

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Minutes

Mr. Darpel, Chairman, called the meeting to order on November 3, 2022, 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 located in Covington, Kentucky. 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		X			X			X			
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills		X	X	X	X	X				X	X	
Todd Berling	Fort Wright		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	
Brian Dunham	Kenton Cty	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		
Tom France	Ludlow	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	*	X	X	
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
John Hennessey	Villa Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Joe Pannunzio	Elsmere		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Dan McElheney	Erlanger			X		X		X	X		X	X	
Sean Pharr	Covington		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X		X	X		X		X		X	X	
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs	X		X	X		X	X			X	X	
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	*	X	X	X	
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	X*	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	
Kristi Zavitz	Ryland Hts.			X									

Also present were Mr. Mathew Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Cody Sheets, Mr. Patrick Denbow, Ms. Megan Bussee and Ms. Tenfelde.

“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 asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Snyder made the motion. Mr. Sketch seconded. All in favor by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Darpel asked for any questions or comments regarding the minutes from October. Mr. Bridges made the motion to approve. Mr. Sketch then commented with regard to the waiver on the very last page. He stated he didn't see a second on the motion. Mr. Darpel noted to make the revision to add Mr. Sketch as having made the second on that motion for that issue. Mr. Darpel then asked Mr. Bridges if he was okay with that and Mr. Bridges then made the motion to approve again with Mr. Sketch giving the second. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Bridges, Mr. Sketch, Ms. Bamgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. McElheney, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Darpel stated the receipts and expenditures report was distributed. He stated they are halfway through the fiscal year and everything seems in line. He noted there was one item he was going to inquire about with the revenue on the reserves. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Ms. Snyder made the motion to approve. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation.

RECENT ACTIONS BY STAFF:

(No action required)

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

(No action required)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

FILE: PC2209-0001

APPLICANT: Flagship Communities REIT per Kurt Keeney on behalf of Garvey Farm LP

LOCATION: 1630 Garvey Avenue; an area of approximately 18 acres located on the east side of Garvey Avenue between Ripple Creek Drive to the north and Comanche Trail to the south, approximately 444 feet south of Ripple Creek Drive in Elsmere.

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Elsmere Zoning Ordinance from R-CPS (a residential compact zone) to MHP (a mobile home park zone). This request includes the review of a conditional use for mobile homes as permitted by the Elsmere Ordinance. The applicant proposes to expand the existing Heartland Pointe Mobile Home Park by constructing 65 mobile home lots and an active recreation area.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Megan Busse.

Prior to her presentation, Ms. Busse commented she would like to submit a KRS 100 signed affidavit for the record with regard to the issue. Mr. Darpel then marked it as Exhibit 1 for the record.

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the map amendment to the Elsmere Zoning Ordinance from R-CPS (a residential compact zone) to MHP (a mobile home park zone).

Mr. Brock McKay addressed the Commission and introduced individuals with the request. He gave a bit of history on Flagship Communities and noted they have grown into a community of 65 communities. He noted they are among the largest in the midwest and over the years have been awarded a lot of awards. He stated he wanted to highlight the wooded areas and the ravines around the property. He further stated they are really talking about the southwest corners and noted extensive buffers were going to be preserved. He stated the property actually sits higher than a lot of the surrounding properties. He noted due to the size and how it is isolated, it is difficult to envision a different use for the property. He noted they are going to stay mainly in the field and avoid the woodland areas. He additionally noted the proposal that they are doing really stays up on the hill and doesn't go down in the valley. He gave additional background information on the property. Mr. McKay stated the site currently has 203 lots and noted 70% of residents have Hispanic Heritage. He noted the Heartland Community Manager has built a relationship with the NKY Health Department as outreach for the community. Mr. McKay also noted the folks in the Heartland Community really lean on their clubhouse and what we call HOA events and amenities. He then gave additional details on the project expansion and why it makes sense. He noted the proposal is to develop 65 additional lots for lease with additional recreational amenities which will be accessible to residents in both Heartland Pointe areas. He noted Heartland offers a high-quality housing option at an affordable price point. He further stated the 65 added units generate approximately 34 more am/pm trips which is a drop in the bucket. He then stated the expansion will generate approximately 4.5 units per net acre which is less than what is allowed and that is based on the usable land area. He commented on some additional green aspects of the manufactured homes that will be part of the project. He noted they are really very efficient as far as utilities go. He stated they feel this fits in with the comprehensive plan and all streets will be privately maintained. He also noted all new homes are required to be state inspected. Mr. Ryan inquired about the traffic study. Ms. Tenfelde stated the regulations apply when it comes to traffic studies and they are well below those requirements. Mr. Viox then addressed the Commission on some traffic numbers. He stated Staff did a very good job on their report and that goes in line with traffic. He noted they did reduce the number of rooftops but added amenities. He stated when the traffic study was done they are probably more off peak than other areas, and he just wanted to make that comment. Mr. France asked what they are proposing to go on the 65 lots - mobile homes or manufactured homes. Mr. Kurt Keeney stated it will be manufactured homes that will go into the expansion. He stated they would be manufactured HUD homes manufactured to HUD specifications. He noted at the end of the day this would be a new manufactured home product. He additionally stated a single section home completely set up today which is 16x56 will be about \$60,000. He noted the multi-sectional will be 28x56 and will be \$80-90,000 dollars. He stated there are only 5 rental homes in the community so the vast majority are owned. He stated to live in this community you have to make \$20/hr. Mr. Keeney stated that is pretty much the industry standard.

Mr. Jim Parsons addressed the Commission and stated they have clearly demonstrated that the request meets the comprehensive plan, and the project has great buffers from the rest of the area. He stated it is really the only use that can be utilized. He also noted that he is actually a property owner and noted the community is very open to the area and his grandchildren often use the amenities in the community. He stated this will be a great benefit to the surrounding community since there are not a lot of amenities in the area. He stated Staff did a great job and supported their recommendation on the issue.

Ms. Megan Busse commented briefly to clarify that when she received the Staff report, the site plan specified mobile homes and gave the definition of mobile homes. She stated she recently became aware that it was going to be manufactured homes but those two are also conditionally permitted as well. She noted there would be no changes for either request in terms of their recommendations or report.

Mr. Ryan noted the review of the access points. He then asked the applicant if they would be open to a condition to supply a copy of the report regarding the access being adequate. Mr. Darpel noted for the record that they agreed to submitting that.

Mr. Tom Breitenstein addressed the Commission on behalf of the city of Elsmere. He stated he is also a certified planner as well and that is why the city brought him on board with the issue. He stated the city recognizes it is the city council who will judge this issue so that is why they are in the neutral area on the issue. He then distributed a letter to the Commissioners and noted much of the information contained in the letter is the work of Mr. Downey and his staff at the City of Elsmere. He then touched upon the issues raised in the letter.

Mr. Matt Dowling addressed the Commission with regard to the sign being posted and stated they have had continuous drives to and from the area and he doesn't doubt it was out there, but he stated it certainly hasn't been posted in the past few days. Mr. Breitenstein addressed the Commission again and stated he doesn't throw that out there to create a monkey in the process but to create a record for the council. He then commented that if the 65 new units are approved tonight, that number is raised to 12.7% of homes in Elsmere will be manufactured or mobile homes. He stated they then compared this to other surrounding cities and the numbers were significantly lower. He stated currently 46.9% of all mobile homes are located within the City of Elsmere. He stated he asked whether increasing the concentration of mobile homes will meet the comprehensive plan. He also asked if this increase will satisfy goal #2 of the comprehensive plan. He then commented about public safety and stated in the past 2.5 years the vast number of calls were attributed to the Heartland Mobile home park. He stated property values are always a consideration and stated the Heartland Community mobile home tax is \$40.68 for real estate tax and the average for single family homes is \$400. He stated he noticed there has been no discussion in terms of this in the Staff's report. He further commented the expansion prohibits any non-conforming uses and stated this refers to mobile home parks. He stated he would ask the Commission if the expansion is permitted under that section of the ordinance. He noted the property remains at 7.1 to 14 per net acre. He then commented the zoning was changed from R1F He asked that thought be considered and given to the number of dwelling units being proposed. He stated in the concept plan there is a retaining wall being built to accommodate 13 manufactured home pads. He then stated that retaining walls should match the contours. He noted it is unclear from the Staff report if they complied with the Hillside standards. He also commented on site design and stated it seems like the traffic analysis focused on the additional 65 units. He stated this is an extension of a larger development and he asked whether a traffic study for this is warranted. He then asked about the criteria being weighed for a conditional use that these things be considered. He then noted it was his goal to make it as complete as possible so as much information would be before the council. Mr. Darpel asked if there was anything in his letter that stated this is not conforming. Mr. Breitenstein commented there was not. Mr. Sketch asked about the density and asked if the Commission should deny it and have a higher density. He stated he doesn't understand that being part of this. Mr. Breitenstein stated the plan calls for a density in this range and then Staff is proposing this range. Ms. Vaughn asked who is responsible for enforcing the zoning in Elsmere. Mr. Keeney stated that it would usually be deferred to PDS to address. Mr. Darpel then stated they have a signed affidavit with regard to the signage being posted. He stated since this was previously tabled this was actually posted twice. Ms. Vaughn asked if the posting of the sign was noticed in September. Mr. Keeney stated they were not aware. Mr. Darpel then admitted the letter distributed as an exhibit to be made part of the record on the matter.

Mr. Eric Lenzel addressed the Commission and stated the sign was put up on October 14th and on October 18th it was gone. He then asked who is responsible for posting of the sign. Mr. Darpel then stated they work in conjunction with PDS. Mr. Lenzel then commented on the survey about the new expansion. This was distributed to the commissioners. He stated he drove through the community and noticed there was parking on the street and blocking where stop signs are even though they claim there is no parking. He also stated he has moved his bedroom into his basement and now he can sleep through the night and not be woken up with sirens. He stated the only way he would agree to this expansion was if there was an HOA in place. Mr. Darpel stated he was a bit concerned with putting in the record what was distributed because it has a lot of information they haven't had a chance to go through. Mr. Lenzel stated these are responses to the survey that was distributed. Mr. Darpel asked what the questions were because these are just the responses. Mr. Darpel stated his concern is putting something into testimony without having all the information and there is no opportunity for it to be rebutted or substantiated because they are not present. He stated if he wants to discuss having done a survey, that is fine. But without them being here he can't enter it as an exhibit. Mr. Darpel then stated he wasn't going to admit it into evidence at this point, but if he wanted to summarize it and enter his testimony into the record, that would be fine. He stated the issues are some of the things he observed in driving through the park and in talking with some of the residents. Mr. Darpel then asked if there was anything else he wanted to add and that he wanted him to have every opportunity to be heard. Mr. Lenzel then stated since this is a recommending body and it goes to the city anyway, it is fine. Mr. Lenzel then asked if he could have his flier put into the record. Mr. Darpel read the flier into the record to summarize and marked it as an exhibit to be made a part of the record. Mr. Darpel asked how many it was sent to. Mr. Lenzel stated it was sent to 667 area residents. He then stated he did not send any fliers into the park.

Ms. Sarah Hellman addressed the Commission and stated she did have concerns about the zone change. She stated she backs up to the property. She commented in terms of traffic it is likely each one of those homes has more than one person driving so it could potentially be 130 additional drivers. She then noted her concerns with traffic. She stated the traffic on Autumn Road is already a mess and it is hard to get through there, so that will be a problem. She also wanted to make a point of the images presented by the applicant and noted it does not represent what the community looks like today and that it is pretty run down. She noted they don't need TANK in the area on Garvey. She stated there was no sign posted on the property on October 6th but there was a small sign posted on October 18th and it was removed a few days later. She stated it kind of feels like they were trying to not notify people so they wouldn't know. She stated apparently there is a no fireworks policy and that is ignored. She then referenced Facebook posts she pulled about the use of fireworks in the Community. She stated the residents love to speed down Garvey and it's very annoying. She stated shortly after moving to her home there were garage doors vandalized and they were told by police that it was kids from the trailer park. She cited concerns with loss in property values. She noted she doesn't think the infrastructure can handle the additional traffic. She stated her main points were crime, traffic and noise. Mr. Berling commented he takes offense at the suggestion that Staff would put up a prop as a sign and commented that Staff is filled with nothing but individuals of great integrity and he wanted that noted for the record. Ms. Hellman stated she wanted to make it clear that it wasn't up prior to the October 3rd meeting and then it magically showed up and was gone a couple days later. Mr. Darpel then commented the sign is put up according to Kentucky statute and unless someone informs them it's gone, they have no way of knowing because they don't drive by there every day. Ms. Hellman stated she would know that for the next time.

Mr. Scott Schepers addressed the Commission and stated he lives off of Garvey. He stated as far as the infrastructure, if they are wanting to put 65 additional homes in this community, how much more cable lines and water lines etc. will they have to run. He stated right now they have the big headache of the new factories and he didn't even know they were going in and no notice was given. He stated the roads are constantly being torn up right now. He stated he works hard for his money and doesn't like taking his truck

and running it over steel plates. He stated he feels this will drive down the retail value of their homes. He stated TANK buses technically need to have a pull off for safety reasons. He stated he does not know how a TANK bus will get up and down Garvey. He stated if you've ever driven up back there, it is an eyesore. He asked if the mobile homes are on axles, and stated they will have the roads torn up because of it. He stated he wanted to put on record that they said it was a drop in the bucket. He stated when it doesn't affect them, it is a drop in the bucket but it does affect them. Mr. Ryan stated they do have to meet requirements in terms of infrastructure so he wants him to know that. Mr. Schepers stated the sidewalks are torn up and the roads are torn up and this will happen again if these go in.

Mr. Jason Stacy addressed the Commission and stated 65 additional homes could be 240 additional humans. He stated this conflicts with the proposition of the applicant it shows an increase in density also shows an increase in crime. He stated a good percentage of the crime comes from the trailer park already. He stated these homes proposed use nice terms like affordable housing but it is also increased crime. He further stated many studies show lower income mixed with higher density leads to higher crime. He stated this is something that affects them all. He noted this is already lowering property values with increased crime and increased traffic. He commented about an article in NPR from October of this year that showed the property values of mobile homes has increased but many of them can't be sold because of disrepair. He additionally noted he found it interesting that they commented these are HUD homes which sets them up for lower income and higher crime. He stated some of the most concerning pieces of information is he has not heard one thing from the applicant that this benefits Elsmere - their schools, their community, etc. He stated this is a sales presentation. He commented the numbers don't add up concerning what the consensus says versus what they are saying. He asked the applicant if they speak Spanish or if they have driven through the community. He further commented to ignore the additional traffic the distribution centers have brought in and this will make it worse. He stated all of this will have a negative impact on their city. He is asking them to take this into consideration. Mr. Bridges stated these would be homeowners versus 250 apartments which is permissible in this zone. Mr. Stacy stated he would be against both and if that happened he would be here against that as well. Mr. Sketch stated he wouldn't be able to because it's already allowed. Ms. Vaughn wanted to clarify that 250 dwelling units could be put there at present. Mr. Ryan then clarified that the current dwelling units permitted is 7.1 to 14 and what is being present is 4.7. Ms. Vaughn stated she just wanted him to understand what was allowed.

Ms. Stephanie Trainor addressed the Commission and stated she is neutral because she understands the need for housing and thinks that is important but also wants to make sure they are doing the best for their city. She stated she understands stigmas are not what they are going for, but she doesn't want people to think Elsmere and think 'mobile home park.' She stated she would love for more houses to be built in Elsmere. She noted she understands this property is very close to the mobile home park and is not ideal for building new homes. She stated she has logistical concerns with the power grid and with this being close by would this be something their own power grid is needed. She noted she has concerns about the retaining wall and how steep and how safe it is. She noted she recently got to go to Eastern Kentucky and saw people in mobile home parks who suffered from flooding. She stated she does not know how much of an asset to Elsmere this would be. She stated she hears a lot of sirens as well in the area to the mobile home park. She asked if current residents have been asked about this to give their input. She stated she would like it to be sustainable. She also commented about the traffic and families who attend Kenton County Public Schools and noted there is no bus service. She stated that there would potentially be additional children that would require an additional bus. She stated she has concerns about property values and is concerned with that. She noted as much as she loves her home, one day she will need to sell it or her children will have to sell it. She stated the stigma of don't live in Elsmere because of high property taxes and mobile homes is something to be concerned about. She asked if residents can own the property under their home. She stated she loves the idea of a small part of their housing going toward their home and if

not, they will always be at the mercy of renting. She also stated she wants people to be able to live in their own houses and to have a good life.

All others registered to speak had nothing to add.

Mr. Jim Parsons addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated they have met all requirements. He stated they requested the amendment because even though it is allowed in the ordinance, they have to request it. He stated all of these would be considered manufactured homes. He stated they are not here tonight to rehash the industrial development. He stated there is no evidence whatsoever that the property values will decline as a result of this. He stated everyone tonight here has certainly purchased their homes after the Parkland Community had been there. He noted there is no evidence of not being able to sell their homes etc. He also noted there is a significant buffer between this and the existing homes. He also commented that this is going to generate a lot more in terms of property tax revenue than is currently being generated. He stated he does take issue with the statement that if you're low income you're high crime. He stated the information they have proved shows that that will have a very low impact. He stated the fact that the notice is an issue is they have had better notice because the city put it on their Facebook page and an individual gave notice on the issue. He stated the issue should be has the applicant met the terms of the code and is the map amendment justified in terms of the comprehensive plan. He noted they would again request consideration of Staff to recommend this for the City of Elsmere. Mr. Darpel asked if there is an HOA. Mr. McKay stated there was not. Mr. Darpel asked if these were brought in on axles. Mr. Keeney stated they are brought in on 8 axles. Mr. Darpel then asked about the retaining wall size. Mr. McKay stated all that has to be done in the zoning phase. He stated all that had to be designed and approved so all this is maintained by the park itself.

Mr. Brock McKay stated in response to the retaining wall, the whole development will have to have a geotechnical study done. He further commented this is a concept plan so it's not a final engineered plan. He stated that is probably about the limits they are going to be able to do. He also commented about utilities and stated that all the roads and utility extensions are all privately funded and is the responsibility of Flagship. Mr. Darpel then asked about the residents having the opportunity to own the land under their home. Mr. Keeney stated that would be no, because that changes things under the comprehensive plan. Mr. Bridges commented about the property taxes and asked if the community gets a tax bill itself in addition to the property owners getting a tax bill. Mr. Keeney stated that was correct and the entire community received a tax bill and referenced \$50,000 and the property owners would receive individual tax bills.

Mr. Denbow stated it is the recommended land use clarification and is recommending 7.1 dwelling units per net acre. Mr. Sketch asked what is considered a qualified manufactured home. Mr. Denbow then clarified the parameters for a qualified manufactured home and stated it was the type that is brought in and manufactured versus modular which are the mobile variety.

Mr. Scott Schepers addressed the Commission in rebuttal and stated it was brought up like they are HUD homes is what the presentation said. He asked if these will be funded through the government.

Mr. Jim Parsons stated the standard for the manufactured home, HUD has certain standards and they have to meet those. It's not that they are HUD homes or some type of assistance. He stated this is a code section that qualifies under that area and meets a higher criteria. Mr. Darpel clarified it is a building standard versus a type of government housing.

Mr. Ryan stated this is a bigger development being inclusive of a larger traffic study, would it not be required. Mr. Tenfelde stated it is her understanding it would not.

Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion on the issue. Mr. Bridges commented about the stigma of the industrial area and the stigma of mobile home parks. He said it just seems like a natural to him. He further commented it is surrounded by industrial and he doesn't see a problem with it. Mr. Simpson stated there have been some parallels about lower income and increased crime and that is incorrect. He stated there are some parallels with increased crime and increased density. He stated in a second comment he stated he just wanted to make sure those two things were clear. Mr. Ryan stated in certain specific areas it is far below the national average. Mr. Ryan stated the city did not identify this as being a mobile home park and they had the opportunity to change it and they left it residential. Mr. Sketch stated this is still the highest density single family. There being no more comments, Mr. Darpel reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Sketch made the motion with regard to the zone change to approve based on it being in compliance with the comprehensive plan and based on the Staff report. Mr. France seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Sketch, Mr. France, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. McElhenney, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn in favor. Mr. Ryan and Mr. Bethell voted against. The motion carried. Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion on the conditional use. Mr. Logsdon asked if a condition could be added to a conditional use. Mr. Darpel stated yes. Mr. Sketch then made the motion on the conditional use to approve with no additional conditions. Mr. Berling seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Sketch, Mr. Berling, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. McElhenney, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Simpson, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Vaughn in favor. The motion carried.

FILE: PC2209-0005

APPLICANT: City of Park Hills per Kathy Zembrodt, Mayor

REQUEST: Proposed text amendment to the Park Hills zoning ordinance permitting a minimum side yard setback of 7.5 feet for buildings located within the HC (Highway Commercial) Zone.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Cody Sheets

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the text Amendment to the Park Hills Zoning Ordinance permitting a minimum side yard width (set-back) of 7.5 feet for buildings located within the HC (Highway Commercial) Zone.

Mr. Darpel stated there was no one to present or address this. Mr. Sketch abstained. Mr. Darpel then recessed the public hearing for discussion. There being none, he reconvened and closed the public hearing. He then asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Ryan made the motion to approve based on Staff's recommendations. Ms. Snyder seconded. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder, Ms. Vaughn, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Martin, Mr. McElhenney, Mr. Pharr, Mr. Simpson and Mr. Sketch in favor. The motion carried.

Reports from Committees

Bylaws – Nothing to report.

Direction 2030 Implementation – Mr. Bethell stated there was nothing currently to report except they are getting ready to update the comprehensive plan. He stated they are going to plan on having a

comprehensive plan meeting in January. He stated anyone who wanted to be on the committee to talk to chairman Darpel

Executive– Mr. Darpel stated they did not meet.

Social Media - Mr. Ryan stated there was nothing to report.

Subdivision Review – Mr. Darpel stated everyone should have received an email with the recommended amendments to the sub regs. He stated they are cleaning up a bunch of stuff and requirements. He stated there are a significant amount of changes and they really have a better plan. He stated he thinks it's good language and asked the Commissioners to take the time to read it. He noted they are submitting this at the next meeting to be adopted. He stated he would like a motion for it to be heard at the next meeting. Mr. Sketch made the motion. Ms. Vaughn seconded. All in favor by acclamation. He noted he really appreciates the effort and can't say it.

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

Comments from Commissioners - Mr. Bridges asked about having the city administrators sit through a three hour meeting. Mr. Darpel stated it was actually looked at through the bylaws. He stated that was put in because sometimes people would sit and wait and then city administrators wouldn't show up. He further stated he would rather have a couple people wait versus a whole room of people. Mr. Sketch stated he had the same thought as Mr. Bridges did. Mr. Darpel stated it could be made a Staff decision perhaps. Mr. Darpel stated he thought it was worth looking at and if nothing else, make it a Chairman's discretion. He stated it's the old common sense which is what they are trying to do. He further commented it would affect the By Laws. Mr. Darpel stated maybe the jurisdiction with the application could say it's going to be a certain time and then it could be moved up or something. He stated he thinks it's worth considering. Mr. Logsdon stated the biggest thing is to know ahead of time if there's going to be an issue.

Report from Legal Counsel – Nothing to report.

Reports/Announcements from Staff - Mr. Denbow stated the deadline has passed for the December meeting, there are four text amendments, one map amendment, one Amended Stage 1, a Public Facility Review, six waivers, a bond issue and the sub regs. He stated he just wanted to make sure everyone was aware. Mr. Darpel stated they will take a look at splitting some of that up. Mr. Bridges asked if they were together or all separate. Ms. Tenfelde stated they were two developments with four waivers on one and two on another.

General Correspondence - None.

New Business – None.

Public Comments - None.

There being nothing further to come before the Commission, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Ryan. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair



Date

Dec. 01, 2022