

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

Mr. Brian Dunham, Chairman, called the meeting to order on July 10, 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).

<b>Commission Member</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Gabriella DeAngelis</b>	Covington						X	X					
<b>Margo Baumgardner</b>	Crestview Hills	X	X		X	X		X					
<b>Todd Berling</b>	Fort Wright	X	X	X	X	X		X					
<b>Jeff Bethell</b>	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Gailen Bridges</b>	Bromley	X	X	X		X	X	X					
<b>Paul Darpel, Vice Chair</b>	Edgewood	X	X	X		X	X						
<b>Brian Dunham, Chairman</b>	Kenton Cty	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Tom France</b>	Ludlow	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>John Hennessey</b>	Villa Hills	X	X	X	X		X	X					
<b>Yovonne Hurst</b>	Ryland Heights		X										
<b>Keith Logsdon</b>	Lakeside Park	X	X	X		X	X	X					
<b>Matthew Martin</b>	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X	X							
<b>Todd Herrmann</b>	Erlanger							X					
<b>Joe Pannunzio</b>	Elsmere	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Sean Pharr</b>	Covington	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Phil Ryan, Treasurer</b>	Park Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Kareem Simpson</b>	Covington	X	X		X	X	X						
<b>Greg Sketch</b>	Crescent Spgs	X	X	X	X	X*		X					
<b>Maura Snyder</b>	Independence	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
<b>Debbie Vaughn</b>	Kenton Co	X	X	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, Ms. Megan Bessey, Mr. Patrick Denbow and Ms. Celeste Leonard.

### **AGENDA:**

Mr. Dunham asked for a motion on the agenda. Mr. Dunham noted a request to table item 13 from the agenda had been received. He then asked for a motion for that change to the agenda. A motion was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Ryan. All in favor by acclamation.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mr. Dunham asked for any questions or comments with regard to the minutes for June. There being none, Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Bridges seconded. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bethell, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr and Mr. Ryan voted in favor. Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Sketch and Ms. Vaughn abstained. The motion carried.

### **RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:**

Mr. Dunham stated the receipts and expenditures report for June 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 June receipts and expenditures. Mr. Bridges 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-24-0001-CT**

**APPLICANT:** Northstar Towers II, LLC per F. Keith Brown on behalf of Bach Farm, LLC

**LOCATION:** 14235 George W Bach Road, an area of approximately 98.19 acres located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Moffett Road and George W Bach Road. The property also has frontage on the west side of Decoursey Pike approximately 2,400 feet south of Ishmael Road in Unincorporated Kenton County.

**REQUEST:** Location and extent of a Wireless Communications Facility and associated ground structures, including one modification request to the required landscaping requirements; the applicant proposes to construct a 199-foot macro cell tower with the following modification request: (1) perimeter evergreen tree screening to be planted in a straight row surrounding the compound where a staggered pattern is required.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Patrick Denbow

### **PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Favorable recommendation on the location and extent of a Wireless Communications Facility and associated ground structures, including modification requests on the required landscaping.

Prior to anyone speaking on the issue, Mr. Smith gave a brief overview of cell tower law for those Commissioners new to the Commission and what role the Commission has in terms of cell tower applications.

Mr. Keith Brown addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. He stated the anchor tenant is Verizon Wireless Dr and he noted he believes they have provided all the documentation for the issue. He stated there were a few things he wanted to emphasize. He stated they are proud of their application and have waived confidentiality. He additionally noted the documentation is in the administrative record. He gave a brief slide presentation of the location of the area where they are proposing the cell tower. He also highlighted the coverage expected with the addition of this cell tower compared to what is being offered presently. He further noted the tower is a 195 feet tall monopole which is a very common size tower for this type. He noted the tower follows all building design requirements. He additionally noted the tower is capable of

servicing three co-locators on the tower. He stated he wanted to emphasize that the tower would be 1,070 feet from the nearest residence. He further stated Northstar is going to spend a lot of money on this tower and they wanted to be sure they met the gap in the area with coverage. He additionally stated the search area was a .5 mile radius and they found a very large farm parcel in an area that is open and would not require a lot of tree removal, which is costly. He stated they think this is a very good location. He further stated the coverage goes out considerably longer than the .5 miles and would provide significantly better coverage than what is currently available. He stated coverage is expanding out in that area. He also noted Verizon would like to co-locate with other towers wherever they can, but there was no option to do that in this area. He stated if it is placed too far out it's not going to provide the coverage and it would be useless. He further noted they think it is the least intrusive in the area and they are not close to residences. He additionally noted they think they have complied with regulations and they wanted to make sure there was due process with the application. He further stated they did a study of the other towers in Kenton County and the majority of them are taller than this one. He noted there is nothing that stands out about this one except for height. Mr. Smith addressed the Commission and stated Staff did a good explanation of the landscaping being proposed. He noted he wanted to point out they are planting 8 foot tall trees which are taller than is required. He stated there would be no signage other than what is required pertaining to high voltage as required by law. He stated they have done all the notices to neighboring property owners that is required. He thanked Mr. Smith for the explanation of cell towers and explaining what the Commission is to do. He stated they think they met all the Federal requirements and the local requirements necessary. He stated they believe they can improve the service substantially in this area and they hope they will receive approval.

Mr. Tyler Arlinghaus addressed the Commission and asked if the equipment will be new or old equipment they will be installing dry. Mr. Smith addressed the question and stated the equipment is new and he has never heard of using old or refurbished equipment for the cell towers.

No others registered to speak had anything to add.

Mr. Dunham read a letter into the record in support of the issue. He then marked the letter as an exhibit to be made a part of the record on the matter.

The meeting was then recessed for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Bridges stated he was familiar with the area and this is a great spot for it. Mr. Dunham then began reconvening the public hearing to ask for a vote. Mr. John Jackson stated he had signed up to speak on the issue. He then addressed the Commission against the issue and stated he just wanted to find out what was going to happen. The Chairman allowed him to speak since he had signed up on the wrong form. Mr. Jackson stated he didn't know anything about this until he got the letter. He stated his question is the people that are putting this up don't want it next to them just as he doesn't want it next to him. He stated they keep saying this is in the middle of a farm and it's not, it is right on the corner of the property. He stated this will bring more people to the area and traffic is bad as it is. He commented he is totally against it and totally against the way they went about it. He stated if they want a cell tower they can put it on the other side and he is totally against it.

Legal counsel for the Commission, Mr. Matt Smith then commented and stated that by Federal law this board doesn't have anything to do with the location and they don't have any say on moving the cell tower to another location. He further stated this is determined by the government as a location for a cell tower and it is not something they control. He noted that is probably not what he wanted to hear but he just wanted to explain that the Commission has no control over the placement of cell towers.

Mr. Dunham then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He stated this would be broken into two motions and asked for a motion on the matter. Ms. Vaughn then made the motion to approve with regard to the cell tower based on the testimony heard, Federal regulations and Staff report. Mr. Bethell seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bridges, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch and Ms. Snyder in favor. The motion carried. Mr. Dunham then asked for a motion as to the second request with regard to the planting of the trees on the site based on the testimony heard, Federal regulations and Staff's report. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Vaughn, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Sketch and Ms. Snyder in favor. The motion carried.

**FILE: PC-24-0002-CT**

**APPLICANT:** Baker Donelson per Erin Connelly on behalf of Vertical Bridge, LLC

**LOCATION:** 6057 Taylor Mill Road; an area of approximately 0.83 acres located between Senour Road to the north and Klette Road to the south, approximately 450 feet south of Senour Road, in Independence.

**REQUEST:** Location and extent of a Wireless Communications Facility and associated ground structures, including modification requests to the required setbacks, paving, and camouflaged tower design requirements.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendation by Mr. Andy Videckovich

#### **PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION #1**

Favorable recommendation on the location and extent of a Wireless Communications Facility and associated ground structures, including modification requests to the required setbacks and camouflaged tower design requirements.

#### **PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION #2**

Unfavorable recommendation on the modification request to the required paving requirements.

Mr. Andy Rogenstrike addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant in favor of the issue. He noted they've got to get the coverage to the people where they live and where they work. He stated this site was requested and coverage is needed in this area with the residential and commercial area and people working from home. He stated Staff did a great job of explaining what they are doing. He then highlighted the plan and showed the area of the site that will be leased for this application. He noted none of the trees outside the orange square depicted in his presentation will be taken down. He stated the area is fairly wooded considering the location and there are some houses to the north. He noted this site is a little problematic because of the topography and the way it falls off. He noted there is more of a slope than what it looks like and commented there is a reason why the pole is a little offset. He noted they are trying to have it back as far as they can off the highway so that is the reason for that. He also noted this will be a 150 foot pole. He stated it is a single pole design. He then commented as to the additional coverage that will be gained by this pole and showed pictures depicting the coverage before and after. He additionally commented about how they got to this location. He noted T-Mobile needed extra coverage and the first thing they do is to look for other tall structures they can use. He noted there was nothing in that area that they could use so that is why they are proposing this tower. He noted it would allow for co-locators as well. He additionally stated there is room for four carriers on this pole. He noted one of the major aspects is the elimination report map showing the other properties that were looked at for this cell tower. He then stated in order to put in a cell tower they first need to find a willing property owner, they have to be able to lease it at a reasonable cost, and they look at the property to see if it is constructible for the pole in order to make it work. He then showed a list of addresses that letters went to regarding finding a location. He noted they have adjusted the tower as best they can for the site. He additionally commented on the waiver they are requesting and noted they are asking for a waiver for the fence not for the tower. He showed a slide depicting what the fencing looks like around a tower. He stated they are not asking for any waivers for any landscaping and will do what is required. He then showed an image of the single monopole and what this particular pole would look like. He stated they have to get the pole up above the treeline in order to get the signal. He noted they did look at camouflaging the pole by making it a tree, but determined it is more intrusive than just the monopole. He then showed a slide depicting what a pole camouflaged by fake tree branches looks like to compare. He then discussed the access. He stated paving it is a little overkill so they are trying to see if there is some compromise in paving part and making part of the access gravel. He stated they understand the need to keep gravel off of Taylor Mill Road and they are considerate of that. He stated that to pave it all the way to the back when it is going to be used once a month is a little overkill. He noted they are not just asking for a waiver just to get out of meeting the ordinance. He noted coming to a compromise of doing an additional thirty-five (35) feet back with the existing fifteen (15) feet that area is what they are proposing. Mr. Rogenstrike stated they searched for two years for a site that would work and this is not something that they just decided on this location to put up a cell tower. He noted they looked at over forty (40) other locations and they have done their homework. He stated they are only asking for a waiver on the gravel because of the issue of keeping gravel off the road and keeping dust down. He noted they do not have a problem with that. He stated he wanted to talk about the use of the flagpole and why he didn't use that as an example. He stated it would have been considered if it was something they could do, but they would not be able to meet the ordinance because they could only have three co-locators if they did a flag pole. He stated he was not trying to put one over on the Commission, it's just that that type would not work as they could not meet the ordinance and they would have had to ask for more waivers. Mr. France asked about the set back of half the height of the pole and why it was not the entire length of the pole. Mr. Rogenstrike stated the reason is that the pole is designed with a weak spot in the unlikely event that it would fail so that it collapses within the fenced area.

Mr. Jason Riggs addressed the Commission in terms of the setback and stated it is not what the tower height is, it's based on what is required not half the height of the pole itself.

Mr. Steven O'Brien addressed the Commission and thanked the Staff for answering all his many calls over the past couple weeks on the issue and stated they were very helpful. He stated he is completely in agreement that the driveway should be completely paved just as other residences are in the area. He stated the proposal poses a significant change to the site. He noted this proposed use is a major deviation from their current characteristics. He stated the PVA stated that a visible cell tower from their property would be a reduction in value of their property and suggested they take a before and after photo. He then asked if there was to be compensation for the reduced value of their property. He noted he would have valued the statement of the impact on nearby land and that it strikes him as important information. He stated the pine tree versus the monopole struck him that there should be more options available. He stated the area is only going to grow more dense in the coming years and stated it would be extremely noticeable as a monopole. He stated he looked up the owner and they are out of state which is fine, but it likely doesn't impact them. He asked how exhaustive the search was by the applicant and felt that could be looked into further. He stated he went to the Kentucky Secretary of State and asked if Vertical Point is registered in Kentucky because he could not find them on the site.

Williams Robluss addressed the Commission on the issue and stated he is against it as he does not want to be looking at this every day it is right across from his porch and he does not want to be looking at it every day. He also noted the impact on wildlife and stated there is a 2.9% decrease in property value if a cell tower is in sight of your home.

Mr. Logan Batson addressed the Commission and stated one of his concerns is the water runoff is going to go right into his yard. He noted that adding this concrete and losing the vegetation is going to cause the water to go right into his yard so he has a concern about that. He noted he thinks the property size is too small for this and has concerns about that as well. He asked how you explore a reasonable rate with a landowner and how that is determined. He then stated exploring the other 40 properties would be a good idea because some of them are more remote.

Mr. Rogenstrike addressed the Commission in rebuttal and read part of the report from Staff's expert with regard to the camouflaging of the pole. He noted they have been having discussions about every alternative for this pole for the past two years and they are not just coming in here saying they want to put up a cell tower. He then spoke to the property values from a report done in Louisville for a cell tower. He stated it was going to be a 284 foot tower and showed an image of the tower and the houses in the area. He noted there was no difference in the sale prices of the homes near the cell tower and just wanted to point that out. Mr. Berling asked about the criteria in looking for a location. Mr. Rogenstrike then reviewed the steps for searching and selecting a location for a proposed cell tower. He noted once they find a location they have it sent to their engineers to see if it will work and if it doesn't, it doesn't move on to the next steps in the criteria.

Mr. Dunham then recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. He stated he is fine with their good faith effort in finding a good location. He noted he agreed with Mr. Sketch about paving the access drive. Mr. Bethell asked if you put in concrete for all the drive versus gravel, would that create a hard surface issue for the water run off versus the gravel. Mr. Sketch stated if a larger rock is used the water will generally permeate the ground better than concrete will. He stated his point is if the regulations call for it and if residences have to put concrete driveways all the way back to their house, they really should too. Mr. Berling asked about the Federal regulations and the set back required as to whether or not if they did not approve the setback would they still be able to put in the pole. Mr. Smith stated regardless of the Federal law, they still have to meet the requirements. Following the discussion, Mr. Dunham reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter and asked that the motion be done in parts. Mr. Bridges then commented that according to the Secretary of State they are not registered in the State of Kentucky. Mr. Duham then commented that is not under the Commission's purview. Ms. Snyder then made the motion to approve the application for the cell tower based on Staff's report and the testimony given. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Vaughn, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethel, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr and Mr. Ryan in favor. Mr. Bridges abstained. The motion carried. With regard to the set back request, Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve the waiver based on Staff's recommendations and the testimony heard. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Sketch, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logdson, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr and Ms. Vaughn in favor. Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling Mr. Hennessey and Mr. Ryan voted against. The motion carried. With regard to the waiver as to the paving of the driveway, Ms. Snyder made the motion to deny based on the testimony heard and that it does not meet

the regulation standards. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried. With regard to the waiver as to the camouflage design requirements, Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve the request based on the information provided and that it is consistent with the design standards. Mr. Sketch seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Ms. Snyder, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

**FILE: PC-24-0014-TX**

**APPLICANT:** The City of Erlanger per Mark Collier, Director of Economic Development and Assistant City Administrator

**REQUEST:** Proposed text amendments to the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance for medical cannabis uses: (1) to allow medical cannabis cultivation, processing, producing, and safety compliance facilities as permitted uses within the BP (Business Park), FI (Flex Industrial), and GI (General Industrial) Zones; (2) to allow medical cannabis dispensaries as a permitted use within the ROC (Residential Office Conversion), NC (Neighborhood Commercial), CC (Community Commercial), HC (Highway Commercial), and MU (Mixed-Use) Zones; and (3) establishing use specific standards, required off-street parking standards, and defining medical cannabis uses and related terms.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Patrick Denbow

**PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendments to the Erlanger Zoning Ordinance for medical cannabis uses: (1) to allow medical cannabis cultivation, processing, producing, and safety compliance facilities as permitted uses within the BP (Business Park), FI (Flex Industrial), and GI (General Industrial) Zones; (2) to allow medical cannabis dispensaries as a permitted use within the ROC (Residential Office Conversion), NC (Neighborhood Commercial), CC (Community Commercial), HC (Highway Commercial), and MU (Mixed-Use) Zones; and (3) establishing use specific standards, required off-street parking standards, and defining medical cannabis uses and related terms.

Mr. Mark Collier addressed the Commission and stated he does not have a lot to add to Staff's report. He noted the district is within the buffer zone. He noted it is very restricted and there are not a lot of areas for this type of business to go in. He stated council has gotten a lot of questions as to where these will be permitted to go in. He noted this is something that council is really embracing and he is glad they are being proactive.

Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Ryan stated there really isn't a legal argument against restricting it. Mr. Pannunzio stated you would have to have a license so anyone would need that. He noted he thinks they are overstating it. Mr. Baumgardner clarified this would be a permitted use not a conditional use. Mr. Dunham then reconvened and closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Mr. Herrmann made the motion to approve the text amendment based on Staff's report and recommendations. Mr. Logsdon seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Pannunzio, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Dunham, Mr. Hennessey, Ms. Logsdon, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn voted in favor. Mr. France voted against. The motion carried.

**FILE: PC-24-0015-TX**

**APPLICANT:** The City of Elsmere per D. Marty Lenhof, Mayor

**REQUEST:** Proposed text amendments to the Elsmere Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum height of allowable side and rear yard fences within the GI (General Industrial) Zone from seven feet to eight feet, and to allow those same fence types to be located within front yards at a maximum height of eight feet.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Celeste Leonard

**PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Favorable recommendation on the proposed text amendment to the Elsmere Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum height of allowable side and rear yard fences within the GI (General Industrial) Zone from seven feet to eight feet, and to allow those same fence types to be located within front yards at a maximum height of eight feet.

Mr. Greg Voss addressed the Commission on the issue. He stated they have had a lot of growth within the last few years and this is the premise behind this request for the industrial zone. Mr. Bridges asked if this was for looks or for security. Mr. Voss stated it was for security.

Mr. Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion. There being none, he then reconvened and closed the public hearing. Mr. Pannunzio made the motion to approve based on it being a safety measure and there has been a lot of industrial growth. Mr. Bethell seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Bethell, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bridges, Mr. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn voted in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

**FILE: W-24-0002**

**APPLICANT:** Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel D. Arnold

**LOCATION:** The terminal of Pleasure Isle Drive located within the City limits of Erlanger

**REQUEST FOR ACTION:** To grant a waiver to the following sections of the Keton County Subdivision Regulations: Figure A.1-Z, Detail #24: This detail specifies the dimensions and design parameters for newly constructed cul de sacs.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich

**PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

To approve the requested waiver to A.1-Z, Detail #24. This detail specifies the dimensions and design parameters for newly constructed cul de sacs.

Mr. Nathan Arnold addressed the Commission and stated they took to heart a lot of the comments from last month so they went back and met to determine a feasible alternative. He noted he spoke to the Grimm Trust who has owned their property for years and they spoke with Drees about developing that property and they decided against it due to having to build a road and the water lines needed. He noted to do any more development, a new road would have to be brought in. He stated that was the background on Drees potentially developing the property.

Mr. Don Stegman addressed the Commission and stated he struggled a bit because there is land out there to develop. He stated he has designed subdivision subdivisions for Drees and for Fischer. He noted that in this case it's really a services instance because both looked at the property and decided it would be too expensive. He noted these are being looked at like flag lots which would mean you can put four together with ten feet of frontage. He noted all these meet the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Nathan Arnold additionally stated he had a letter showing approval from the two adjoining property owners who are materially affected. The letter was introduced and marked as an exhibit on the matter. Mr. Dunham stated it didn't meet the requirements but he would enter it into the record.

Mr. Mark Collier addressed the Commission and stated he met with the applicant with regard to the changes and stated their concerns were met from the last meeting.

Mr. Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. Mr. Bethell stated compared to last time they have made some good improvements. Mr. France stated he would agree. He noted they looked at it and came up with a workable solution. Mr. Dunham stated he would echo that. He stated when he left the meeting last month he thought maybe he made a mistake in they are supposed to be looking at future development. He then commented he feels much better that from a practical standpoint it's not a developable piece of land so it seems like this is the ability to develop what is there and he is comfortable with it now. Mr. Bridges stated he doesn't like the layout but it complies so with their regulations. Mr. Dunham reconvened and closed the public hearing and asked for a motion. Mr. Herrmann made the motion to approve the application based on Staff's report and the testimony given, and that unusual topographical restrictions exist. Mr. Berling seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Berling, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Ms. DeAngelis, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Ms. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn voted in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

**Reports from Committees**

*Bylaws* – Mr. Dunham stated they did not meet.

*Direction 2030 Implementation* – Mr. Videkovich stated they have been very busy and went over a lot of the remaining comprehensive plan elements. He noted there are just a few final edits yet and the committee will be asking to refer this to the planning commission as a whole to authorize adopting it at the September meeting. He noted this was a very big step for this whole project moving forward. He noted they do have all of the elements online and he is recommending going online and taking a look at it. He further noted there is also a summary of all the public input online as well. He stated they do plan to have the full website up and running by August 1st. He asked the Commissioners to go online to review it. He noted if you don't have a lot of time to focus on the housing element and land use element.

*Executive*– Mr. Dunham stated they haven't met since their last meeting.

*Social Media* - Mr. Ryan noted he met with Josh Weiss about potentially upgrading the graphics of the website. He stated he will have Pam send out a survey to see what days might be available to do a meeting. He noted he would like to get moving on it so they will see what happens. Mr. Berling asked when they upgrade the logo if they could change the spelling of commission and fix that.

*Subdivision Review* – No report.

*Z21 Review* - Mr. Bridges stated they have not met.

*Comments from Commissioners* - Nothing to report.

*Legal Counsel* - Nothing to report.

*New Business* – Nothing to report

*General Correspondence* - Nothing to report.

*Public Comments* - None

*Reports/Announcements from Staff* - Mr. Videkovich stated the first meeting of the year is on January 2, 2025 and it's the day after New Year's day. He stated the normal procedure is to move it to the following Tuesday and put that out there for future planning. He also noted if you have any outstanding continuing education hours to please get them in so credit is given for those.

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. Ryan to adjourn. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair 

Date 8-1-24