss addressed the question and stated if they were the initial developer he believes they would have come up with something similar to this plan. He stated they purchased the distressed property in 2009 and they are trying to improve a distressed property. He further stated this modification to the plan will help that. He then stated over the course of the last 12-18 months they began looking at how they could improve on the plan. He stated what they are proposing they feel will increase the quality of life for the residents.

The public hearing was then recessed for discussion amongst the commissioners. Mr. Cook asked if there was going to be two votes. Mr. Darpel stated there were two issues so there would be two votes. Mr. Darpel then stated if the waiver is denied then there is no reason to vote on the Stage I Plan. Mr. Porter stated he sees no connection between the sidewalk issue and the park. He stated it is a totally different thing. He stated the whole thing to him doesn't make any sense to trade a waiver on a sidewalk for something that in his opinion doesn't relate. Ms. Hood stated no matter how you sugarcoat it is a trade off. She stated it is a safety issue and to think of the little boy that sees his friend and goes across the street when he could go round and round the subdivision. She stated it is a tradeoff. Mr. Eilerman stated it is not a safety issue in his mind.

Mr. Sletto made the motion to accept Staff's recommendation and to allow the waiver for the reason that it is an innovative concept and improves the residents of the community. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Sletto, Mr. Cook, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Pannunzio, and Mr. Tewes in favor. Ms. Brown, Ms. Carlin, Ms. Hood, Mr. Porter, Ms. Snyder and Mr. Darpel voted against. The motion carried 9-6. Ms. Brown made the motion to approve the amended Stage I Plan. Mr. Eilerman seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Brown, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Coates, Mr. Cook, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushabeck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Ms. Carlin, Ms. Hood, Mr. Porter and Ms. Snyder voted against. The motion carried.

**Unfinished Business:** None.

**Reports from Committees:**

***By-Laws*** – Nothing to report.

*Direction 2030* (comprehensive plan) – Mr. Darpel stated Keith left a handout summarizing the comprehensive plan update.

*Executive* – Mr. Darpel stated

*Subdivision Regulations* – Mr. Cook stated the next meeting is the 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Darpel stated he received an email from Mr. Fisher that he will forward to all the commissioners with a couple things he wanted the commissioners to keep in mind. Mr. Hushabeck stated if anyone had any technical questions to please contact him and he would be glad to help.

*2020 Sourcebook (model zoning ordinance)* – Mr. Darpel stated Mr. Rogge is not present so he is now the chairman.

*Report from Legal Counsel* – Mr. Hunt thanked everyone for their patience and stated Matt will be back next month. He stated the legislation affecting the NKAPC has stalled in committee so it's not going anywhere right now. Mr. France asked if there was any movement as far as the recertification of the signatures for November. Mr. Hunt stated he didn't have any updates with that regard but they would check on that.

*Announcements from Staff* – Mr. Scribner had nothing to add.

*Correspondence:* None.

*New Business:* - None.

*Public Comments:* None.

There being nothing further to come before the commission, Ms. Snyder made the motion to adjourn. Ms. Brown seconded the motion. The meeting then adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

APPROVED:

---

Chair

---

Date