

**From:** [Gregg Hothem](#)  
**To:** [KCPC](#)  
**Subject:** FILE NUMBER: PC-25-0016-MA  
**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2025 4:58:34 PM

---

I will be out of town and unable to attend the KCPC Meeting and Public Hearing on FILE NUMBER: PC-25-0016-MA regarding the rezoning of 1405 & 1459 Hands Pike to Semi-Urban Residential. I would like to submit by objection to the planned community of 450 residential units with only one access to Hands Pike. I live in Tuscany and my neighbors and I have long been upset with only 1 entrance to the majority of our community. The Planning Commission has discussed the Tuscany issue in the past including the need to establish new standards for determining where more than one entrance is required, primarily for life safety concerns. I don't believe this has occurred. I request that this zoning request be denied until such new access standards have been established. I believe the new standard should only permit a new community to have a single access when there are less than 200 residential units and no unit is more than 2,640 feet from the access point.

I also concur with Staff's comments that this rural location does not qualify as Semi-Urban Residential.

I'm sorry that I cannot attend the December 4, 2025 meeting but hope my comments will be considered.

Thank you,

Gregg Hothem  
2207 Piazza Ridge  
Covington KY 41017  
513-290-8935

This email originated from an external source and is not from a pdskc.org email address. Please exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.

**From:** [Mike MacIsaac](#)  
**To:** [KCPC](#)  
**Subject:** Fischer Homes rezoning request  
**Date:** Monday, December 1, 2025 12:06:13 PM

---

I have read today that Fisher Homes is requesting re-zoning for 73 acres on Hands Pike.

While I have no issues with this request, I do have issue with the lack of access to the Tuscany subdivision.

It is simply not safe to live in Tuscany with only 1 access point.

Most communities do not allow this large of a subdivision to only have one access point for obvious reasons, the highest of which is the potential for disaster if fire engines or EVs cannot access via the single access point.

Why is this allowed ?

Safety MUST BE paramount when new zoning is considered.

It is not too late for Tuscany & I'm very certain that with a little thought this can be rectified.

Also, with the advent of the new KCSD building, there will now be additional traffic bottlenecks at the ONLY access point for Tuscany & this is going to create a nightmare even before there is a true disaster.

Please Please Please consider the residents before allowing any sort of re-zoning & I would suggest that Fischer be required to improve the Tuscany situation before getting any re-zoning for a new build-out.

Also, I would think it would be incumbent on KCSD to provide a traffic flow plan before the nightmare becomes a reality at Tuscany.

Thank You for your consideration & please heed the call.

**Michael J. MacIsaac**  
**262-960-1674**  
**[mjmacisaac@yahoo.com](mailto:mjmacisaac@yahoo.com)**

***He who pursues righteousness and love finds life, prosperity and honor.***  
**Proverbs 21:21**

This email originated from an external source and is not from a pdskc.org email address. Please exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.

**From:** [Mastin, Heather](#)  
**To:** [Legal Notices](#); [KCPC](#); [Andy Videkovich](#)  
**Cc:** [David Mastin](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Case PC-25-0016-MA  
**Date:** Saturday, November 22, 2025 12:07:10 PM

---

Heather Mastin  
1337 Hands Pike  
Covington, KY, 41017  
[heather.mastin@kenton.kyschools.us](mailto:heather.mastin@kenton.kyschools.us)

Kenton County Planning Commission  
1840 Simon Kenton Way, Suite 3400  
Covington, KY 41011

November 22, 2025

**Re: Public Comment on Case PC-25-0016-MA – Proposed Map Amendment to Semi-Urban Residential (SU)**

Dear Members of the Kenton County Planning Commission and Staff:

I am writing as a resident at 1337 Hands Pike, immediately adjacent to or near the parcel subject to **PC-25-0016-MA** (map amendment / development plan). I respectfully request that the Commission either **deny** the proposed amendment or **continue** the case until the applicant provides a full, code-compliant plan. My objections are grounded in the Covington **Neighborhood Development Code (NDC)**, and I believe the proposal in its current form does not sufficiently satisfy multiple critical standards.

---

**Key Concerns (Code-based Objections)**

**1. Inconsistency with the Purpose of the Semi-Urban (SU) District**

- The NDC's stated purpose for the SU district is to allow "renovation, incremental expansion, or new construction of contextually-sensitive single-family detached and attached, two-family, townhouse, and triplex/quadplex dwellings ..." **and to prevent or minimize vehicular access points from interrupting streetscapes and non-motorized mobility.** [Covington KY](#)
- The proposed scale of ~450 dwellings (including multi-unit apartment buildings) on ~73.9 acres represents a **substantial intensity increase** from suburban residential. This magnitude of change undermines the "incremental, contextually-sensitive" objective and risks creating a built form that is not compatible with nearby lower-density single-family properties.

## 2. Building Type & Massing / Compatibility Deficiencies

- Under **Sec. 04.08.3** (Housing & Building Types), the NDC limits permitted building types in SU to those consistent with a more moderate density, including **apartments, duplexes, lot-line dwellings, triplex/quadplex, single-family detached**, etc.
- However, placement, height, and massing must also comply with **Table 04.10.2: Building Placement and Massing Standards by District**.
- If the development plan does not clearly include appropriate **step-downs** (in height, setbacks, and building types) toward the existing single-family rear yards, it would likely violate the contextual massing standards of Table 04.10.2, which is controlling where discrepancies exist.
- Without strong transitional design (e.g., lower building heights, generous rear setbacks, tree buffers), the proposed density and building types could **significantly disrupt the character** of the adjacent low-density neighborhood.

## 3. Setbacks and Height Concerns

- The NDC requires that setbacks and height conform to both the building type standards and the context average determined per **Sec. 09.28.2**
- If the applicant's plan lacks a properly calculated context average, or fails to respect the required rear setback / height limits when measured against this context average, then it may not comply with Sec. 04.10.2. I request the Commission to require clear context-average analyses and built elevations showing compliance.

## 4. Frontage / Access Considerations

- The SU district purpose explicitly aims to “prevent or minimize vehicular access points from interrupting streetscapes and non-motorized mobility.” [Covington KY](#)
- Given the number of units proposed, there is a risk of multiple vehicular access points, increased driveways, and curb cuts, which could fragment pedestrian connectivity and compromise walkability. The application should more clearly show how access will be structured, limited, or consolidated to meet this purpose.

## 5. Infrastructure Capacity & Phasing

- A development of this size (450 units) imposes major demands on water, sewer,

stormwater, and transportation infrastructure. The application as submitted does not, to my knowledge, sufficiently document capacity, needed upgrades, or financial responsibility for infrastructure improvements.

- Given the code's emphasis on *context-sensitive growth*, the Commission should require a **phasing plan** tied to infrastructure delivery (e.g., building permits conditional on completed public improvements), rather than blanket approval without guaranteed mitigation.

## 6. Environmental / Stormwater Risk

- With large-scale development, impervious surface will likely rise significantly, increasing run-off risk. The NDC (in its environmental and design standards) expects detailed stormwater mitigation and buffering (e.g., via pervious materials, bioswales, green infrastructure).
- Without a robust stormwater management plan, existing properties (especially at lower elevations) face increased flooding risk, erosion, or degraded water quality.

---

## Requested Actions / Conditions

To address these concerns, I respectfully ask the Commission to take one or more of the following actions:

1. **Continue the Case** — Defer approval until the applicant submits:
  - A **context-average analysis** per Sec. 09.28.2, demonstrating compliance with Table 04.10.2 (mass, height, setbacks).
  - Elevation drawings and building section cuts that clearly show step-downs from the densest building types (apartments) to lower-density along the edges.
  - A detailed **access plan** showing limited curb cuts, shared driveways, and pedestrian connections aligned with the SU purpose.
  - A **phased infrastructure strategy**, tying building permits to delivered utility and transportation improvements.
  - A full **stormwater management plan**, with modeling, green infrastructure, and buffering to adjacent properties.
2. **Deny the Map Amendment** — If the applicant is unwilling or unable to commit to the design transitions, infrastructure guarantees, and context-sensitive development required by the NDC, then the proposed rezoning is **not appropriate** for this parcel.

Approving such a high density without these conditions may lead to long-term negative impacts on the adjacent neighborhood.

3. **Require Conditions of Approval** — If the Commission agrees to rezoning, insist on conditions (via binding plan or master development agreement) that enforce the above-requested materials and design commitments. This will ensure that the neighborhood character and infrastructure needs are protected, not just in theory but in legally enforceable terms.

---

## Conclusion

My opposition is **not** a blanket rejection of development or density; rather, I strongly advocate for **development that is consistent with Covington's own Neighborhood Development Code**. The NDC was adopted to ensure that new growth is *contextual, walkable, and sensitive to existing neighborhoods*. Approving a 450-unit plan without robust context analysis, design transitions, and infrastructure guarantees would contradict both the letter and the spirit of the NDC.

I appreciate the Commission's willingness to hear public input on **PC-25-0016-MA**, and I urge you to require changes reflecting these code-based concerns before granting approval. I also respectfully request to be placed on the mailing list for all future submittals, hearing notices, and decisions regarding this case.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Heather Mastin

This email originated from an external source and is not from a pdskc.org email address. Please exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.