

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Minutes**

Mr. Darpel, Chairman, called the meeting to order on August 2, 2018 at 6:15 p.m. and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance and invocation by Mr. Ryan. The meeting was held in the Commission Chambers of the PDS Building in Fort Mitchell. Attendance of members (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date) was as follows.

Commission Member	Jurisdiction	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X			X	X	X				
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co			X	X		X	X	X				
Diane Brown, V. Chair	Erlanger	X	X	X	X		X	X					
Nancy Collins	Ryland Hts.			X	X			X	X				
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X		X	X			X	X				
Brian Dunham	Kenton Cty		X		X		X	X	X				
Mike Gaiser	Ludlow	X	X	X	X		X						
Lynne Hood	Crestview Hills	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park	X	X	X	X		X	X					
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X		X	X	X				
Ron Padgett	Covington	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere	X	X		X		X	X	X				
Sean Pharr	Covington	X	X	X	X		X	X	X*				
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X	X	X		X	X	X				
Marco Sansone	Bromley												
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs	X	X	X	X								
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X	X	X			X	X				
Jack Toebben	Fort Wright	X	X	X	X		X	X					
Robert "Bob" Whelan	Covington	X	X	X	X		X	X					
Brian Wischer	Villa Hills	X	X	X	X		X	X					

Also present were Mr. Mathew Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Andy Videkovich, Ms. Emi Randall and Mr. Patrick Denbow.

"X" denotes attendance at the regular meeting and "x" denotes attendance at the continuation meeting. "*" denotes arrival after roll call was taken.

AGENDA

Mr. Darpel noted a change to the agenda with regard to item PC1801-003. He stated requests 3 and 4 were withdrawn by the applicant and would not be heard. He then asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve and Mr. Ryan seconded. All in favor by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Darpel asked for any questions or comments with regard to the minutes for July. There being none, Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Pannunzio seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Collins, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pharr and Mr. Ryan in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Darpel asked for motion to approve the receipts and expenditures report. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation.

RECENT ACTIONS BY STAFF:

(No action required)

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

(No action required)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

FILE: PC1801

APPLICANT: Quast Real Estate Development per David Quast

LOCATIONS: (1) 4081 Richardson Road – an area of approximately 0.82 acres Richardson Road, between Richardson Road to the north and Amhurst Drive to the south, approximately feet east of Amhurst Drive in Independence. (2) An area consisting of five parcels and totaling approximately 6.56 acres, located on the north and south sides of Richardson Road and the east and west sides of Lily Drive, between Turkeyfoot Road to the west and Bramblewood Drive to the east, approximately 450 feet east of Turkeyfoot Road in Independence.

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing Location (1) from R-3 (a multi-family residential zone) to NC (a neighborhood commercial zone); and, an amended Stage I Development Plan for Location (2) which is currently zone NC (a neighborhood commercial zone).

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Patrick Denbow

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Request 1) Favorable recommendation on the proposed map amendment to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-3 (a multi-family residential zone to NC (a neighborhood commercial zone).

Mr. David Quast addressed the Commission in favor of the issue. He cited past development projects his company had developed previously. He then referred to his attorney Mr. Brock McKay who addressed the Commission on the issue. Mr. McKay then showed photographs of

the property in question. He also showed slides of the existing Stage I Development plan regarding the issue. He also showed the revised plan by Viox and Viox.

Mr. Moriconi registered to speak but had nothing to add.

Mr. Robert Morehead addressed the Commission and stated he lives directly across the street from the proposed egress to the site. He stated he is opposed to this. He noted when this was rezoned they were told there would never be any egress onto Richardson Road. He stated there is not enough room to handle the congestion this will create. Mr. Morehead stated nothing has ever been done with the property and he is opposed to this going in. He further stated they were told certain things and it's going to create problems in the area. He noted it is not a good road and is very narrow. He additionally stated when school is in the school buses back up because it is a dead end. He further stated this will create traffic jams, especially during the school year. Mr. Darpel asked if his only objection is to the access and not the zone change. Mr. Morehead stated he is not opposed to them turning it into an office but it is going to create a traffic jam once school is back in. Mr. Darpel clarified that Mr. Morehead noted there is not enough room for the buses to turn around on Richardson Road. Mr. Morehead agreed. He then stated the road hasn't changed and is very narrow so he is questioning why this has a favorable approval by Staff now. He additionally stated there is trash pickup and other things that will cause congestion and this is not suitable for this type of traffic on a dead end street. He stated if they're going to make it an office, just make it go back out on Richardson Road.

Ms. Linda Morehead addressed the Commission and stated she lives directly across from the proposed site. She stated she questions the 3000 square foot home being turned into an office space because the house is not 3000 square feet. She asked whether it was going to be torn down and a much bigger office building put in. Ms. Morehead also asked about the buffer area as they were promised a buffer zone by the City of Independence and it never happened. She then asked who mandates that these things happen because they have gotten no response from Independence. She additionally noted the whole street is residential and there are kids that go up and down on their bikes and playing. She noted it is a concern if there is suddenly an office building with an egress onto that street it will create a problem. She also noted concerns with a rental property but stated her concern is the egress and she does not feel it should be allowed.

Mr. Darpel commented that the office building is part of the development plan so they can't just go in and put in something larger.

Dr. Quast addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated she was correct, the square footage was incorrect. He also noted they can only keep what is there and have to adhere to what is there and allowed. Mr. Ryan asked about parking for the building. Dr. Quast stated they anticipate the employee parking to be behind the strip center.

Mr. Morehead commented in rebuttal and asked about this property being called a separate entity when it all flows into the same piece of property. He stated the house is very, very tiny and he is very familiar with it. He noted you are not going to get that many people in there to warrant that many parking spaces.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being none, he then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He asked for a motion on the

issue. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendations, the testimony heard, and based on it being in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Dunham seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Dunham, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Collins and Mr. Darpel in favor. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion on the proposed plan. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendation and testimony heard, as well as it being in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Padgett seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Collins, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn and Mr. Martin in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

FILE: PC1807-0002 (action required)

APPLICANT: Bayer Becker per Mark Rosenberger on behalf of Scott Appelman

LOCATION: An area of approximately 6.8 acres located on the north side of Dudley Road between Thomas More Parkway to the west and Fallen Tree Court to the east, directly across from Prestwicke Drive in Edgewood.

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Edgewood Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C (a single-family residential zone with a minimum lot size of 12,500 square feet) to R-1F (a single-family residential zone with a minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet); the applicant proposes to construct a residential subdivision.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Emi Randall

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Favorable recommendation for a proposed map amendment to the Edgewood Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1C (a single-family residential zone with a minimum lot size of 12,500 square feet) to R-1F (a single-family residential zone with a minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet); the applicant proposes to construct a residential subdivision, subject to the applicant agreeing to the condition that the subject property not exceed a density of 4.0 dwelling units per net acre as recommended in the Land Use Element of Direction 2030.

Mr. Dehner addressed the Commission on behalf of the City of Edgewood. He noted they had an opportunity to meet and go over the current plan. Mr. Dehner stated the concept plan that was proposed they were in favor of and they ask that they bind the concept plan to the approval. He noted the density levels are much lower than what is there currently. He noted they like the concept plan and the market value of the development. He then stated the only thing they need to do is push the development closer to the road to keep it from falling over the hill. He reiterated they would like the developer to be bound to the concept plan and the developer is agreeable to that from their previous discussions.

Mr. Rosenberger addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant and stated they are in agreement with the binding of the concept plan. He stated Staff had described the plan very well. Mr. Smith clarified that the concept plan would have to be developed pursuant to what is presented tonight and if changed they would have to come to the Commission for any recommendations on those changes. Mr. Rosenburger agreed. Mr. Ryan asked how many homes will be visible from the road if he had an idea. Mr. Rosenburger stated he doesn't have that yet but if he had to guess, possibly six.

Mr. Appleman had nothing to add.

Mr. Joe Messmer addressed the Commission against the issue and stated he is the largest residential property near this development. He stated they feel this is a lot of lots on this piece of property but if the developer can be bound to just what is presented they think they can live with it. He stated they don't want to see a low income area there.

Ms. Staggs had nothing to add.

Mr. Jim McCullum addressed the Commission against the issue and stated as long as they can be tied to this concept plan he is in agreement.

Mr. Darpel asked for clarification on the access point at Prestwicke. Mr. Dunham asked about why this site can't be developed similarly to the Sanctuary Development and the plan is to build eleven houses on the property with narrow lots. Mr. Rosenberger stated he could not answer to that. Mr. Darpel asked if these were going to be ranch or two story homes. Mr. Appleman addressed the Commission and stated the development would be a mix of ranch and two story homes. He then submitted exhibits depicting the design of the proposed homes. Mr. Dunham asked what is firm with the concept plan other than the lot size. Mr. Rosenberger stated the cliff in the back is firm and noted it is a 100 foot drop. He stated he is going to ensure that everything is top quality with the development and detail. Mr. Dunham asked why they chose to do a different design from the Fallen Tree and Sanctuary developments down the road. He then questioned how they are going to build to the concept plan because it doesn't sound like what is going to be built is going to be like the concept plan. Mr. Darpel asked if a side entry garage can be designed on a 60 foot lot. Mr. Rosenberger stated on three lots they can build side entry garages. Mr. Darpel noted on the exhibits submitted as they are, none of those can be built on the lots. Ms. Vaughn stated after seeing the photographs of the design concepts she has concerns that many of those houses can't fit on the lots as presented. Mr. Rosenberger reiterated the photos submitted are for design styles and not size. Mr. Appleman also reiterated that the photos were for design ideas only and not the size of what will actually be built.

Mr. Dehner addressed the Commission and asked if the developer would have to come back similar to a Stage 2 Development plan for each lot. Mr. Darpel stated they would not have to for each lot. Mr. Darpel stated he just wanted to make sure everyone is on the same page so there isn't anyone that's not happy later when it's not what they thought it would be. Mr. Appleman stated he doesn't like the narrow lots. Mr. Darpel then commented that that is what is being submitted. Mr. Darpel also commented this is not what is typically in Edgewood to have narrow lots. Mr. Appleman stated he doesn't want to be misrepresented either and this is a project they will be taking seriously. He then added he will be moving there with a couple family members himself. Mr. Appleman stated they have been very open in discussions with Mr. Dehner about what they intend to build there. He additionally noted they are willing to stand behind the lot size but what will actually be designed remains to be seen. Mr. Darpel stated they just want to make sure it meets certain standards and with a PUD you have that, and with this you don't. Mr. Smith asked for clarity on what the developer is agreeing to develop. Mr. Rosenberger stated the homes will generally fit into the footprint of the home. Mr. Smith then asked if there was a material change they would have to come back before the city for approval. Mr. Rosenberger stated they would have to go to the city as the next step. Mr. Smith stated in terms of any material changes it would come back before the Commission and then before the city. Ms. Randall stated that was true, what is being proposed in the permits and the development is the same and they would have

to go through the subdivision process as well. Mr. Darpel asked if the concept plan would remain intact and it would remain with 4 dwelling units per acres. Mr. Appleman stated that is correct. Mr. Smith then asked if Mr. Appleman is agreeable that any material changes made they would have to come back before the Commission. Mr. Appleman stated he is in agreement with that. Mr. Darpel then marked the photographs submitted as an exhibit to be made a part of the record on the matter.

Ms. Staggs addressed the Commission against the issue and asked about maintaining the original homestead. She asked if the developer was going to build eleven additional homes or will that be part of the eleven. Mr. Appleman stated it was eleven homes.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion. Mr. Dunham stated he understands what Mr. Appleman is trying to do here but the current zoning works. He stated other developers on the street have done nice developments under the current zoning. He stated the idea that this would be approved with so much up in the air, he can't support that. He additionally stated he doesn't think it's professional or appropriate. He noted it's not clear what is going to be constructed there. He then noted it is his position that it is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He stated if you look at the land use map that Edgewood has it really is broken down into dwelling units per acre. He noted if they intended to have development with higher density they would have shown that on the land use map. He then stated he doesn't feel the current zoning is inappropriate and the submitted zoning is appropriate. He stated he is totally uncomfortable with what is being proposed to go in here. Mr. Darpel stated the only issue he has is there is too many questions that the expectations are necessarily meeting on both sides. He noted why not have a PUD and then you know what is going in versus a concept plan. He noted he doesn't like the idea of a binding concept plan and it sounds like trouble so that is why he has a problem with it. Mr. Padgett stated he thinks this is a great idea but he also thinks there are just so many questions. Mr. Martin commented that he is losing fifteen feet of height by switching the zones and that is a lot. Mr. Darpel then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Dunham made the motion to recommend disapproval based on the fact that it is inconsistent with the Comprehensive plan, that the current zoning is appropriate and the proposed zoning is inappropriate, nor have there been major changes of an economical, social or physical nature. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Dunham, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Collins, Mr. Darpel, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr and Ms. Snyder in favor. Mr. Ryan abstained. The motion carried.

At this time (8:32 p.m. a five minute recess was taken.

FILE:PC1807-0003 (action required)

APPLICANT: AD Construction Design per David Froelicher on behalf of Petro Traders, LLC

LOCATION: 1820 Dixie Highway; an area of approximately 0.55 acres located on the southwest corner of the intersection of George Huser Drive with Dixie Highway in Fort Wright.

REQUEST: A Stage 1 Development Plan for the described area which is currently zone CC (Community Commercial); the applicant proposed to construct an approximate 4,000 square foot dentist office.

*Mr. Dunham recused himself from any consideration or voting on the issue due to a conflict of interest

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Favorable recommendation on the Stage 1 Development Plan for the described area which is currently zoned CC (Community Commercial), but only subject to the applicant agreeing to the following conditions:

1. The interior concrete sidewalk be connected to the existing sidewalks along the adjacent rights-of-way and the existing sidewalk on 1826-1830 Dixie Highway. A cross access easement shall also be provided to accommodate the cross access.
2. The aprons of the closed access points along Ashwood Circle, George Huser Drive, and Dixie Highway be removed, and the area restored with a tree lawn, sidewalk, and curbs along the respective rights-of-way.

The applicant had nothing to add and stated he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Thompson stated the same and had nothing to add.

At this time Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. There being none, he then reconvened and closed the public hearing and asked for a motion on the issue. Mr. Bethell made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendations. Mr. Padgett seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Bethell, Mr. Padgett, Ms. Collins, Mr. Darpel, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Snyder in favor. Mr. Dunham recused himself from any consideration and voting on the issue. The motion carried unanimously.

*At this time Mr. Darpel had to leave the meeting and Mr. Ryan took over chairing the meeting.

FILE:PC1807-0004 (action required)

APPLICANT: Kenton County Planning Commission per Paul J. Darpel, Chair

REQUEST: Amendments to Kenton County's Direction 2030: Your Voice. Your Choice. Comprehensive Plan, revising and adding recommendations and tasks within the Regional, Sub Areas, Environment, Mobility, and Community Facilities plan elements to include bicycle-and pedestrian-related recommendations and task identified in the Kenton Connects study, and incorporating the research and public comments reports by reference.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Chris Schneider

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

To approve proposed amendments to Kenton County's Direction 2030: Your Voice. Your Choice. Comprehensive Plan. These amendments will add recommendations and tasks to the Regional, Sub Areas, Environment, Mobility, and Community Facilities plan elements to include bicycle-and pedestrian-related recommendations and task identified in the Kenton Connects study, and incorporating the research and public comments reports by reference.

Mr. Ryan then read into the record a letter from Keith Logsdon who also was part of the study. The letter was then marked as an exhibit and made a part of the record on the matter.

Mr. Jason Reiser addressed the Commission in favor of the issue. He stated he was on the advisory committee. He just wanted to show appreciation for the Commissioners and the Kenton Connects Committee members. He stated the Commissioners are the ultimate influencers. He stated he read a promotional piece promoting Kentucky businesses while on a flight in New York. He stated the promotion flyer talked about the virtues of the riverfront pathways and that is something that is being put out there to draw employers to the region. He noted the region has one of the highest incidences of heart disease and this is an opportunity to promote a healthy environment.

Sheila Gray addressed the Commission in favor of the issue and stated she was also on the advisory committee. She stated it was a pleasure to have a yearlong discussion about the possibilities for Kenton County for walkers and bikers. She noted she would strongly encourage the Commission to adopt the amendments so Kenton County can continue to move forward on the issue. She referred to the study recommendations with the application in terms of the benchmarks intended as a result of the study.

Mr. Wade Johnston addressed the Commission in favor of the issue and stated he wanted to come out as a member of the Kenton Connects committee to show his support of the amendments. He cited statistics regarding the use of existing trails in the area and stated he hoped the Commission would adopt these amendments.

Mr. Joe Gray addressed the Commission and stated he wanted to point out that he was involved with 2030 when he was on the Commission this is directly in line with the goals and objectives of that. He noted he believes this is the next step in the Comprehensive Plan with the action part of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted his guess is in the area that the corridors are identified by labeling bike lane, he believes that will increase awareness of bikers in the area and therefore accidents will go down.

Mr. Ryan then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Dunham stated he has no doubt that this committee will be active going forward. He noted if the ball is picked up and run with it could have a nice goal. Mr. Ryan stated maybe it could be worded differently. Mr. Bethell then read the goals and noted while they do spell out some numbers, it is clearly a goal to strive for. Mr. Ryan stated he is not worried about the numbers; it's how it's worded and implementing it. Mr. Ryan also stated that this is an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan so it would take a vote of the entire majority of the Commission for it to pass.

There being no further questions or comments on the matter, he reconvened and closed the public hearing. Mr. Ryan then asked for a motion on the issues. Mr. Bethell made the motion to recommend approval. Mr. Dunham seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Bethell, Ms. Collins, Mr. Dunham, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Snyder in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

FILE:PC1807-0005 (action required)

APPLICANT: Kenton County Planning Commission per Paul J. Darpel, Chair

REQUEST:

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Chris Schneider

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Request 1) To approve the proposed amendments revising the Recommended Land Use Map for the Cities of Bromley, Edgewood, Elsmere, Erlanger, Fort Mitchell, Independence, Ludlow and Ryland Heights; Request 2) To approve the proposed amendments revising the connectivity layer of the Recommended Land Use Map; Request 3) To approve the proposed revision to the Mixed Use and Community Service Sections of the Land Use Element; Request 4) To approve the proposed revision to the Direction 2030 web architecture to make the site faster, more secure, and more resource efficient.

Ms. Emi Randall spoke briefly in favor of the application on behalf of the Mayor of Ludlow who had to leave the meeting prior to the issue being heard.

Mr. Chris Moriconi addressed the Commission and noted it was a great process for the cities and it was really managed well and they appreciate it.

Mr. Ryan then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Bethell stated a lot of work by Staff has been done on this issue and they have done a tremendous job. He stated he would certainly encourage approval. He noted this will keep the process moving with the blessing of the cities and he thinks it's important. Mr. Dunham thanked Mr. Bethell for his invaluable work, support and effort on the issue. There being no further discussion, Mr. Ryan then reconvened and closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Mr. Bethell made the motion to approve requests 1-5 based on Staff's report and recommendations. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Bethell, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Collins, Mr. Dunham, Ms. Hood, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Martin, Mr. Padgett, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Pannunzio and Mr. Ryan in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Ongoing Business

Reports from Committees

By Laws: - Mr. Ryan stated the next meeting will be held next Tuesday at 5:00 p.m.

Direction 2030 implementation: Mr. Bethell stated they did not have a meeting but would be meeting in September.

Executive: No meeting held.

Social Media: Mr. Ryan stated they did meet and had a quorum. He stated they basically approved the architecture for the website and made some tweaking to colors, etc.

Subdivision Review: No meeting held.

Reports from Commission Members: Nothing to report.

Reports from Legal Counsel: Mr. Smith stated Judge Bartlett did issue an order to dismiss the Planning Commission from the Villa Hills issue.

Reports/Announcements from Staff: Mr. Chris Schneider noted Crestview will be submitting a mixed use zone for the Towne Center next month that is approximately 70 pages long. He stated

the consultant that is working on this asked if there would be any interest in hearing about this in advance of the meeting and if so, what date would work the best. Mr. Ryan asked if a doodle poll could be created by Pam to determine the best date. Mr. Schneider stated she could do that. Ms. Randall asked if that can be held after they submit an application. Mr. Smith stated it probably should be before the application. He also noted the Commissioners shouldn't be discussing it back and forth amongst themselves. He noted he feels it would be wise to present it before they submit the application. Upon further discussion, Mr. Smith stated it probably should be held as a special meeting and be advertised. Ms. Randall stated the amount of information regarding the application was so great that they thought it would be beneficial to learn about it ahead of time. Additional discussion was had regarding submitting the presentation via a webx or PowerPoint presentation versus having a special meeting.

General Correspondence: None.

New Business: None.

Public Comments: None.

There being nothing further to come before the commission, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Ms. Vaughn. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair

Date



12/16/18
