

“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 Matt Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following NKAPC staff: Mr. Martin Scribner, Dep. Director for Planning and Zoning, Mr. Andy Videkovich, Senior Planner, Mr. Mike Ionna, Associate Planner and Mr. Scott Hiles, Dep. Director for Infrastructure Engineering.

AGENDA

Mr. Darpel asked for a motion to approve. All in favor by acclamation. The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Tewes stated he doesn't think he was present to vote on the minutes from last month. There being no other changes or corrections, Ms. Snyder made a motion to approve. Mr. Eilerman seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Eilerman, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Rogge, Mr. Ruh, Mr. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Ms. Brown and Mr. Hushebeck 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. All in favor by acclamation. 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:

*The following two issues were combined for the purpose of the meeting.

2070R:

APPLICANT: City of Park Hills per Robert Winter, City Attorney

REQUEST: A proposed text amendments to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance adding and Institutional (INST) Zone.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Mr. Mike Ionna.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

To approve the text amendment adding the INST Zone, along with cross references, to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance subject to the following conditions:

1. That lighting of athletic field be listed as a conditional use.
2. That the proposed standards for the lighting of an athletic field, with the exception of

Section 10.11., D.4., a., be removed from the proposed text.

2071R:

APPLICANT: City of Park Hills per Robert Winter, City Attorney

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1FF (Residential) to INST (Institutional).

Staff presentations and Staff recommendations by Mr. Mike Ionna.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Favorable recommendation of the proposed map amendment to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance changing the site in question, as described herein, from R-1F (Residential) to INST (Institutional) subject to the following condition:

1. That approval of the map amendment be conditioned on the approval of the approval of the proposed text amendment (2070R) adding the INST (Institutional) Zone to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Don Catchen addressed the Commission and stated this is something that the city of Park Hills would like to see done. He noted there is only one thing they would like to see done is that they would prefer that the specifics be left up to the city with regard to how many games the lights are used, etc. He stated he would prefer those restrictions be left up to the city as far as making those restrictions. He then noted that basically five of six council members are in favor of this amendment with regard to the lighting. Ms. Brown asked if it was correct that the lighting would be limited to a number of games per season. Mr. Catchen stated that was correct. Mr. Scribner clarified that the text in the proposal limiting the lighting to a number of games was not something that was suggested by Staff but by the city. He stated staff didn't feel it was appropriate to make a recommendation on that specifically.

Mr. Todd McMurtry addressed the Commission and stated he would be submitting language that was approved the previous evening with regard to the issue. He then stated there were various members of Covington Catholic and Notre Dame that are in favor of the issue. He introduced them each individually and stated approving the text and map amendments would benefit the school and area. He stated the long term benefit would be for the school as it grows and develops over the coming years. Mr. McMurtry additionally stated the benefits of having lighted sporting events and noted would make things better for the students and all involved by having practice and games in the evening and under the lights. He stated high school football is growing locally and nationally and Covington Catholic is not able to offer lighted evening games because of the zoning. He further noted area growth would occur with the ability to have lighted evening games. Mr. McMurtry stated they see this adoption of the amendments as a benefit and the school will suffer by not being able to offer the lighted games. He stated one of the more persuasive arguments is that Park Hills is one of the only cities that does not allow lighted sporting events in the city. He further noted the lighting will not affect the neighbors and many of them are present in support of the amendments. He stated generally it has been well received and that they support these proposed changes. He then noted Staff has had a great deal of input on this already, the school has had its input and by and large it has

been a group effort. He stated for all of these reasons Covington Catholic is asking that the amendments be adopted. He then noted the school has a couple key objections to the lighting being a conditional use. He stated it is not a conditional use but is something that should be treated as development controlled. He further stated with the quality of lighting that would be going in it will limit the amount of lighting and glare to surrounding properties. He further noted the amendment does limit the number of football games but does not limit the number of baseball or soccer games. He then noted Covington Catholic has been a positive force in the area for decades and would like to have this implemented. He stated as such they are respectfully asking the commission to adopt the recommendations as presented. Mr. McMurtry then submitted the packet he referenced as an exhibit. Mr. Darpel marked it as an exhibit to be made a part of the record. Mr. McMurtry then stated the Chief of Police was present and noted that having evening sporting events would require the need for an increase in the police coverage. He then noted that by allowing evening sporting events and requiring the additional police force to be in effect, the chief feels they have sufficient coverage to provide for the need generated by allowing lighted sporting events. Ms. Hood asked if the field would be available to other schools to have the opportunity to play. He noted it would not.

Mr. Bob Roeh addressed the Commission and stated their primary goal is to be student centered and feels it important for the students to get the opportunity to play at night. He also stated by allowing evening games it will make it safer for the students with regard to holding events in the evening when the temperatures are high during the day. He stated they will continue to be a good neighbor as far as working with surrounding areas with regard to parking and will work with them in regard to the number of games being played there.

Ms. Tracy Coutzman addressed the Commission and stated lots have been purchased with the intent to build restaurants in the immediate area. She stated the development has been halted until it is determined whether or not there will be lighted evening games permitted.

Mr. Stegman had nothing to add.

Ms. Cathy Zem stated the majority of council is on board with the zoning requests. She stated as to lighting they would like to see Covington Catholic to have lighting for night games. She further noted Covington Catholic is the only school that does not have lighted Friday night games.

Mr. Carlo Wessels had nothing to add.

Mr. Bob Winter addressed the Commission and stated the evidence shows the petition should be granted. He stated the lighting of the field is proper and the original petition reflects flexibility with the owners of surrounding properties and residents of the city. He further stated if there are problems with parking and traffic due to the lighted night games that can easily be handled. He stated they would like to see the petition granted.

Mr. Zach Ruh addressed the Commission on behalf the Musco Company to provide the lighting for the field. He stated when Covington Catholic came to them they had two goals: can they provide lighting to meet the requirements of Kentucky sports and also to minimize the effect to neighboring properties. He then gave a brief background on the company and stated lighting is

all they do. He stated they have thirty years of research and development. He stated they have specific considerations for spill and glare control for the lighting of the field. He noted there are many changes they can do to minimize the spill of lighting on surrounding properties. He then stated they are proposing four 80 foot poles, two located on each side of the football field. Mr. Ruh then went over the specifics of the light spill as it relates to the Covington Catholic field. One thing of importance is the amount of light directed at the field to minimize the amount of spill. He further noted the lighting they are proposing significantly cuts off glare. He then showed examples of the type of lighting called light structure green that would be used to minimize the effect of light spill on the surrounding area residents. Mr. Hilgefjord questioned what steps are taken in order to reduce the lighting to surrounding neighbors and what would be done if the requirements cannot be met. Mr. Ruh then stated they would actually send a tech to remedy the amount of glare or spill and will take whatever steps necessary to bring it into requirements.

Mr. Charles Chapman addressed the Commission to speak against the issue. He stated he is a resident of Park Hills and his family has lived on Arlington Road for 41 years. He stated he has heard a lot of good things about the project and it's going to create a lot of jobs in the area. He then stated a couple things concerned him is that the city attorney stated more people would be present if they were opposed. He stated his family was not notified about these proposals and just found out about the issue this evening. He stated he feels like this is compromising the zone in order to keep certain business out of this area and to allow for this zone change will allow for other types of businesses to come into the area. He then stated he has heard about the lighting and the steps that are being taken with regard to that lighting, but asked what considerations will be taken with regard to noise in the area when evening games will be allowed. He stated these were just a couple concerns of his. Mr. Darpel commented that this is a recommending body and the Commission makes recommendations to the cities by having public hearings on issues. He stated this is in place to provide protection to citizens such as himself. He then commented that any property directly adjoining the property in question would be notified and that the signs were placed in high traffic areas.

Mr. Darpel then read a letter in opposition from Tamara A. Miano. He read the letter into the record and marked it as an exhibit to be made a part of the record. With that he asked that any proponents wished to speak they could now do so.

Mr. McMurtry addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated this will better serve the entire community because it makes things more predictable. He then referenced the letter read into the record and stated the type of lighting to be used is going to be newer and incorporate newer technology that will address some of her concerns stated in her letter. With regard to noise, he stated the games will certainly generate more noise than a practice would but to the extent that this does occur, the school has taken this into serious consideration as to the volume of the announcing, etc., that would occur at the games. He noted a lot of thought and concern to the surrounding residents has been taken into consideration and there is not going to be a noise problem or a light problem. He stated this is really state of the art and in terms of lighting, it really can't be done any better. He stated there are a lot of positives and this will certainly enhance the school in a lot of ways, especially at the student level.

Mr. Catchen then addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated there has been constant

communication between the property owners to ensure there will be a minimal amount of impact to area residents. He stated nothing has been heard in rebuttal that can't be dealt with should the need arise.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion. Mr. Scribner then stated that as far as specifics as to the lighting with regard to the number of games, the number of police officers, etc., he stated this is something that is better handled by the city versus having Staff regulate that. Mr. Scribner stated he is referencing the specific four conditions with regard to the amendment. Ms. Brown then stated she doesn't feel there is enough operational control for the number of games to be included in the requirements. Mr. Sletto then stated if he were going to make a motion he strike D4c from the language, which is the ten football game limitation. Mr. Darpel stated the reality is this is the language submitted from the city and they can limit it. He further stated the problem becomes enforcement. He stated the city can come in and adopt an ordinance to address any number of these and can enforce it under those. He stated this is the city asking for a text amendment. Mr. Hilgefurd stated he doesn't feel these types of conditions belong in a zoning code. He stated he feels they are operational and are better handled at the local level but he doesn't feel it is something that necessarily belongs in a zoning ordinance. Mr. France stated that Notre Dame wasn't mentioned but the zoning references one athletic field. The meeting was then closed. Mr. Sletto then made a motion to adopt the ordinance in its entirety but to strike section D4c. Mr. Ruh seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Sletto, Mr. Ruh, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hush beck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. Ms. Brown and Mr. Rogge voted against . The motion carried. With regard to the map amendment, Mr. Sletto made the motion to accept Staff's recommendation. Mr. Ruh seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Sletto, Mr. Ruh, Ms. Brown, Ms. Carlin, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hush beck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Rogge, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried unanimously. Ms. Carlin had to leave the meeting prior to the vote.

At this time (8:05 p.m.) a five minute break was taken.

*Mr. Darpel stated because the next four items are all related in the interest of time there will be one presentation vs. having four individual presentations on the issues.

2072R:

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Dan Groth, City Administrator

REQUEST: proposed text amendments to the Independence Zoning Ordinance: (1) adding the Downtown Independence (DI) Zone to Article X, Zones, along with necessary cross references to other sections of the Zoning Ordinance; (2) adding fence and wall regulations for mixed use zoned to Article XIII, Fends, Walls, and Obstructions to View Regulations; and) 3) adding sign regulations for the DI Zone to Article XIV, Sign Regulations.

Staff presentations and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Favorable recommendation of the proposed text amendments to the Independence Zoning Ordinance: (1) adding Downtown Independence (DI) Zone to Article X, Zones, along with

necessary cross-references to other sections of the zoning Ordinance; (2) adding fence and wall regulations for mixed use zones to Article XIII, Fences, Walls, and Obstructions to View Regulations; and (3) adding sign regulations for the DI Zone to Article XIV, Sign Regulations, subject to the condition that the regulating plan be updated accordingly if any changes are made to the proposed boundary of the DI Zone.

2073R:

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Dan Groth, City Administrator

REQUEST: a proposed text amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance adding the Conservation Development – Single-Family (CD-SF) Overlay Zone to Article X, Zones, along with necessary cross-references to other sections of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff presentations and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Favorable recommendation of the proposed text amendments to the Independence Zoning Ordinance adding the Conservation Development – Single-Family (CD-SF) Overlay Zone to Article X, Zones, along with necessary cross-references to other sections of the Zoning Ordinance.

2074R:

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Dan Groth, City Administrator

APPLICANT: an approximate 116-acre area located along the north and south sides of McCullum Pike between Madison Pike and KY 17, approximately 600 feet east of Madison Pike and 1,300 feet west of KY 17.

REQUEST: a proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C, R-1D, and NC to R-1C (CD-SF), R-1D (CD-SF), and NC (CD-SF).

Staff presentations and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Favorable recommendation of the proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C, R-1D, and NC to R-1C (CD-SF), R-1D (CD-SF), and NC (CD-SF).

2075R:

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Dan Groth, City Administrator

APPLICANT: an approximate 60-acre area located alongside the east and west sides of Madison Pike between Independence Station Road and Locust Road.

REQUEST: a proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C, R-1D, and NC to R-1DI (Downtown Independence) Zone.

Staff presentations and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich.

NKAPC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Favorable recommendation of the proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C, R-1D, and NC to DI (Downtown

Independence) Zone, subject to the condition that the properties located at 5302 – 5303 Madison Pike , 5305 Madison Pike and 5323 Madison Pike be removed from the proposed DI Zone.

Mr. Dan Groth addressed the Commission and gave a short background on the City of Independence as far as where they have been and where they would like to go in the future. He stated Independence is one of the largest cities in the state for land mass. He noted the NKAPC staff worked with the city in doing a small area study and as a result a strategic action committee was formed. He further noted by incorporating these new amendments will not involve the taking of anyone's property, require anyone to sell their land, and it will create development.

Mr. Alex Mattingly addressed the Commission and stated the steering committee met 19 times in 2010 and 2011 and discussed tools for implementing the small area study. He noted part of what they did was hold public hearings to get public input. He stated everyone's input was important. He then noted the committee listened to the people and made several changes along the way. He noted the mandatory requirement was reduced among other things.

Mr. Ray Powers addressed the Commission against the issue. He presented a proposed cursory draft of the conservation development/mixed use overlay zone (C/MU) to be added to the establishment of zones to the Independence Zoning Ordinance and asked that it be marked as an exhibit to be made a part of the record. Mr. Darpel then marked it as such.

Peggy Bond addressed the Commission against the issue and stated they felt left out of the whole process, especially with the mixed use. She stated she made up the text for the mixed use to be included. She stated this committee took off the mixed use primarily to make a conservation development/mixed use. She noted she felt this hurt them economically and so that is why they came up with this proposed cursory draft. She stated the mixed use on McCullum Road was left out. She stated all they are asking for is fairness. She then noted with regard to the 50% requirement was originally intended to be mandatory but then they backed down. She stated the point she is trying to make is there were changes made to the 2007 study that should not have been made and they should have stayed with the recommendations of the study. Ms. Bond stated she feels it is unusual for the city to want to put a conservation development on one street of 23 properties. She stated the way she understands it the city is requesting the zone change on one street and 23 properties. She stated in other examples it was the property owners, the ones who own the land, who made the zone request. She stated these properties do not have natural resources besides trees. She stated there are no waterways, no forests and no preserve. She further noted as for protecting wildlife, none have been identified. She further stated she wonders if this subdivision is being used to pave the way for other interests.

Ms. Rita Hauke addressed the Commission in opposition and asked about the exceptions for St. Celia. She further stated on McCullum Road there is really not a berm and cars frequently park along the road. She stated if they put more development in it will put more traffic on the road. She further noted if they put small homes on small lots it's going to bring the property values down and that's why she got involved. She stated she went around to the people in her neighborhood and stated there were 57 people in her neighborhood that were against this. She stated she has not found one person that wants this type of development. She stated she thinks

the Commission needs to know that there are a lot of people that do not like this.

Mr. Stephen Royalty agreed with the prior speakers and had nothing to add.

Mr. Alan Daley stated what he wanted to say has already been covered.

Ms. Joann Cobble addressed the Commission and stated she owns two parcels that are in the DI zone. She noted she was born and raised in Independence and feels downtown Independence has never looked better. She further stated Staff had said this is consistent with the recommendations of the land use plan. She stated this is incorrect. She then showed a graphic depicting what has been changed with the downtown district. She stated the proposed DI zone's building restrictions are unreasonable. She further noted not allowing drive thrus in the DI zone is unreasonable and arbitrary. She stated she sees no problem with drive thrus in the area and feels this is arbitrary because right by the court house you can have drive thrus but just down from it you cannot. She then stated she counted over forty residential buildings that would be affected in this proposed zone. She asked how an 8 unit building enhances the aesthetics of the downtown area. She further asked how the commission like it if the city allowed an eight unit apartment building right next to their house. She then asked for an unfavorable vote on the issue. She also stated she has petitions that she would like marked as exhibits and included in the record. Mr. Hult wanted to clarify that her greatest concern is having the multi-family next to a single family. She stated this was true. She stated they never said multi-family and usually multi-family is usually segregated from single family.

Ms. Julie Dunn addressed the Commission against the issue. She stated she agrees with the previous two speakers and also has a question about the gateway sign to the city. She asked where this sign is to be. She stated from what she understands there is concern that McCullum is to be the gateway to the city. She stated McCullum is a very narrow road; there are no berms or sidewalks. She stated it is unfeasible that McCullum be the gateway to the city.

Ms. Winette Due had nothing to add.

Mr. Phillip Due had nothing to add.

Ms. Kathleen Wolnitzek addressed the Commission against the issue and asked to enter 152 signatures and letters from individuals against the issue. She then stated they had no representation at any of the steering committee meetings despite what the chairman of that steering committee stated. She stated none of the 23 property owners knew you could be on this steering committee. She asked why they were not contacted to give their input because they were impacted by the changes. She further stated because they had no representation they had no chance to voice their opinion in opposition. She stated their job was to implement the 2007 study, not rewrite it. She stated this could have a detrimental impact on the property owners affected. She stated they understand the city's desire to further growth and change but feels they have done so at their own choosing. She stated she is asking for disapproval. The petitions containing the signatures along with the letters were then marked as an exhibit and made a part of the record.

Mr. Powers had nothing to add.

Ms. Margie Powers addressed the Commission against the issue and stated the focus of the CD-SF should be on Harris Pike. She stated the CD zone should not be imposed where they are proposing. She further stated the city center of activity is on Harris Pike. She noted there is no land available for sale on McCullum Road and there is more land available for growth and development on Harris Pike. She asked that the Commissioners listen to those against and vote against the issue.

Mr. Schneider had nothing to add.

Mr. Chuck Baum addressed the Commission against the issue and read a letter into the record from a Mr. Bill Straug. He then read the letter into the record. He then stated he agrees with the prior statements against the issue. He noted that Staff has referred to McCullum Road as McCullum Pike, which would insinuate it is a main thoroughfare but it is actually a narrow two lane road.

Mr. Don Nienaber addressed the Commission and stated he is totally against the conservation development and feels it should go back to what it was originally. He stated he is in the original study and has been taken out. He stated he feels all the property owners in the original study should have been notified and were not. He asked the Commission to vote against this and stated it goes against the original downtown study. He noted when the meeting was held at Simon Kenton they people did not know it was a 50% conservation subdivision. He thanked the Commission for letting him speak and stated he is totally against this. Mr. Darpel then marked the items introduced (the map showing the original properties and emails) as exhibits to be made a part of the record.

Mr. Bill Cobble addressed the Commission and stated this is the second time the people have come to speak out on this issue. He asked that the commission please vote this down and send it to the city so they can vote it down.

Mr. Fred White stated he is against the issue and agrees with the prior testimony of those against the issue.

Ms. Cobble addressed the Commission and referenced properties on her graphic that were "whited out" and are not in the conservation zone or the mixed use zone. She stated she has looked at quite a few conservation districts from other cities and has found none that do not require a minimum acreage, as is the case with what is proposed. She stated with no minimum acreage requirements you will have some willy nilly developments.

Mr. Darpel then called the applicant back up in rebuttal. Mr. Groth stated the gateway sign has not been addressed and will be addressed at a later time. He then stated if a developer wants to do something, that's great. They just want to give them the opportunity to do so. He stated they have not changed anything, just added the conservation district. He stated it is really not that big of a deal. Mr. Darpel then asked about the group being left out he is not aware of it with regard to a side of McCullum being left out. Mr. Scribner then stated the study is a guide and is not a hard and fast rule but guidelines for what is to happen during the implementation stage, which is where they are at. He stated the map and texts that you see has gone through many

revisions and this came from input from the residents. He stated if anything, the original draft was probably closer to the small area study and from resident input was changed along the way. He further stated as Staff tried to help the committee work through some issues there was input coming from all sides and this is what the city has decided and would like the planning commission to consider. He commented on Harris Pike and stated there is going to be development in that area.

Ms. Cobble addressed the committee in rebuttal and asked what the minimum acreage was that was planned because she did not know what that was. Mr. Scribner stated that was done so long ago and he really does not remember but it was taken out based on input from the citizens.

Ms. Hauke addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated they were not allowed to speak at some of the meetings and provide input. She further stated at one point were given note cards to ask questions that never got answered.

Ms. Wolnitzek addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated the impacted property owners had no representation. She stated there were residents on the committee but there was no representation for those that were impacted. She stated they want to keep it the way it was originally written.

Mr. Cobble addressed the omission in rebuttal and stated he attended most of the meetings. He stated these meetings lasted for two hours and they were not allowed to say anything. He stated they did not even have a quorum and at no meeting did they have over fourteen people.

Mr. Powers addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated he did not find one person in favor of the changes.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Ms. Brown stated she likes the DI zone and thinks this is very much in style and in form of some of the other studies that are going on. She stated she thinks it builds a walkable type of community. Mr. Ruh stated they saw this same thing several years ago in Ft. Mitchell and they voted everyone out and it was changed back. Mr. Sletto stated he repeatedly heard that notice seems to be a problem with small area studies and he would like this addressed. He then stated he feels it is a good point to have a conservation district a minimum size. Mr. Hilgefurd stated the point of an overlay zone is not forcing anybody to do anything but merely provides for a reward. He stated the people have the option of staying with what they have or choose the options of what is available with the overlay zone. Mr. France stated he is still bothered by the fact that the whole north side is ignored and that they don't know have the opportunity to develop in a similar fashion if they wanted to. There being no further discussion, the public hearing was then reconvened and then closed. Mr. Darpel asked for a motion on item 2072R. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendations. Mr. Rogge seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Rogge, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Pannunzio and Mr. Porter in favor. Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Hushbeck, Mr. Ruh, Mr. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel voted against. The motion passed. With regard to 2073R Ms. Snyder made a motion to approve. Mr. Hilgefurd seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Brown, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Hult, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter and Mr. Rogge in favor.

Mr. France, Mr. Hushbeck, Mr. Ruh, Ms. Sletto, Mr. Tewes and Mr. Darpel against. The motion was approved. Mr. Darpel asked for a motion for item 2074R. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve based on Staff recommendations. Mr. Hilgefurd seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Brown, Mr. Coates, Ms. Hood, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Rogge and Mr. Tewes in favor. Mr. Eilerman, Mr. France, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushbeck, Mr. Ruh, Ms. Sletto and Mr. Darpel against. The motion passed. With regard to item 2075R Ms. Brown made the motion to approve based on Staff recommendations and the testimony heard. Ms. Snyder seconded. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Brown, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Coates, Mr. Eilerman, Mr. Hilgefurd, Ms. Hood, Mr. Hult, Mr. Hushbeck, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Porter, Mr. Rogge and Mr. Tewes in favor. Mr. France, Mr. Ruh, Mr. Sletto and Mr. Darpel voted against. The motion carried.

Unfinished Business: None.

Reports from Committees:

By-Laws – Nothing to report. No meeting held. Mr. France stated a meeting is in order relative to the discussion and that some changes need to be made to the fee schedule. Mr. Rogge, Ms. Worstell, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Sletto and Mr. Pannunzio are on this committee per Mr. Darpel. He stated once they get through the sub regs there will time to meet.

Direction 2030 (comprehensive plan) – Mr. Scribner reminded everyone that there is a public meeting on June 14th from 6-8 p.m.

Executive – Mr. Darpel stated there is a proposed budget to be discussed at next month's meeting. He stated they basically need to adjust the fees to become self-sufficient. He stated there is no way to do this but stated the budget they are proposing for next year is about the same as this year. He stated they need to understand where their funding is coming from and to be prepared. He stated he is asking a lot of everyone but he stated the plan is to discuss how they can operate down the road.

Subdivision Regulations – Mr. Darpel stated on July 12th there will be a round table discussion to sit down to discuss the differences and the similarities particularly with the road sections.

2020 Sourcebook (model zoning ordinance) – Mr. Darpel stated Stan Porter is on that committee as well as Ms. Carlin, Mr. Hult, Mr. Eilerman and Mr. Darpel.

Report from Legal Counsel – Mr. Smith had nothing to report.

Announcements from Staff – Mr. Scribner stated there is an audio conference being held at the end of the month. He also stated that Staff is aware and is trying to keep up on everyone to make sure they are up on their requirements and all certified. He stated as of a couple weeks ago Mike Ionna passed his certification so the entire staff is now certified.

Correspondence: Mr. Darpel read a letter into the record from the Fiscal Court inviting the commissioners to attend a meeting on June 26th regarding Southern Kenton County.

New Business: - None.

Public Comments: None.

There being nothing further to come before the commission, Ms. Snyder made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Hult seconded the motion. Mr. Rogge abstained. All others in favor. None opposed. The meeting then adjourned at 11:06 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair

Date