

Mi
KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Minutes

Mr. Brian Dunham, Chairman, called the meeting to order on March 7, 2024, 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 Planning and Development Services office in Covington. Attendance of members is as follows (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date).

Commission Member	Jurisdiction	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Anthony Baker	Covington		X										
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills	X	X										
Todd Berling	Fort Wright	X	X	X									
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X									
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	X	X									
Paul Darpel, Vice Chair	Edgewood	X	X	X									
Brian Dunham, Chairman	Kenton Cty	X	X	X									
Tom France	Ludlow	X	X	X									
John Hennessey	Villa Hills	X	X	X									
Yovonne Hurst	Ryland Heights		X										
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park	X	X	X									
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	X	X									
Dan McElheney	Erlanger		X										
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere	X	X	X									
Sean Pharr	Covington	X	X	X									
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X	X									
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	X										
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs	X	X	X									
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X	X									
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	X	X									

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

Also present were Mr. Matt Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Andy Videkovich, Mr. Cody Sheets and Ms. Sophia Roberto.

AGENDA:

Mr. Dunham asked for a motion with regard to the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Ryan seconded. All in favor by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Dunham asked for any questions or comments with regard to the minutes for February. He commented about there being 100% attendance for February. He also stated he wanted reflected in the minutes that he asked Mr. Wood what the last matter was that appeared before the commission, and he indicated he was not sure about that, and Mr. Videckovich responded it was the Corporex development. There being no other comments or questions, he then asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Bridges made the motion to approve with Mr. Dunham's amendments to the minutes. Mr. Bethell seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Berling, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Dunham stated the receipts and expenditures report for February was distributed. There were no comments or questions regarding the report. He then asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Ryan made the motion to approve the February receipts and expenditures. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation. The motion carried.

RECENT ACTIONS BY STAFF:

(No action required)

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

(No action required)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

FILE: PC-23-0008-TX

APPLICANT: Kenton County Fiscal Court per Joe Shriver, County Administrator

REQUEST: Proposed text amendment to the Kenton County Zoning Ordinance to (1) include commercial storage and outdoor yard space for campers, boats, and recreational vehicles as a permitted use within the RC (Rural Commercial) Zone; (2) introduce additional development controls for the commercial storage and outdoor yard space for campers, boats, and recreational vehicles; and (3) provide additional clarity regarding permitted uses and principal buildings within the RC Zone. This issue was tabled at the December 7, 2023 meeting.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Cody Sheets

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the proposed amendment to the Kenton County Zoning Ordinance to (1) include commercial storage and outdoor yard space for campers, boats, and recreational vehicles as a permitted use within the RC Zone; (2) introducing additional development controls for the commercial storage and outdoor yard space for campers, boats, and recreational vehicles; and (3) providing additional clarity regarding permitted uses and principal buildings within the RC Zone.

Mr. Shriver addressed the Commission on the issue and stated he appreciated the time tonight. He stated they had a couple folks interested in this type of use. He stated it was tabled when it was originally presented and he met with Staff to discuss the issue. He stated the interesting thing was after hearing the comments at the December 7th meeting and discussing the matter further with Kathy Donahue, he finds it even more appropriate than ever. He noted these are not large zones and they are usually located around intersections. He stated a lot of what was discussed was about the ills of having it in a residential area. He then noted it was the residents who wanted to store their boats and RVs. He noted they

do have subdivisions in unincorporated Kenton County who cannot store a boat or RV at their residence, and you would have to have use of this area. He additionally stated to the best of his knowledge, he hasn't heard a lot of complaints about the non-conforming uses. He stated when he looks at it, he doesn't see a proliferation of these things and he doesn't see where it would become a problem.

Ms. Kathy Donahue and Jennifer Myka addressed the Commission as members of the South Kenton County zoning committee. Ms. Donahue stated she would like to say they have a very good working relationship with the county, and have for years. She commented they just so happen to be on opposite sides of the fence on this issue. Ms. Myka gave some background on the group and what their goals are, as well as some history on storage yards in a rural commercial zone. She stated their group is against this proposed text amendment and stated it is inconsistent with the purpose statement of the RC zone, and that adoption of this amendment would set a precedent of disregarding the purpose statement and its defining characteristics, and also the adoption of it further opens the door for allowing future inconsistent use requests when the use has not been demonstrated as a need of our rural community. Ms. Donahue then addressed the Commission again and stated that RV and boat storage yards do not fit the definition of retail and professional services. She stated they are not retail and professional services. She further noted the purpose of these storage yards will not be small in size. She stated most sites like these are 7-10 acres. She stated a good rule of thumb is about 40 vehicles per acre. She noted they feel it should be in a light industrial zone. She further noted this would be against the intent of Z21. She asked why should a use that is only placed in the Industrial zone in the rest of Kenton County be permitted in a rural zone. Ms. Myka stated at the December meeting when this was first proposed, there was disagreement as to whether this use was needed by the rural community. She then highlighted the results of a survey with regard to RV storage. She noted this will impact adjoining residential homes and farms. Ms. Donahue then showed some slides of the vicinity and other lots that could possibly be rezoned and used for this proposal. She stated they appreciated the county's attempt to add some developmental controls, but they feel it is like trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. She noted the lighting would still impact the homes in the area, and a fence could be within five feet of a property line. She asked how much landscaping would hide the five foot fence and screen out noise. She stated storage yards increase impervious surfaces. She then noted all the RC zones within A1 zones are outside SD1 area. Ms. Myka then stated that development within the RC zone is intended to maintain the rural character of South Kenton County and maintain the character of small rural areas. She then thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present their rationale for their objections to the proposed amendment. Mr. Ryan asked if they determined how many RC zones are in the area. Ms. Myka stated they mainly stayed within the A1 zone. Mr. Sketch asked why anyone would want to store a boat in Southern Kenton County. Ms. Myka stated that's a question they asked and the vast majority in the area don't need this storage. Mr. Sketch asked why this wasn't considered to be a conditional use. Ms. Donahue stated they rather prefer to be proactive versus reactive. She noted they are just trying to keep their A1 zone the way it is and not have it slide into something it's not. Ms. Vaughn asked about the non-conforming uses and what she thought of those. Ms. Donahue stated in her opinion they are unsightly, especially in the winter when the leaves are down. Mr. Martin stated under the current zoning truck sales are permitted. He asked what difference in their mind would Ford F150's vs. Rv's be in that zone. Ms. Myka stated she thinks it's in adding something that's not there and adding to what is already existing. Mr. France asked about the survey and the number of people in South Kenton who have an RV.

Ms. Joan Martin was registered to speak but had nothing to add.

Ms. Patty Davidson addressed the Commission and stated she wanted to thank Ms. Myka and Ms. Donahue for their presentation and stated they did a good job. She stated she is against this and moved here because she loved the rural atmosphere and peacefulness of the area. She stated she doesn't want to see any of this out her big picture window when she looks out. She further stated she knows a lot of people who own boats who drink and party on their boats, and she would not appreciate them coming in at 3:00 in the morning and making a big ruckus. She stated Kenton County would be doing a disservice to the residents by allowing this. She commented that putting something like this in the area would increase the traffic in the area. She noted an elderly person was already hit getting her mail. She stated she can see a lot more accidents happening on that road. She also commented about the slippage in the yard and septic lines and that will deter the value of her home if she ever decides to sell. She stated septic lines are not cheap to fix and if people think there is something that can happen with those, they are not going to want to take that chance. She stated she doesn't want to look at something like this, even with a six foot fence. She stated she would hope the Commission would take this into consideration. She also commented about the flammable items stored on boats, trash and stated all these things are concerning to her. She stated she likes her peaceful community and she hopes they take that into consideration.

Ms. Patty Conover addressed the Commission against the issue and stated this is very upsetting and it's an older community. She stated this is just ugly and it's upsetting and it just shouldn't be there. She noted a half mile up the road there is a big one with hundreds of campers in there, and it doesn't make sense to put another one a half mile down the road. She stated you don't know what is going to happen and she just doesn't think it belongs there. Mr. Martin commented and asked if she knew there were 22 other uses already allowed in this zone. He stated there are a number of things that would create a lot more traffic than a storage facility. She stated she guarantees they will make it a storage facility and not one of the other uses. Mr. Martin stated he's struggling with adding one use with a number of uses and why the storage facility is such an issue.

Mr. Tom Huffman was registered to speak and had nothing to add.

Ms. Oria Huffman addressed the Commission against the issue and stated the whole street is family. She commented that the Commission is missing a big point. She stated she moved here from New York when she got married. She stated one of the things they love is the drive on Taylor Mill Road and all the curves and the beauty of the area. She stated there are little buildings there but they were built in the 50's and 60's so they kind of blend in with the area. She stated the storage facility makes the road ugly. She stated if you're going to put in something like that, hide it away so no one can see it. She stated this is right there. She commented let's build where it makes sense and let's use common sense. She then stated let's not make it ugly.

Mr. Bill Morgan addressed the Commission against the issue and stated he lives across the road from the In and Out Market and it's already noisy. He stated he thinks it will really make it a lot noisier if approved. He asked if this will affect people who own boats and RV's who store them on their property. He stated he does have a camper on his property and he only has a half acre.

Mr. Shriver addressed the Commission in rebuttal and responded to Mr. Dunham's question about making this a conditional use. He noted it could be, but like Mr. Martin, he kept looking at the list of permitted uses and he kept thinking if you're allowing these things, why are putting more into this use, and he could not come up with a compelling reason. He stated he kept going back to the tractors and the trucks and those things. He stated if we put this forward as a conditional use and the court absolutely can. Mr. Sketch asked if this was just one area because it seems the people are concerned about just this area. Mr. Shriver stated the text amendment would change it everywhere, not just this area. He stated the lot in question is 3.8 acres. Mr. Ryan commented there was someone who owns 3.8 acres and that's what prompted this change. Mr. Shriver stated that is correct. He further commented he went to the court and stated he would like to make this a permitted use. Mr. Ryan stated the other uses are all retail commercial uses, and this request appears to be a departure from the other uses. He noted when they generally do text amendments they are adding something that is similar in kind. He stated this does not appear to be retail or professional services. Mr. Shriver stated he does think there is a use for the area, and because of the issue of not having this stuff in residential zones - and there are areas in unincorporated Kenton County that are subdivisions and this would not be a place where they would store an RV or a camper. He stated to that end he is looking at different pieces of it and not necessarily the transactional part of it and is this an associated use. He stated in that regard he sees it as it does. Mr. Berling asked about light industrial being a better fit and asked if there were other areas in Kenton County that would be a better fit for that. Mr. Shriver stated PDS would be a better source for that because he does not know. Mr. Bridges commented about the person who came before the court asking about this amendment and stated so there is a person interested in this. Mr. Shriver stated he is not here for the person interested in the text amendment, he is here on behalf of the court. Mr. Bridges stated all those here are against it and there is no one for it. Mr. Shriver stated he serves the whole county and he is presenting this before the Commission. Mr. France stated the person interested in doing this is not here tonight but all those against are here. Mr. France asked Mr. Shriver what is the county's point in bringing this when the constituents do not want it. He further stated when so many are opposed, what is driving the county to do it. Mr. Shriver stated the whole process is to bring this here so it can be vetted. He stated he is not here on behalf of the applicant, he is here on behalf of the court. He stated he is not opposed to any of these folks and noted the motivation was only to have it vetted. Mr. Bridges asked if he is neutral on the issue. Mr. Shriver stated he is neutral. Mr. Dunham then asked staff the question that was presented if this would impact someone who owns an RV and stores it on their lot. Mr. Sheets stated it would not. Mr. Dunham asked if this gets passed, how would this differ from what was shown in the photo in the presentation. Mr. Sheets commented that is a valid point and noted as stated gravel and pavement would be required. Mr. Martin commented about the storing of RV's in an RC zone.

Mr. Dunham then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Bethell stated he's been on the Commission for several years and once again, the South Kenton people have presented very well and have come prepared and make logical arguments and so forth. He stated he is a bit conflicted on how to vote on this. He stated in one sense he agrees with Mr. Martin in terms of uses already permitted. He also said he would have to defer to the wishes of the people in his vote. Mr. Dunham stated we are a planning commission and we're supposed to look at this subjectively from a planning standpoint and not whether or not somebody comes with more folks speaking for or against it. He stated I would just think we would be looking at it as a reasonable addition to permitted uses in an RC zone. He further stated getting a feel for what is in there and looking at it as a plan is what should drive us. Mr. Bethell then stated he would concur we are a planning commission and stated in planning he feels the people should be a part of that plan. Mr. Pharr stated if we're looking at it and determining if it is reasonable through the lens of you know, Staff is saying using the word compatible and with what Commissioner Ryan is saying, is this thing like the rest of them and he tends to agree more with Mr. Ryan on it. He stated other than that, the other 21 of them are repair shops, banks, beauty shops etc., and are more in line with servicing the residents. He stated as Mr. Shriver pointed out, these zones seem to be along intersections along the roads there and it seems like we're carving out an exception that doesn't seem to fit with the rest of the other uses and he feels it's stretching what this is. Mr. Bridges stated he's really amazed that there is no limit on this. He stated there is no restriction on this. He further stated just because there are three kinds of poison on the shelf we don't need to add a fourth. He further commented he's been on the Commission for a number of years and he's never seen a situation where there is no one for an issue. He stated not one person stated I want to place my RV here. He asked why would we go against something that all these people are against and no one is for. He stated it is not retail and is not professional services. Mr. Sketch stated in all the planning commission meetings, what is the percentage of people coming for something versus the percentage of people coming against. He further asked in doing any kind of planning, you've got to do it on a land use issue, you can't do it because people don't like it. Ms. Snyder stated they are supposed to sit back and listen to the presentation and look at everything fact based and go with everything that is best for the county not fifteen people here. Ms. Vaughn stated she is so respectful of this process and the Commission and sitting and listening to everything. She stated everyone has been so respectful. She also stated she lives in the area and she has never been so conflicted on an issue. She further stated there are all these conflicting things in her mind. She stated she thinks the fiscal court will continue to listen to them and for her, she has decided she is going to vote for it and she doesn't think it is necessarily a perfect solution, but knows there is another solution where they can seek an appeal and for people to talk on this. Mr. Bridges reiterated people should have some kind of say and no one came out to speak in favor of it. He stated it is not retail or professional services. He stated there is plenty of industrial land that could be slated for it in the areas and it doesn't have to be in people's backyards. Mr. Bethell stated he doesn't think he indicated we shouldn't listen to the people, but he thinks people surrounding that property have a vested interest in how that property should be used. Mr. Bethell then stated he thinks we need to weigh all these things and that's why he stands with the folks from Southern Kenton County. Mr. Dunham stated just to be clear, he did not say - and he knows he's not saying we don't listen to folks and it's a very important process. He stated if we simply listened to what people said around undeveloped property, we would never have any development. He stated people have a right to develop property in a way that makes sense for the surrounding area from a planning standpoint. Mr. Bethell stated he concurs and thinks they have done that as a Commission on any number of occasions. Mr. Logsdon stated he has been sitting here listening to this all night and stated it brings back some interesting memories in planning. He stated he can't see where what is being proposed is fitting into the purpose statement, nor can I see where some of the uses already existing fit into that purpose statement. He stated this clearly states smaller in scale and smaller in size. He stated he doesn't think someone living in rural Kenton County would have trouble finding somewhere to store their camper. He stated if we're really serious about this, the county should be thinking about a conditional use. He further stated he thinks we need to look closely at this if he follows the purpose statement of a rural RC zone. He stated he would probably vote against it because there are better ways it can be done like with a conditional use. Mr. France stated it clearly states the intent is to maintain the rural character of the area. He asked does this fit this or not. He stated he is inclined to say it does not fit. Mr. France also commented about the Fiscal Court being neutral and not advocating for or against it, and that within the definition of the zone it is clear to him it does not fit to be a permitted use within the RC zone. Mr. Bridges stated this is supposed to be small in scale and this would be the only thing without a limit and asked why would this not have a size limit. Mr. Sketch stated the lumber yard doesn't have a size limit. Mr. Bridges stated all their stuff is under roof. Ms. Vaughn then commented there were some public comments on the issue. Mr. Dunham then read a summary of those into the record on the matter and marked those as exhibits to be made a part of the record. Mr. Dunham then closed the public hearing and asked for a motion on the matter. Ms. Vaughn made the motion to approve the text amendment based on Staff's recommendation, the discussions heard and that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and with added information that making it a conditional use rather than a permitted use may be something the county commission may want to consider instead of the current rationale. Mr. Dunham asked if the comments about the conditional use were a consideration. Ms. Vaughn stated a consideration. Mr.

Matt Smith clarified an informational comment. Ms. Vaughn noted in the affirmative. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call on the motion found Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Sketch, Mr. Berling, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio and Ms. Snyder in favor. Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pharr and Mr. Ryan voted against. The motion failed. Ms. Vaughn then made another motion to deny the request and that although Staff had a favorable recommendation, pursuant to the full discussion by all participants and the neutral recommendation of county administrator, Mr. Joe Shriver, the Commissioners as a body believe it is best not to approve this at this time and move to deny it. Mr. Bridges seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pharr and Mr. Ryan in favor. Mr. Berling, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Sketch and Ms. Snyder voted against. The motion was approved.

FILE: PC-24-0009-TX

APPLICANT: City of Independence per Chris Moriconi, City Administrator

REQUEST: A proposed text amendment to allow fences in the front yards of corner lots.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Sophia Roberto

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendment to allow fences in the front yards of corner lots.

Mr. Chris Moriconi addressed the Commission and stated this was brought to their attention by several residents. He stated for people with a corner lot, this would allow the sidewalk to go almost up to someone's yard. He stated they looked at this particular lot and it was kind of confusing because it says front yard but this is actually a side yard. Mr. Bridges asked if there was any consideration or distinction for a dominant street. Mr. Moriconi stated this is just a corner lot and there was no dominant street consideration.

Mr. David Riggs addressed the Commission as a neutral party. He stated he's kind of for this but kind of not. He stated he bought this house after he retired from the military and has four kids under the age of 6. He stated he would like to keep them safe and would just like to cover his area. He stated he has about twenty feet of land he can't fence in at all. Mr. France stated this would not help Mr. Riggs even if approved. Mr. Moriconi said that is correct. Mr. Riggs further stated he has emailed each council member regarding this. Mr. Moriconi stated he thinks the Board of Adjustment can only be used if they find an error. Mr. Riggs stated he's just trying to get the 500 square feet of his property - that he paid for - fenced in. Additional discussion was had as to reverse corner lots and side streets and discussion on standard lots.

Mr. Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion. He stated this is probably more generous than he would want to see if he was a neighbor. He noted other than providing a little more clarification than the depiction, he's okay with it. Mr. Ryan stated he thinks there are options available for appeal and the city would need to present the other arguments before they make the final decisions. Mr. Dunham then reconvened and closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Ms. Snyder made a favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendment stating it is appropriate and reasonable and is consistent with the comprehensive plan, and the comments heard and the recommendations by the city. Mr. Martin seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Martin, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Dunham entered the photographs submitted by Mr. Riggs as exhibits into the record.

Reports from Committees

Bylaws – Mr. Dunham stated there were no updates.

Direction 2030 Implementation – Nothing to report.

Executive – Mr. Dunham stated they had a recent meeting and covered a few things for follow up meetings. He commented about a bond issue. Mr. Smith then commented about bonds related to the Towne Center that there was some discussion on

it and stated there are bonds over twenty years old. He stated they don't have a scaling that has to be increased. He stated there are three bonds at issue. He stated the City of Independence has been discussing the three bonds and have come up with an agreement that he feels is reasonable. He stated they would be a party to the agreement and what it would provide for is two bonds that comes out to \$139,085.32 that the planning commission would release those bonds but only after the Towne Center actually paid that sum to the City of Independence. He stated the city would then have to make those improvements. Mr. Smith stated from what he understands, the \$139,000 isn't even going to cover the design costs. He stated it is nice the city is stepping up to do this. He further stated as it relates to the third bond, it is a \$111,000 bond and the city is satisfied with the improvements that have been made there, and the cabinet is slated to have improvements at that intersection anyway. He stated at the end of the day, the agreement would be with the planning commission and would be with the City of Independence and it would be with the Towne Center that upon the city's receipt of \$139,085.32 they would confirm to the Commission that they have received those funds, and the commission would proceed to release those three stale bonds. Mr. Smith further stated the city has then agreed, in accordance with the subdivision regulations, to complete the improvements at the Centennial intersection, which according to the city is the most important intersection to be improved. He stated the city would then work with Staff and subdivision regulations to put it out for bids. He stated they would then indemnify the Commission as well as the Towne Center from anything to do with the agreement and they are releasing the bonds as the two parties have agreed. Mr. Smith stated he thinks it's been a long time coming and he doesn't see any reason not to approve it. He further stated he knows the executive committee voted to approve it and noted in order to approve it they need a motion to enter into the agreement. Mr. Ryan made the motion to authorize the chair to enter into an agreement with the Planning Commission, the City of Independence and the Independence Towne Center LLC regarding bonds in substantiating the form as presented to the Executive Commission. Ms. Snyder seconded. All in favor by acclamation.

Social Media - Mr. Ryan stated they talked about adding storage space to emails, which is about \$200 more to have unlimited storage to be able to keep more emails.

Subdivision Review – Mr. Darpel stated that he would like authorization to submit the application to approve some minor revisions to the sub regs at the next meeting to just clean up some items that were found. He stated he would like authorization for that to be put on the agenda for next month. He stated they would be circulating those in the next few days and were just cleaning up some items they found in the field. Mr. Darpel then made the motion to authorize to submit that on the agenda for next month for the subdivision regulations revisions. Mr. Sketch seconded. All in favor by acclamation.

Z21 Review - Mr. Bridges stated they did not meet.

Comments from Commissioners - No report.

Report from Legal Counsel – Nothing to report.

Reports/Announcements from Staff - Mr. Videkovich stated Mr. Simpson had a meeting conflict and was not able to be present. He stated the Implementation Committee is meeting next Tuesday to review the draft recommendations for the comprehensive plan. He stated Mr. Simpson is working with that group on the housing recommendations and will hopefully have that hashed out by April. He noted after April, they are going to be gearing up to have another round with their public consultant. He then went through the procedure for logging in the KCPC email and what is needed for that. Mr. Smith commented that the original intent of having a designated KCPC was to have it separate from a personal email in the case of an open records request. He stated it would not interfere with personal or business accounts. He suggested either using the KCPC account or that a notice gets sent that there is an email to be read and not send it to the personal or business email. He stated doing so would destroy the purpose for which it was designed. Mr. Videkovich stated they can look into getting a notification for the emails to see if that can work. He noted they could look into that.

General Correspondence - Mr. Dunham stated there was correspondence about the Brent Spence project but those dates had all passed. Mr. Videkovich stated an email had been sent out about that.

New Business – None.

Public Comments - None.

There being nothing further to come before the Commission, Mr. Dunham asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Darpel. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair BMF

Date 4-4-2024



