

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

Minutes

Mr. Darpel, Chairman, called the meeting to order on December 2, 2021, 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 (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date) was as follows:

Commission Member	Jurisdiction	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Anthony Baker	Covington									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	X
Jeff Bethell	Fort Mitchell	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Paul Darpel, Chair	Edgewood	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brian Dunham	Kenton Cty	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
Tom France	Ludlow	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Keith Logsdon	Lakeside Park	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X
John Hennessey	Villa Hills			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	X		X
Dan McElheney	Erlanger											X	
Sean Pharr	Covington	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Greg Sketch	Crescent Spgs	X		X		X					X	X	
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	
Kristi Zavitz	Ryland Hts.	*				X	X	X		X			X

Also present were Mr. Mathew Smith, Legal Counsel, and the following PDS staff: Mr. Andy Videckovich and Ms. Megan Busse.

“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 any questions with regard to the agenda. There being none, he then asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Snyder then made the motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Mr. Ryan seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Darpel asked for approval of the minutes from November. There being no questions or comments, Mr. Darpel then asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Bridges made the motion to approve. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Bridges, Ms. Snyder, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Berling, Mr. Darpel, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Zavitz in favor. Ms. Baumgardner and Mr. Dunham abstained. The motion carried.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:

Mr. Darpel stated the receipts and expenditures report was distributed. He asked for a motion to accept the report. Mr. Ryan made the motion to accept the report. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. All in favor by acclamation.

RECENT ACTIONS BY STAFF:

(No action required)

RECENT ACTIONS BY LEGISLATIVE BODIES:

(No action required)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

FILE: PC2110-0004

APPLICANT: City of Fort Wright per Jill Bailey, City Administrative Officer

LOCATION: 1661 Park Road; an area of approximately 1.6 acres located on the east side of Park Road approximately 70 feet north of Grove Park Drive and 170 feet south of St. Agnes Circle in Fort Wright

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Fort Wright Zoning Ordinance from R-2 (a multi-family residential zone) to R-1DD (a single and two-family residential zone). This rezoning will allow single family or two-family residential uses up to 6.5 dwelling units per net acre. The current multi-family zone allows up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Busse.

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the map amendment to the Fort Wright Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-2 (a multi-family residential zone) to R-1DD (a single and two-family residential zone). This rezoning will allow single-family or two-family residential uses up to 6.5 dwelling units per net acre. The current multi-family zone allows up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.

Mr. Tim Theissen addressed the Commission on behalf of the city. He stated he was present to answer any questions and noted it is a pretty straightforward application.

There were no others registered to speak on the issue. Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion. There being none, he then reconvened and closed the public hearing. He asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Berling made the motion to approve the request for a map amendment based on Staff's recommendation, the testimony heard and that it is in compliance with the comprehensive plan. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Berling, Mr. Martin, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Zavitz in favor. The motion carried.

*Mr. Dunham recused himself from the following issue due to a potential conflict of interest.

FILE: PC2111-0002

APPLICANT: BF Development Associates per Amanda Webb

LOCATION: 2300 and 2315 Needham Drive, and 5420 Rockwood Drive; an area of approximately 92.77 acres located at the terminus of Amici Drive, approximately 1,500 feet east of Madison Pike and 1,500 feet north of Hands Pike in Covington.

REQUEST: A Master Development Plan review of a Planned Neighborhood in the SR (Suburban Residential) Zone. The applicant is proposing to construct a new subdivision consisting of 147 detached single family lots and 92 attached single-family lots, for a total density of approximately 2.59 dwelling units per net acre.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Ms. Busse.

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the map amendment to the Covington Zoning Ordinance to approve the Master Development Plan review of a Planned Neighborhood in the SR (Suburban Residential) Zone; The applicant is proposing to construct a new subdivision consisting of 147 detached single-family lots and 92 attached single-family lots, for a total density of approximately 2.59 dwelling units per net acre.

Mr. Darpel read an email into the record from Christopher Meyers and marked it as an exhibit to the minutes.

Ms. Amanda Webb addressed the Commission in favor of the issue. She noted they are here to request approval of a new master development plan. She stated it has been revised in the way the City has required it with new recommendations. She noted she was available to answer any questions. Mr. Darpel asked how many units were built as of today and noted a concern with the one access in and out. Ms. Webb stated she did not know how many there were but that it was well under the threshold. Mr. Darpel stated from a safety matter it scares him with only having the one access and not even having an emergency egress. Mr. France also noted his concerns with the access. Mr. Bethell commented and stated if there was a fire close

to the entrance and you have to have an ambulance back there, with a fire truck blocking the road there could be some concerns. He noted he has a hard time not having two access points and he has safety concerns with regard to that. Ms. Webb stated she does understand the concerns and she respects that and reiterated that they are within the guidelines. Mr. Logsdon stated this is one of those cases where the number of lots needs to be limited until a second access is completed. He stated with everyone using the same road it's going to be a mess.

Mr. Kramer had nothing to add.

Ms. Stacey Grindstaff addressed the Commission as a neutral party and asked about the three properties that were acquired and the additional properties being developed. She asked about where the other 30 acres were. Staff then pulled up the graphic to show where that property is located. Ms. Grindstaff had nothing additional to add.

Mr. Michael Cooper addressed the Commission and stated he is on the Tuscany HOA but is not representing them and he wanted to make that clear. He commented with regard to traffic concerns. He noted he has been involved in two incidents in front of the development on State Route 17. He noted he had to go all the way down and sit in traffic because the accident was so bad that he had to sit and wait to get through. He noted everyone else was waiting to go through and the police were routing them another way. He stated it was a mess and he had to wait about an hour for the accident to clear. He noted he is not opposed to the development, but he is concerned about the access. He stated there has already been a petition for a stop sign request at the bottom of Tuscany View and that has been granted. He also commented about a stop sign request at Montella and Tuscany View because people speed up that hill and it is becoming a traffic nightmare. He noted there was almost a child that was hit walking from one sidewalk to another and another incident was involving a mother pushing a stroller. He stated the traffic is okay, but when they bought their home they were told that as the property developed there would be another access point. He noted that is what they had been told. He stated the second access was a concern at that time and is still. He stated it's a beautiful community and he loves it there, but the drawings showed a cul de sac and now it shows Camiche going and going. He noted as far as one ingress and egress he is concerned.

Mr. France asked for a comment by Ms. Webb on the other access. Ms. Webb stated in order to develop that other property they have to keep developing down and that is what they are doing. She stated unfortunately they don't control that property down yet.

Mr. Joe Kramer then addressed the Commission to answer the question and stated there were a lot of family members involved and some wanted to sell and some didn't, and what you are seeing is a result of that. He stated they have looked at that and continue to look at that additional property but they just don't control it yet.

Mr. Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion amongst the Commissioners. He stated he has concerns with safety and something happening and that road being blocked. He stated obviously that is something that has to be looked at in the subdivision regulations. Mr. Smith stated he shared concerns with having only one access but the regulations don't require it to have another. He noted it meets all the regulations presently but is something that maybe needs to be looked at in the future. Mr. Bridges commented that Wayman Branch is going to be just as bad if the traffic is diverted there. He additionally stated something needs to be done with the regulations. He noted time and time again here we are criticizing our own regulations. Mr. Darpel stated this is one of the concerns - how long an access can be, etc. and this is exactly why subdivision review has to occur. He stated it's hard to foresee everything. Mr. Bethell stated we keep running into this on an ongoing basis and the question seems to be where is the other access and the response is well, the regulations don't require it. He further noted a life could be in jeopardy because of the regulations and that concerns him. He stated we need to learn sometimes while on

the run and this may be one of those times. Mr. Ryan asked if the traffic study is updated with every addition. Mr. Videkovich stated the study is the original study that was done on the whole development and it continues to be looked at with each development. He noted while this specific number of lots was not included in that original study, it is just shifting what is looked at. He then stated this does not warrant another traffic study. Mr. Ryan asked what the total number of dwelling units under that traffic study that were allowed or what was looked at in the original study. Mr. Darpel then reconvened the public hearing so Mr. Kramer could clarify. He then addressed the Commission and stated the traffic study done about two years ago did include this property and they estimated the number of acres. He noted there are several triggers that can require them to look into another traffic study. He noted he does not know them all off hand. He stated there is a time that falls in there, he stated a change in the amount of units falls in there, also there are miles in terms of how far they are allowed to go. He stated there are several triggers that can require them to update that. Mr. Darpel stated essentially these traffic studies determine if these intersections get a passing grade. He further noted the traffic study is looking for the traffic flow, they are not looking for safety. He noted a traffic study is not going to do it. Mr. Logsdon asked if the original development plan called for a second access. Mr. Videkovich stated it did not show a second access. Mr. Ryan asked how many homes the traffic study qualified for. Mr. Kramer stated it was for this development and the development to the west and it was estimated. Mr. Darpel then closed the public hearing and asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. France made the motion to approve the request based on Staff's recommendation and testimony and legal counsel's advice on the issue and that it meets the subdivision regulations. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. Mr. Logsdon asked Mr. Smith if a comment could be added to the motion to state no more lots can be added until there is the second access. Mr. Smith stated you can't condition the motion but you can certainly add an informational comment. Mr. Darpel then noted the addition to the motion of an additional comment that it is strongly recommended that future access be considered before any further development. Mr. France noted he was fine with adding that to the motion. A roll call vote on the motion found Mr. France, Mr. Martin, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bethell, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Darpel, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Logsdon, Mr. Pannunzio, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Zavitz in favor. Mr. Dunham recused himself from any consideration or voting on the issue. The motion carried.

*Mr. Darpel recused himself from the following issue due to a potential conflict of interest. Mr. Dunham, Vice Chair, presided over the meeting for the issue.

FILE: PC2111-0001

APPLICANT: City of Fort Mitchell per Edwin King, City Administrator

LOCATION: All land within the corporate limits of the City of Fort Mitchell.

REQUEST: A new zoning ordinance, which includes new text and a new official zoning map for the City of Fort Mitchell.

SUMMARY: The City of Fort Mitchell seeks to replace the current zoning ordinance with a new ordinance that recognizes Fort Mitchell's development patterns, streamlines processes, and addresses new development trends. The full draft text and map of the new zoning ordinance and official zoning map can be found at <http://www.kcpeky.org/meetings/now-pending>.

Staff presentation and Staff recommendations by Mr. Andy Videkovich

PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Favorable recommendation on the new Fort Mitchell Zoning Ordinance, including new text and a new zoning map.

Mr. Edwin King stated he appreciated the Staff and the committee. He stated this is not an easy feat for cities to go through but they made it as seamless as possible. He then noted he was available to answer any

questions. Mr. Ryan asked if a thorough review was done. Mr. King stated he had and not all of it was done since he had been there and noted he had been with the city since March.

There being no others to speak before the Commission, Mr. Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion. Mr. Bridges noted they gave their recommendations unanimously on this and stated this was well thought out and well done. Mr. Dunham reconvened and closed the public hearing. He asked for a motion on the matter. Mr. Bethell made the motion to approve the request based on Staff's recommendations and the testimony heard. Mr. Logsdon seconded the motion. A roll call vote on the matter found Mr. Bethell, Mr. Logsdon, Ms. Baumgardner, Mr. Berling, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Dunham, Mr. France, Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Martin, Mr. Panunzio, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Snyder and Ms. Zavitz in favor. Mr. Darpel recused himself from any consideration or voting on the issue. The motion carried unanimously.

Ongoing Business

Reports from Committees

Bylaws – Mr. Dunham stated they did not meet. He stated what they will look at it in the next year.

Direction 2030 Implementation – Mr. Bethell stated there was nothing to report. No meeting scheduled for this month.

Executive – Mr. Darpel stated they did not meet.

Social Media - Nothing to report.

Subdivision Review – Mr. Darpel stated they did not meet. He noted there was a meeting coming up next week.

Z21 Review - Mr. Bridges stated the City of Independence is coming back with some revisions already so they will be putting a meeting together.

Comments from Commissioners - Mr. Logsdon commented about an ongoing study that has been going on for a couple years now to develop a park trail from Bourbon County to Newport.

He stated a couple public meetings would be held on December 8th at 5:30 at the Campbell County Fiscal Court office and the second one is the 13th right next door at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Ryan asked if an email could be sent out on that.

Report from Legal Counsel – Nothing to report.

Reports/Announcements from Staff - Mr. Videkovich stated as Mr. Bridges stated, they are trying to get the Z21 committee scheduled regarding Independence and if possible, would like to get that scheduled by next week. He asked the Commissioners to be looking for that. Mr. Videkovich stated staff will be posting some additional videos and that information will be sent out. listen. He stated there are some wipes at everyone's seats and commented Pam would appreciate it if the Commissioners would wipe down their tablets. He also noted PDS has a couple positions to fill so if anyone knows of someone who might be

interested to please pass along that information or share the information if you come across it on social media.

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. France. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair 

Date 1/6/22