

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Minutes

Mr. Darpel, Chairman, called the meeting to order on February 4, 2021 at 6:15 p.m. and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance and invocation by Mr. Ryan. The meeting was held virtually via the GoToMeeting platform. 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
Jeremy Armbruster	Erlanger	X	X										
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills	X											
Todd Berling	Fort Wright	X	X										
Jen Best	Covington	X	X										
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell	X	X										
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	X										
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X	X										
Brian Dunham	Kenton Cty	X	X										
Tom France	Ludlow	X	X										
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park	X	X										
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	X										
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere	X	X										
Sean Pharr	Covington	X	X										
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X										
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	X										
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs	X											
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X										
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	X										
Robert "Bob" Whelan	Covington	X											
Brian Wischer	Villa Hills	X	X										
Kristi Zavitz	Ryland Hts.	*											

Also present were Mr. Mathew Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Andy Videkovich and Megan Busse 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 stated he did not have any adjustments to the agenda. There being none, he then asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Pannunzio made the second. All in favor by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Darpel asked for approval of the minutes from January. He noted there were a few changes sent in by Mr. Bridges and the only change he saw was on page six where it should read “Mr.” Sketch and not “Ms.” and “he” and not “she”. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from January. Mr. Bridges made the motion to approve. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Bridges, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Wischer, Mr. Armbruster, Mr. Berling, Ms. Best, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Darpel and Mr. Dunham in favor. The motion carried.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Darpel asked for any questions or comments with regard to the receipts and expenditures report. He stated he and Mr. Smith were discussing it and it looks like they are in pretty good shape. He noted he would meet with Ms. Reddy and would likely be meeting in an Executive session with regards to that. He noted he would be keeping everyone informed as to that. Following his brief comments he asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Ryan made the motion to approve. Ms. Snyder 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: PC2101-0004

APPLICANT: Power of Design per Andrew Miller on behalf of Celco Partnership d.b.a. Verizon Wireless

LOCATION: On the northwest corner of the intersection of Winston Avenue and Howard Litzler Drive in Covington.

REQUEST: To grant a waiver from the requirement of Section 3.4, B., 2., of the Regulations for Cellular Antenna Towers and Small Cell System Towers in Kenton County; the applicant proposes to construct a

35 foot tall Small Cell Tower in the AUC (AutoUrban Commercial) Zone, where 27.5 feet is the maximum height permitted within the zone.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videcovich

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on a waiver from the requirement of Section 3.4, B., 2., of the Regulations for Cellular Antenna Towers and Small Cell System Towers in Kenton County; the applicant proposes to construct a 35 foot tall Small Cell Tower in the AUC (Auto-Urban Commercial) Zone, where 27.5 feet is the maximum height permitted within the zone.

Mr. Andrew Miller addressed the Commission in favor of the issue. He stated they have surveyed the area in terms of the right of way and noted there is a concrete marker noted so it will be very close to the sidewalk. He stated they have tried to push it back as much as possible. Mr. Darpel asked if the towers were really only extending out 300 feet. Mr. Miller stated the range goes out 300-400 feet but he would like to confirm that. Mr. Miller noted if they can tweak the setback they could add to the coverage area by having the taller pole. Mr. Ryan asked about the traditional two locators on top of the pole and inquired if they had a greater range. Mr. Miller stated the current pole is designed for one more potential carrier and he could not speak as to their technology. He stated this range is only for Verizon's range. Mr. Ryan then asked about the diameter of the base and Mr. Miller commented it is three foot in diameter. Mr. Ryan then asked if it would intersect into the sidewalk. Mr. Miller stated it was possible. Mr. Dunham asked about the right of way and it shows it being 36 ½ feet off the edge of the pavement and the post is shown just over ten feet off the edge. Mr. Darpel asked if that was the right of way, could the pole be moved over. Mr. Miller stated the construction drawings were drawn with the GIS information and he said he does have a right of way drawing that shows it much closer. Mr. Miller stated he could submit that. Mr. Darpel stated it would be approved as submitted and if it was different they would have to come back and correct it later. He stated if Mr. Miller has a right of way survey they will have to use it. He further stated they will just have an issue if it is not right to come back and address that.

Mr. Terry Shumate addressed the Commission and stated he did not have anything to add.

Mr. Chris Myers stated the city didn't have anything to add.

Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion on the matter. Mr. France asked about the right of way and how the issue would be approved. Mr. Darpel stated if it was later found to be incorrect they would have to come back and correct it but he stated he felt there was sufficient information enough to move forward. Mr. Logsdon stated in light of the potential to possibly come back, if the Commission could give guidance to staff to move the pole back. Mr. Darpel stated they have specific information as to how it's going to be built and if moved he doesn't know if it will potentially meet requirements, etc. He stated that is what they are focusing on to make a determination on how it is presented. Mr. Smith suggested if talking about moving the pole back they have the opportunity to condition the request that it be moved if the additional right of way meets proper requirements, it can be moved back. Mr. Shumate then stated his comment and question goes to height variance and location and he was asked for clarification. He stated they weren't expected or prepared to talk about location as he thought that was

decided. He noted they are not opposed to working on the location, but given the proximity of a very small pole they would have to go back to examine the location and whether or not it involved other issues. He stated he was just asking for clarification for what is the scope of the hearing. Mr. Darpel stated they are actually trying to give some flexibility with the pole. He stated the problem is the site plan submitted is contradictory. Mr. Darpel further stated one of the Commissioners noted the pole is right up along the sidewalk and if there is an opportunity to create a safer result for the public that is something they would look at. He additionally noted they are just saying maybe the information wasn't correct but they are inclined to say it can be located where it is if everything is correct. Mr. Shumate stated he understands completely and they have no problem with moving it a few feet if they can without negatively affecting their resolution. Mr. Simpson asked about a definitive location other than "as far as possible". Mr. Dunham stated he doesn't have a problem with the current location because these are going to be all over the place and he just raised the question for clarity. Mr. Darpel stated we're here to look at height waiver and the Commission is not here to design or locate their poles. Mr. Miller addressed the Commission and stated at this time another engineering analysis would have to be done. Mr. Shumate stated it would not be significantly smaller in every respect with the exception of height.

Mr. Darpel then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Pharr stated he would make the motion but is struggling a bit with placing conditions on it because they came before the Commission for a height requirement. He then made the motion to approve the request conditioned upon the right of way requirements that the applicant finds that the pole has sufficient coverage for the purpose of the pole and the city and staff use their discretion to work together to address the right of way requirements. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion. Mr. Smith stated he thinks they would have to have an ascertainable standard with as much clarity as they can for the condition. He stated with what he's heard from the applicant, they are willing to push that back to provide a safer situation with the sidewalk. He stated what he would suggest is the condition be entertained provided there is sufficient right of way and provided it does not cause coverage issues and that the pole be moved back a distance that Staff feels will not interfere with pedestrians on the sidewalks. Mr. Pharr stated he would like to adopt that condition by reference and with the condition he moved to grant the waiver for the reasons stated by Staff and the testimony and specifically finding that it is not detrimental to the public interest, that Covington has approved it and that it better meets the objections of the regulations. Mr. Simpson agreed with the amendment to the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Pharr, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Wischer, Mr. Armbruster, Mr. Berling, Ms. Best, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio and Mr. Ryan in favor. The motion carried.

FILE: PC2101-0005

APPLICANT: Power of Design per Andrew Miller on behalf of Celco Partnership d.b.a. Verizon Wireless

LOCATION: All sites are in Covington (1) Along East 32nd Street, approximately 11 feet from the residence at 3111 Frasier Street; (2) On the southwest corner of the intersection of Sterrett Avenue and Greenup Street, approximately 26 feet from the residence at 121 Sterrett Avenue; (3) Along McKee Avenue approximately 27 feet from the residence at 317 East 43rd Street; (4) On the northwest corner of the intersection of Michigan Avenue and Baltimore Avenue, approximately 31.5 feet from the residence at 4422 Michigan Avenue; (5) On the northside of West 7th Street approximately 19 feet from the

residence at 308 West 7th Street; (6) On the southeast corner of the intersection of Garrard Street and East 2nd Street, approximately 27 feet from the residence at 202 Garrard Street; (7) On the west side of Sanford Street approximately 25 feet from the residence at 523 Sanford Street; and (8) On the northeast corner of the intersection of Garrard Street and East 11th Street, approximately 20 feet from the residence at 1025 Prospect Street.

REQUEST: To grant waivers from the requirement of Section 3.4, C., 6., of the Regulations for Cellular Antenna Towers and Small Cell System Towers in Kenton County; the applicant proposes to construct Small Cell Towers closer than 35 feet to existing or proposed residential structures. The requirement is to be set back at least the height of the tower from the nearest residence.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videcovich

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

For locations #1-3, and 5-7: Unfavorable recommendation on the waiver request.

For location #4: Favorable recommendation on the waiver request.

Mr. Chris Miller addressed the Commission and stated there were questions about the setback and the need for additional poles. He stated to better answer that they would have to have a full evaluation to determine the number of poles. He stated the setback would require a shorter pole but a full evaluation would need to be done to determine that.

Mr. Terry Shumate addressed the Commission and stated it is likely that if poles are shifted significantly it's going to require at least one pole to make up for the deficiency in coverage. He noted this would require a full evaluation and possible additional poles. He stated that in a general sense a full evaluation could tell you specifically. He stated he would like the Commission and public to understand that it's not just the setbacks that were a challenge, they also do look at code. He stated last year after a public hearing they did decide to reduce the pole height from 40 feet to 35. He stated this was done in the spirit of cooperation but the code provisions are not the only factors and way they can go. He stated they are actively working with state historic preservation areas. He also stated one thing they do is determine where utilities are and determine where they can fit without negatively affecting the utilities that are already there. He noted they did have problems with a lot of sites where they couldn't go where they wanted to go because of existing utilities. He stated the reason these particular sites are before the Commission is they have tried to make it work with all the parameters present. He stated he just wanted the public to know that Verizon had worked very hard to find a viable location for each and it is why they are before the Commission with variances to the challenges they face. He stated their main goal is the people are customers and they want to do as much as possible for the people that need their service.

Mr. Darpel then summarized emails that were submitted in opposition to the issue and read those into the record on the matter.

Mr. Patrick Hughes addressed the Commission against the issue and stated the Historic Riverside Civic Association objects to the application on all seven applications opposed by the City of Covington. He further stated with respect to Michigan Avenue they have no opposition. He noted no one from Verizon or any of its agents have made any attempt to communicate with any of the neighborhood residents. He stated he has not been contacted as an officer of the neighborhood association nor any other office of the neighborhood association has been contacted by any representative of Verizon. He further stated the City of Covington does not consent to the waiver and this is fatal to their application. He further stated the applicant has failed to submit any evidence to support the criteria for approval, and they have

acknowledged that co-locator opportunities exist. He stated Verizon is seeking the easy way and has not even approached those about co-locating. He additionally noted they are in a historic district and the proposed location is in no way camouflaged to protect the surrounding residents from the tower. He noted the locations are extremely close to the street and extremely close to residents. He stated these proposals are in contrast to the historic nature of the neighborhood, but most importantly they have not bothered to talk to them. He noted many residents are concerned about their health in regards to 5G being so close to their residences. He stated they as residents are likely not entitled to receive notice of these applications. He additionally stated they are not asking that every citizen be contacted. Mr. Hughes stated a simple Google search would have been easy. He stated at no point has Verizon submitted co-locator locations. He then stated they agree and this type of coverage is needed. But he said they could have assisted with that in an area not as harmful to the community. He additionally stated need is not a consideration with respect to cell tower locations. He further noted they are strongly opposed to all seven locations, especially the ones at Garrett and Sanford. He stated they are willing to discuss this with Verizon, albeit a bit late.

Ms. Lisa Desmarais addressed the Commission against the issue and stated she just had two points to make and one was to Patrick Flannery and the work done in the 1960's to bring the neighborhood back to what it is today. She stated in the spirit of historic nature it is extremely important that proliferation not become more important than preservation. She stated it is important to not allow commercialization to prevent preservations.

Ms. Arlene Luebbe stated she has a lot she would like to say and asked for five minutes. Mr. Darpel stated they have so many people who want to speak and asked that she keep it in terms of the actual waiver. She stated four years ago she tried to speak up and against all open meeting laws was told to shut up and leave so hopefully she can tell the meat of her story. She stated she has been studying about 5G for years and she has never heard of the distances relayed tonight. She noted she has been told cell towers will be placed every three to five houses and that cell towers have to be between 50 and 75 feet from a residence. She stated another thing she wanted to reference was who was going to cover the insurance etc. She noted lawsuits are taking place all over the world with regard to this. She stated she understands the cities are required to carry liability insurance and she would like to know where there is coming from. Mr. Darpel stated matters of insurance are out of the Commission's purview and that's not something that is an issue for them to address. He stated if she had other relevant items for them to consider she could continue. She additionally noted in terms of the historic preservation it was noted due to the cell towers a 30% decline in home value since the 5G cell towers go up for an average home. She stated for a historic district it might even be a larger loss.

Ms. Amy Castetter addressed the Commission and asked who would be liable for any injuries if there is a health issue caused from these cell towers. She stated insurance often excludes the risk from commercial general policies. She stated it could be two or more decades to know if EMS is a significant liability industry. She stated owning, buying or selling a home near an EMS tower could be devastating. She stated she feels the opposition case is strong. She stated the health and prosperity of the residents is hopefully more important than doing business as Verizon Wireless. Mr. Darpel stated any health or insurance issues are out of the purview of the Commission but her issues are noted and they appreciate her time.

Mr. Ryan commented about the requirements of the FCC and asked Mr. Smith if he could comment on the ruling of the FCC with regard to health issues. Mr. Smith commented and stated Federal law is very very clear and prohibits the Commission from entertaining or considering any evidence concerning the health effects of any of this technology. He stated they are not supposed to be talking about it and stated they are prohibited from allowing it in any way from impacting their decisions under the FCC and

Telecommunications Act. He stated he knows people feel very passionate about it and have statistics either way but it is not something they can discuss or get into or be part of the hearing.

Ms. Jane Paige Steiner stated she just wanted to go on the record that she is in agreement with Patrick Hughes' statement on the issue.

Mr. Roy Steiner stated he also wants to go on the record and stated he is in agreement with Patrick Hughes and he has his full support.

Mr. Aaron Vissman stated he also wanted to go on the record and second Mr. Hughes' and Mr. Ryan's views. He stated there are better options that fit the aesthetic character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Christopher Myers addressed the Commission as a neutral party and stated he didn't have anything else to add and that Staff presented everything well. He stated he is happy to address questions if there are any for him.

Mr. Terry Shumate addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated he would like to address Mr. Hughes and the people he represents. He stated they have a tremendous amount of sites to build to make the 5G network work. He stated the amount of work to undergo to achieve the system that they want and that they need is to work through the representatives appointed and elected to represent the people. He stated through those organizations they hope to collect the underlying communities, the underlying residents or whatever the case may be, through those organizations and figure out what's best for the community and what the community wants. He stated what he doesn't understand is that they file with SHPO and they consult with the local historic entity. He stated they have in fact worked with SHPO based on local historic organizations' needs and wants and comments. He stated he is not saying there is not still more work to do. He stated he does object slightly to the commentary that they ignored residents and they ignored the local community because that is not true. He stated they are trying to do everything they can to locate as sensitively as possible and he will enforce that. He stated he has 1500 sites in the Cincinnati market. He stated they have fifty on record now with more coming. He stated they have design issues, they have engineering needs, and they can only move forward with an overall proposed design. He stated they move forward and do all the required filings and they hope to garner all the needs and wants of those organizations of those the people represent as quickly as possible. He stated it sounds like there is more work to do particularly in the Riverside District and they will follow up after the meeting to talk. He stated he thought they were working to that goal through SHPO and maybe they need to work more specifically with the people impacted and they will welcome that discussion.

Mr. Patrick Hughes addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated Verizon has a \$228 billion dollar market cap. To suggest that they don't have the resources to more fully reach out to the communities impacted by their plan is frankly ridiculous. He stated nonetheless, as part of the Historic Riverside Civic Association they are willing to meet and discuss the issue.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion. He asked what the preference was in a motion on the issues. He stated initially he thought they needed to vote on each one individually. He stated they do need to make sure nothing has changed with the city through the course of the public hearing. Mr. Bridges stated they definitely need to check with Covington on whichever of the seven their position has not changed then someone needs to make a motion to deny them. He further stated he doesn't even think they can consider them because they don't meet the conditions and he doesn't think they can even approve them. Mr. Darpel stated he agreed and understood where he was coming from and that's why they need to check with Covington first. He then reconvened and closed the public hearing. Mr. Darpel then asked Mr. Meyer if the city recommendations are consistent with what is stated by staff. Mr. Meyer

then stated there has been no change in the City of Covington's position on the matter. Mr. Darpel then stated if there are not any further questions or comments he would then ask for a motion. Mr. Pharr then made the motion to approve the waiver with respect to location number 4 based on Staff's report and testimony, that it would not be detrimental to the community, that Covington does approve this waiver and it does meet their goals and objectives. Mr. Bridges seconded the motion. Mr. Darpel clarified it was location 4 on the northwest corner of Michigan Avenue and Baltimore Avenue from the residence at 4422 Michigan Avenue. Mr. Darpel then asked for the roll call on the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Pharr, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Wischer, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Armbruster, Mr. Berling, Ms. Best, Mr. Bethell in favor. The motion carried. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion for the remainder of the items on the issue. Mr. Pharr then made the motion with respect to locations 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and referenced their specific locations on the issue to deny the waivers for the reasons stated by Staff and that the City of Covington does not approve of the waivers. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Pharr, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Wischer, Mr. Armbruster, Mr. Berling, Ms. Best, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin and Mr. Pannunzio in favor. The motion carried. Mr. Darpel commented that the Commission is the final say in the matter and it will go no further. He stated he appreciated everyone's time and participation.

FILE: PC2101-0003

APPLICANT: Midland Atlantic Development Company, LLC per Clayton Riney on behalf of Citizens Deposit Bank and Trust Inc.

LOCATION: An area of approximately 1.25 acres located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Valley Plaza Parkway and Highland Pike in Fort Wright.

REQUEST: A revised Stage I Development Plan for the described area which is currently zoned NSC (C-PUD) (a neighborhood shopping center zone with a planned unit development overlay); the applicant proposes to construct a 2,200 square foot restaurant with a drive-thru, alter the drive-thru of an existing bank, and add off street parking.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Patrick Denbow

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on a revised Stage I Development Plan for the described area which is currently zoned NSC (C-PUD) (a neighborhood shopping center zone with a planned unit development overlay); the applicant proposes to construct a 2,200 square foot restaurant with a drive-thru, alter the drive-thru of an existing bank, and add off-street parking.

Mr. Clayton Riney with Midland Atlantic addressed the Commission on the matter. He stated they do two things primarily; they purchase stabilized grocery anchored shopping centers and they build single tenant properties like the one being presented. He stated he is a resident of Fort Wright and is happy to be developing this property. He stated they have been working with the city and PDS for a year and a lot has changed. He stated they have completely done a 180 and have taken into consideration PDS's concerns and citizens and they think they can make it work. He stated obviously a map amendment is required and their request for a provision was approved previously. He stated the site today is 2.5 acres larger but has a smaller building than originally planned. He stated both of the uses are still identical to the original plan and the building is smaller. He stated they specifically designed the building to function more of a tenant

building than to function as one building but separate tenants. He stated although they need a revision they are very close to what the original Stage I allowed and they ask the Commission's support. Mr. Darpel stated he loves the creativity with the drive through in the back. Mr. Riney stated it took about twelve months but they came up with a plan. He stated they had gotten creative and they pretty much have to tear down the canopy to reconfigure everything and make it work. He stated the user was very particular and it required them to jump through some hoops to get there.

Mr. John Pielsticker addressed the Commission and thanked Clayton Riney for his hard work in putting this together. He stated they are very satisfied with the end result and are looking forward to getting it completed.

Mr. Darpel then reconvened and closed the public hearing for discussion amongst Commissioners. Mr. Berling stated he just wanted to let the Commission know he has been in contact with the city administrator and they are all supportive of this project. There being no other clarification, Mr. Darpel reconvened and closed the public hearing. He asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Berling made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendation and the testimony presented, and that it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Bethell seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Best, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Phaer, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Wischer and Mr. Armstruster in favor. The motion carried.

FILE: PC2101-0001

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Chris Moriconi, City Administrator

REQUEST: Proposed text amendments to the Independence Zoning Ordinance amending regulations to the Industrial Park (IP) Zone to: (1) increase the maximum height of buildings from forty (40) feet to fifty (50) feet, (2) add additional office uses and accessory uses, and (3) add development controls for office uses.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Megan Busse

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation for the proposed text amendments to the Independence Zoning Ordinance amending regulations to the Industrial Park (IP) Zone to: (1) increase the maximum height of buildings from forty (40) feet to fifty (50) feet, (2) add additional office uses and accessory uses, and (3) add development controls for office uses.

Mr. Moriconi addressed the Commission in favor of the issue and stated he was available to answer any questions. Mr. Darpel stated he has never voted for requirements put into the building codes. Mr. Moriconi stated from a professional office aspect they had to put that in there. Mr. Darpel stated he gets it and not everybody agrees on everything. There being no other comments, Mr. Darpel recessed and closed the public hearing. There being no discussion, Mr. Darpel reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve based on the fact that they are appropriate and reasonable, and they do not adversely affect health, safety and welfare. Mr. Pannunzio seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr.

Simpson, Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Armbruster, Mr. Berling, Ms. Best, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Logsdon and Mr. Martin in favor. Mr. Darpel and Mr. Wischer voted against. Mr. Moriconi thanked Staff and Megan Busse for the great job they did on the issue.

Ongoing Business

Reports from Committees

Bylaws – Mr. Darpel apologized and stated he did not send out the new Committee assignments. He stated if there is someone who wants to be on a committee or wants to change committees he's happy to entertain that and he will try to accommodate that. He stated he could have Pam send out the list of committees. He asked if Mr. Dunham was still interested in being on the Bylaws Committee. Mr. Dunham stated he was still interested.

Direction 2030 Implementation – Mr. Bethell stated they did meet on the 28th. He stated they have gone through the land use of all the different entities. He stated nineteen of the entities in Kenton County and Covington had some land use questions that they wanted to have resolved. He stated they had some testimony from the people of Covington and noted the bottom line is Staff was going to be working on land use for the City of Covington so they can go ahead and get that finalized.

Executive– Mr. Darpel noted they did not meet but he did talk with Sharmilee Reddy and they plan to meet sometime in the next few weeks.

Social Media – Nothing to report.

Subdivision Review – Mr. Darpel stated he met with Steve Lilly and Sharmilee Reddy and they are getting closer on the final standards. He stated he is also going to try to meet with some of the inspectors to clean up a few things. He stated he wanted to try to get that done before the end of the year.

Z21 Review - Mr. Bridges stated there was nothing to report.

Reports from Commission members – Nothing to report.

Report from Legal Counsel– Nothing to report.

Reports/announcements from Staff- Mr. Videovich had nothing to report.

New Business – None.

Public Comments - None.

Mr. Darpel thanked the new Commissioners for their participation and hoped to see them in the next several months. There being nothing further to come before the Commission, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Mr. France. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair 

Date March 4, 2021