

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Chairman Dunham called the meeting to order on March 05, 2026, at 6:15 p.m. and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance, invocation by Commissioner Ryan, roll call, and the meeting and safety procedures. The meeting was held in the fiscal court chambers of the Kenton County Government Center, 1840 Simon-Kenton Way, in Covington.

Attendance of members is as follows (for this meeting as well as those during the year to date).

Commission Member	Jurisdiction	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Doug Armbruster	Elsmere	X	-										
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills	X	-	X*									
Todd Berling	Fort Wright	X	-										
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	-	X									
Paul Darpel, Vice Chair	Edgewood	X	-	X									
Gabriella DeAngelis	Covington	X	-	X									
Kevin Dicke	Fort Mitchell	X	-	X									
Brian Dunham, Chairman	Kenton County	X	-	X									
Sarah Flem	Covington	X	-	X									
Tom France	Ludlow	X	-	X									
Ken Heidrich	Lakeside Park		-	X									
Todd Herrmann	Erlanger	X	-	X									
Betsy Janes	Villa Hills	X	-	X									
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	-	X									
Phil Ryan, Treasurer	Park Hills	X	-	X									
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	-	X									
Greg Sketch	Crescent Springs	X	-	X									
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	-	X									
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	-										
Quin Wichmann	Ryland Hts.		-	X									

"X" denotes attendance at the regular meeting.
 "**" denotes arrival after roll call was taken.

"/" denotes not on Commission
 "." denotes no meeting

Also present: Legal Counsel Mr. Matt Smith, and the following PDS Staff: Mr. Josh Wice, PDS Director; Ms. Nicole Cullum, PDS Deputy Director; Mr. Andy Videkovich, PDS Director of Planning; Mr. Cody Sheets, PDS Principal

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Planner; Mr. Zane Winkler, PDS Planning Intern, and Pamela Bushelman, Senior Secretary, PDS Planning & Zoning and KCPC Secretary.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS AND REPORTS

Approval of the Agenda

Chairman Dunham noted that members had received a copy of the final agenda for this meeting. There were no corrections or changes and he asked for *a motion to accept the agenda. So moved by Commissioner Snyder; seconded by Commissioner Ryan. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.*

(Commissioner Baumgardner arrived at 6:20 p.m.)

Approval of the Minutes

Chairman Dunham next addressed the approval of the January 06, 2026, meeting minutes. There were no corrections or changes. Chairman Dunham asked for a motion to approve the minutes. *So moved by Commissioner Snyder; seconded by Commissioner Martin. A roll call vote found: Commissioners Snyder, Martin, Ryan, Simpson, Sketch, Bridges, Darpel, DeAngelis, Dicke, Dunham, Flem, France, Herrmann, and Janes in favor; and Commissioners Wichmann and Herrmann abstained. There were none opposed and the motion carried.*

Report of Receipts and Expenditures

Chairman Dunham stated the receipts and expenditures reports for December 2025 and January 2026 were distributed. There being no comments or questions regarding the reports, he asked for a motion to approve. *Commissioner Snyder moved to approve both reports; seconded by Commissioner Ryan. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.*

Report of last month's actions by Staff (no action required)

- Subdivision Plat Letter – there were no comments
- Stage II Updates – there were no comments.
- Cell Tower Updates – there were none this month.

Report of last month's actions by our legislative bodies (no action required)

There were no comments.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Dunham introduced **FILE NUMBER: PC-26-0001-MA**

APPLICANT: Joseph Rettig on behalf of James & Kathy Rettig

LOCATION: 1351 Bramlage Road; Two portions, totaling approximately 1.78 acres of an existing flag lot with a total area of approximately 22.28 acres located on the south side of Bramlage Road, approximately 1,590 feet west of Wilson Road and approximately 3,175 feet east of Banklick Road in Unincorporated Kenton County.

REQUEST: A proposed map amendment to the Kenton County Zoning Ordinance changing the described area from R-1B (Residential One-B) Zone to A-2 (Agricultural-Two) Zone.

SUMMARY: Approximately 92 percent of the flag lot is currently zoned A-2, with the remainder being zoned R-1B. The applicant is requesting to change two portions of the existing lot, including an approximately 0.19-acre portion of the flag stem and an approximately 1.59-acre portion along the eastern property line to A-2 in order to bring the entire property under the A-2 Zone.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Mr. Cody Sheets presented this review concerning a proposed map amendment to rezone two small areas of a 22.28-acre flag lot from R-1B (single-family residential) to A-2 (agricultural). He pointed out that currently, 92% of the site is zoned A-2, with the exceptions being two small areas of R-1B. He noted that surrounding properties include R-1B to the east and north, A-2 to the west, and A-1 to the south.

He then provided a history and explained that in 2006, the property was designated for single-family residential use as part of the South Banklick Small Area Study, consistent with its existing R-1B zoning and a subsequent map amendment expanded the A-2 Zone but excluded areas zoned R-1B. He stated the zoning boundaries have remained consistent, keeping affected portions in R-1B.

Mr. Sheets then clarified that the R-1B zoning requires a minimum lot size of ½ acre for residential use, while A-2 allows agricultural activities alongside single-family housing, with a minimum lot size of 1 acre. He pointed out that the proposed amendment aligns with the goals of the 2024 Kenton County Comprehensive Plan, promoting agricultural use and conservation.

Mr. Sheets stated that the amendment is expected to facilitate more housing opportunities and is consistent with recommended land use densities. He added that the site has no developmentally sensitive areas but does contain blue line streams and a pond. He concluded with a favorable recommendation, stating that the proposed amendment aligns with the comprehensive plan and would eliminate barriers to agricultural development.

He then asked if there were any questions and Commissioner Sketch asked why the boundary line was located there in the beginning and Mr. Sheets stated that Staff was unsure.

There were no further questions from Commissioners and Chairman Dunham noted the following individuals signed up to speak on the request:

FOR

Mr. Joey Rettig (1351 Bramlage Rd) – APPLICANT
Mr. Ben Bach (10112 Meadow Glen Dr)

First, Mr. Joe Rettig, (1351 Bramlage Rd), addressed the Commission and said that he believed [the Staff Report] stated everything clearly and asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. There were none and Chairman Dunham then called for comments from Mr. Ben Bach who stated he had nothing to add.

Chairman Dunham then recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners and stated that it is a 'clean up matter' and he was pleased it was caught and being fixed. There was no further discussion and he returned to the public hearing. There was no need for further questions or clarification and he closed the public hearing and called for a motion. *Commissioner Darpel made a motion to approve the favorable recommendation in Unincorporated Kenton County for FILE # PC-26-0001-MA on the two portions on Bramlage Rd. to bring the property back into compliance through the zone change; seconded by Commissioner Ryan. A roll call vote found Commissioners Darpel, Ryan, Simpson, Sketch, Snyder, Wichmann, Baumgardner, Bridges, DeAngelis, Dicke, Dunham, Flem, France, Heidrich, Herrmann, Janes, and Martin in favor. There were none opposed and the motion carried.*

Chairman Dunham then introduced **FILE NUMBER:PC-26-0002-MA**

APPLICANT: Fischer Homes per Amanda Webb on behalf of Dale Tuerpe

LOCATION: 4979 Oliver Road; an area of approximately 27.98 acres located on the west side of Oliver Road and on the east side of KY 17, with Centennial Boulevard to the southwest and McCullum Pike to the north, approximately 0.75 miles south of McCullum Pike.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

REQUEST: A proposed Map Amendment and Concept Development Plan to the Independence Zoning Ordinance changing the described property from R-RE (Residential Rural Estate) Zone to PUD (Planned Unit Development) Zone.

SUMMARY: The applicant proposes 178 total dwelling units including 66 two-family dwellings and 112 multi-family (condominium) dwellings at a density of 7.2 dwelling units per net acre. The development also includes proposed public streets with access onto KY 17, off-street parking spaces, a detention basin, and 38.5 percent open space.

Mr. Andy Videkovich presented this proposal for a map amendment to change the zoning of approximately 27.98 of 34.02 acres from R-RE (Residential Rural Estate) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) where the plan includes 178 dwelling units, comprising 66 two-family patio homes and 112 multi-family condominiums, at a density of 7.2 units per net acre. He described the site as being located on both sides of KY 17 and features significant wooded areas, streams, and a single-family home with access to Oliver Road.

He confirmed that the surrounding area consists primarily of single-family residential lots and is situated about 1,700 feet from the expanding commercial and residential developments along Centennial Boulevard and the site is currently zoned R-RE and is bordered by additional R-RE, R-CVS (Conventional Subdivision), and R-LLS (Large Lot Subdivision) zones.

Mr. Videkovich explained that the R-RE zone allows for rural development with a minimum lot size of 1 acre and a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per net acre. In contrast, he pointed out that the PUD zone promotes flexible land use, efficient land use, open space, and clustered communities while adhering to conventional zoning principles. He stated the development standards for PUDs include regulations on various aspects such as building height, setbacks, and landscaping, with a requirement that at least 30% of the area be designated as accessible open space for residents.

He then reviewed the submitted site plan for the development including the housing types and the proposed streets. Mr. Videkovich explained that streets A and D, which serve the paired patio homes, will have cul-de-sacs, a 50-foot right-of-way, and a landscaped median at the main entrance connecting to KY 17. He stated streets G and E are designed for the condominiums, featuring a 23-foot right-of-way, with bump-out turnarounds and streets B and C cater to both types, with a 26-foot right-of-way and a stub for future development access. He mentioned that off-street parking includes garage spaces and approximately 124 additional parking spaces.

He then explained that landscaping will be integrated throughout, with 38.5% of the area (10.8 acres) designated as open space, accessible via an interconnected sidewalk system. He indicated that the amenities may include seating areas and trails and will be maintained by a homeowners association.

Next, Mr. Videkovich reviewed the submitted details for the homes and stated that the paired patio homes range from 1,245 to 2,195 square feet with 2 to 3 bedrooms, while the condominiums range from 1,110 to 1,610 square feet with 2 bedrooms. He stated the submitted projected prices are \$290,000 to \$320,000 for the paired patio homes and \$215,000 to \$280,000 for condominiums.

Mr. Videkovich then reviewed the 2024 Kenton County Comprehensive Plan, stating that the proposed development aligns with the Suburban Subarea and Housing objectives by promoting housing near employment and retail services. However, he identified inconsistencies with the Mobility and Housing elements, as the development will not provide income-aligned housing types and lacks required sidewalk connectivity along KY 17 and Oliver Road. He then highlighted that the housing study indicates a surplus in the type of housing proposed, and the development's density of 7.2 dwelling units per acre far exceeds the recommended 2.1 to 4 units, contrary

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

to the Independence Small Area Study, which advocates for low-density single-family homes. He added that the site has no sidewalks on adjoining roads, and public transit is not currently available nearby.

Mr. Videkovich stated that the proposed map amendment is generally inconsistent with the Kenton County Comprehensive Plan and emphasized that, while the development could offer new housing options, it does not meet the standards for affordable housing and falls short on requirements like sidewalks and open space. He outlined necessary conditions for the Final Development Plan, including the installation of sidewalks along existing streets and ensuring that open space amenities are accessible to all residents. Additionally, he noted the need for further information on landscaping, use standards, and compliance with subdivision regulations.

He then asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners.

During a discussion on PUD designations, Commissioner France raised a question about whether it allows for a maximum 10% increase in density over existing zoning. Mr. Videkovich explained that while clustering of uses is permitted in exchange for open space, the Independence Small Area Study suggests a potential 10% increase could be acceptable. However, Commissioner France noted that this would only increase the density from 2.1 to 2.3, which he viewed as minimal, especially compared to a larger 7.2 du/na increase.

Commissioner Dicke then inquired about the preservation of natural amenities in the site plan. Mr. Videkovich stated that approximately 38% of the site would remain as open space where there are no lots or streets. However, he also mentioned that the extent of undisturbed areas is unknown and some of the areas will need to be cleared during development.

Commissioner France asked if the pond could be considered open space, to which Mr. Videkovich confirmed it could be if it becomes usable, such as by adding benches for passive recreation. Lastly, Commissioner Bridges sought clarification on the income-aligned housing table, specifically regarding the area that indicated a deficit and that the type proposed were deemed to be in excess; Mr. Videkovich confirmed this was correct.

There were no further questions from Commissioners and Chairman Dunham noted the following individuals signed up to speak on the request:

FOR

Amanda Webb, (3940 Olympic Blvd, Ste 400, Erlanger, KY)
Sam Rees, (3940 Olympic Blvd, Ste 400, Erlanger, KY)
Kimberly Tuerpe (4979 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Ken Holliday (4979 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Mike Willenbrink (209 Grandview Dr, Ft Mitchell, KY)

AGAINST

Celia Glaza (4975 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Scott Whalen (5037 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Benjamin Bach (10112 Meadow Glen Dr)
Jeannie Rohrkasse (4605 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Kelly Jett (4581 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY)
Jacob March-Bishop (796 Jimae Ave, Independence, KY)

There were no others who wished to speak and Chairman Dunham moved on to comments from the applicant.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Ms. Amanda Webb, (3940 Olympic Blvd, Ste 400, Erlanger, KY) from Grand Communities and Fischer Homes presented their development plans for the site. She provided an overview of Fischer Homes, the site location, and important features like a large stream, flood plain area, and accessibility routes. She stated the proposed project includes patio homes and higher-density condominium units priced between the low to high \$200,000 range. She pointed out that the higher density condominiums will be situated on the south side of the parcel, while the patio homes will be placed internally. She noted that the patio homes have a loft option.

Ms. Webb then highlighted the planned community amenities, including open spaces, sidewalks, interconnected pathways, and landscaping, and stated that they are collaborating with planning staff on these aspects. She acknowledged that the proposed density exceeds the allowed limits but argued that the nearby commercial developments justify the increase. Additionally, she emphasized the need for diverse housing options in northern Kentucky and mentioned plans for sidewalks along KY 17 and Oliver Rd to enhance pedestrian safety. She concluded by inviting questions from the Commission.

Chairman Dunham requested an aerial image of the south side of the site, which shows a higher density aligned with their request. He stated he reviewed the staff report, noting that the current zoning there is R-RE, allowing 1 dwelling unit per acre and the future land use map indicates a density of 2.1 to 4.0 dwelling units per net acre, and he is trying to understand this discrepancy.

While Mr. Videkovich looked for an aerial image Commissioner France noted that while Ms. Webb had outlined the open spaces and amenities, there were only a few benches for a subdivision of 350 people. He pointed out the absence of pathways to the creek and around the pond, saying, "It sounds good, but it doesn't seem like it's there yet." Ms. Webb responded that it is still early in the project, and these features will be included in the final development plan. She mentioned that while they plan to add seating areas, the primary amenities will be located south and off-site, with retail shopping and connected trails. She assured the Commission that the city will require a comprehensive amenity plan, including trails around the detention basin and along the creek, which will be detailed in the next phase.

Commissioner Wichmann asked about the south side street leading to the property line and whether discussions had occurred with the adjacent property owner. Ms. Webb stated they were in talks with another stakeholder about that specific road but could not share more details. He also inquired about the northern dead-end street. Ms. Webb confirmed it ends at the property line and noted the challenging topography, indicating there are no plans to extend it north.

Commissioner DeAngelis questioned the HOA fees, to which Ms. Webb replied that none have been set yet, as the condominium association will establish them. Commissioner DeAngelis further asked if the purchase price range excluded upgrades, and Ms. Webb confirmed it does not include upgrades.

Commissioner Bridges asked about a curb cut on KY 17, and Ms. Webb confirmed it already exists.

Ms. Webb then mentioned that the condominium product has no yard maintenance fees, while the paired patio product includes exterior maintenance, snow removal, yard maintenance, and open space management handled by the HOA.

Commissioner Sketch raised a concern about the widths of the streets leading to the patio homes, stating that the road from section B to C should be 25 feet wide due to its connection to a 22-foot-wide street and then a 25-foot-wide street. Mr. Mike Willenbrink, (209 Grandview Dr, Ft Mitchell, KY) clarified that the cul-de-sac streets are 25 feet wide and confirmed that the street in question is also 25 feet wide, while the 22-foot-wide street is the first on the right upon entering the community.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Commissioner Herrman asked about the average HOA fee, but Ms. Webb did not have that information. He questioned if it would be part of the average monthly home cost, and she replied that Fischer Homes finalizes HOA fees after planning. Commissioner DeAngelis mentioned that in Tuscany the fee for a condominium is currently \$231, with a similar amount expected for paired patio homes.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the applicant discussed the discrepancies between land use, the Small Area Study, and conservation zones with the city, emphasizing that current regulations differ significantly. Ms. Webb mentioned that while she had met with city officials, she could not speak for them but felt confident presenting a supported plan.

Mr. Videkovich introduced the Independence Small Area Study Map, highlighting the site property marked with a star and a dark brown area in the southwest, which is designated for high-density multi-family residential development (7.1 to 30 du/na). Chairman Dunham inquired about the purple area, identified as mixed-use, while Commissioner Bridges asked about the area below the site, which is rural single-family residential. Mr. Videkovich noted that the zone south of the site has not changed in decades but confirmed it was similar to the Publix site, which had to come to the Commission for rezoning.

Mr. Willenbrink stated that their site is 28 acres at 7.2 du/na, near a larger 53-acre high-density zone. He explained that areas with higher density should ideally be closer to arterial streets to manage traffic better, arguing that the expanding commercial area, like the Publix on the corner, indicates growing demand. He emphasized that easier access would attract more retail and commercial developments, particularly in the mixed-use and high-density areas along KY 17.

Chairman Dunham called on Mr. Sam Rees, (3940 Olympic Blvd, Ste 400, Erlanger, KY), who had nothing to add.

Chairman Dunham then called on Mr. Ken Holliday, who was representing the sellers of 4979 Oliver Rd., to address the Commission. Mr. Holliday noted that the arrival of Publix has significantly impacted the area, increasing property values and attracting developer interest. He stated that the Tuerpes, who are not farmers, purchased their property for its peace and quiet and now value the convenience of shopping nearby.

He next preemptively addressed concerns from opponents regarding rising school populations, and Chairman Dunham explained that school issues are not relevant to this hearing. Mr. Holliday asserted that Publix changed the local landscape and rendered the Small Area Study obsolete, as the future land use was determined before its establishment. He emphasized that his clients' plan to sell their property reflects progress and highlighted that Independence is a desirable place to live, which drives growth. He also mentioned the upcoming 536 Road Study, which should help alleviate density concerns and reaffirmed that Publix's presence supports the project's viability.

Chairman Dunham then called on Ms. Kimberly Tuerpe, (4979 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY) who had nothing to add.

Ms. Celia Glaza then spoke on behalf of her grandparents, Ron, and Cecelia Dennis, of 4975 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY. She addressed the Commission about the 533 other new homes being built in Independence, stating this project would raise the total to 711; she stated many are unsold. She estimated this could add over 1,422 new residents and about 1,500 more cars on the road. She expressed concern that the developer stated the project would not connect to Oliver Road which is not meant for heavy traffic but is required to have sidewalks. Ms. Glaza highlighted traffic issues on Oliver Road, especially during events at the booster field, and noted several accidents on other local roads. She worried that the new entrance could lead to more collisions with a 55-mph speed limit. She also mentioned rising crime rates, flooding risks for homes near Fowler Creek due to tree removal,

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

overcrowded schools without expansion plans, and the loss of green spaces. Ms. Glaza emphasized that community growth should listen to residents' concerns. There were no questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Dunham clarified that the Commission cannot address school impacts and mentioned that stormwater runoff is managed with a detention facility at the site.

Chairman Dunham called on Mr. Scott Whalen, (5037 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY) who expressed his opposition to the development, advocating for the community to remain rural. He noted the area has already seen significant growth and stated that while he respects Mr. Tuerpe's right to sell his property, he questions the need for further expansion. There were no questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Dunham called on Mr. Benjamin Bach, (10112 Meadow Glen Dr, Independence, KY) a resident of Independence and HOA board member, who addressed the Commission and expressed concerns about unfulfilled promises from the developers and emphasized the importance of documenting commitments. He stated concerns with the Coppice Hollow project and criticized the removal of all trees on this site without plans for replanting, arguing this will degrade the hillside and insufficiently capture water, impacting the watershed for Fowler Creek.

He also defined a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the record that *'the intent of the Planned Unit Development is to provide flexibility and create planned communities that may incorporate a range of uses including single-family detached and/or attached dwellings, commercial office, flex industrial, or recreational uses. PUD should be designed to incorporate open space and development pattern in accordance with natural features on the site. It should be used to create communities of unique character and lasting value not to subvert the requirements of the conventional zoning district.'* He further raised issues regarding traffic, noting that the existing curb cut on KY 17 was not designed for the anticipated increase and questioned the addition of another grocery store being the basis of granting the request given that multiple existing stores already serve the area.

Mr. Bach argued that the project does not address Northern Kentucky's housing crisis and suggested redesigning or selling the property to meet the actual housing needs. He voiced support for the PDS recommendation, highlighting that the proposal does not meet required criteria and criticized the applicant for not addressing traffic issues adequately. He suggested solutions like a frontage road and traffic circles to improve safety and flow.

He then addressed the landscaping issue and stated that no trails would be constructed. He mentioned that, as a resident of Meadow Glen, homes were sold until the development was completely sold out. He noted that during this time, prospective buyers were informed about plans for a second pool and trails, none of which were ever implemented by the developer. Lastly, Mr. Bach urged the Commission to follow the PDS recommendation, which was unfavorable.

Chairman Dunham noted that regarding the access point on KY 17 discussed by PDS, the applicant would need to conduct a traffic impact study, which the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) would review and approve for this project.

Chairman Dunham then called on Ms. Jeannie Rohrkasse, (4605 Oliver Rd, Independence, KY). She requested an explanation of what the sidewalk on Oliver Road would look like and how it would function. Additionally, she asked for the location of McCullum Road on the site plan. Commissioner Bridges clarified that McCullum Road is situated further away from the site.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Chairman Dunham called on Mr. Kelly Jett (4581 Oliver Road, Independence, KY). He stated that a sidewalk on Oliver Road would not be feasible and expressed concerns about water runoff if the land is cleared for development. He noted that the creek in the development area is only 15 feet wide, compared to 50 feet at his property, and questioned how the water would be managed. He highlighted that homes on the other side of Oliver Road are higher than the creek, except for one nearby house, which makes water runoff a significant issue for many residents. Chairman Dunham reiterated that the developer is required to manage stormwater and mentioned a detention facility on the property. Commissioner Ryan emphasized that the developer must comply with SD1 regulations for water shed control.

Mr. Jett then expressed concern about the development being too much for the rural area, fearing it would lead to traffic issues as more cars enter KY 17. He criticized the focus on business interests over community needs. Commissioner Darpel commented that sidewalks would only be required in front of the developer's property along Oliver Road and not in front of other homes. Mr. Jett called this a waste of money, as it would lead to sidewalks that connect to nothing. Commissioner Darpel clarified that while the sidewalks may not connect to anything, the developer is not required to install sidewalks in front of other houses.

Chairman Dunham called on Mr. Jacob March-Bishop, (796 Jimae Ave, Independence, KY) who noted the dramatic population growth in Independence, which has risen from about 13,000 to around 40,000 in the past 20 years and while he acknowledged some economic benefits of this growth, he expressed concern about its impact on the community. He reminisced about the area where Publix now stands, which used to be a farm before KY 17 was built and pointed out that most farms in the area have since disappeared, leaving only a few small ones. He described the current traffic as "elbow to elbow" since the city has grown and expressed anger and frustration over new housing developments along his commute, feeling they disrupt the community's character. Overall, he conveyed anger and disappointment about the rapid changes in Independence, urging the community to uphold its integrity amid development. The Commissioners asked no questions.

There were no other speakers signed up, and Chairman Dunham called upon the applicant to respond to the comments and questions. Ms. Webb stated that they are currently working on obtaining the traffic study. She noted that the sidewalks are required by the Kenton County Subdivision Regulations and have already been addressed. Additionally, she conducted research on the Homeowners Association (HOA) fees, which vary depending on the type of unit and whether the owner has a garage. In Tuscany, these fees are approximately \$200 per month, along with an additional semi-annual fee that totals around \$300. Ms. Webb emphasized that Tuscany is a much larger community with more amenities. She then asked if there were any further questions.

Chairman Dunham asked if they would like to address the stormwater runoff issue. Mr. Willenbrink responded that they need to meet SD1 requirements for stormwater management, including submitting drainage calculations for approval. He noted that a 75-foot buffer from Fowler Creek is included in the plan. Commissioner Flem questioned what would happen to the creek and blue line stream during construction. Mr. Willenbrink pointed out the creek's location on the east side and confirmed the buffer would be maintained. Ms. Webb clarified that a recent environmental consultant determined the blue line stream running east to west is a non-jurisdictional swale and there is no environmental responsibility for it but they do remain responsible for Fowler Creek. Ms. Webb added that the "blue line" information comes from GIS data, which can be accurate but sometimes is not and therefore they hire external consultants who validate their findings with the Army Corps of Engineers.

Commissioner Darpel asked about parking for the duplexes, noting he saw spaces for the condominiums but not for the duplexes. He expressed concerns about parking availability during the holidays for guests, especially near the eight units at the back of the cul-de-sacs. Ms. Webb clarified that the duplexes have two-car garages and can accommodate an extra vehicle in the driveway without blocking the sidewalk; she added that there are also on-

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

street parking and room for one car between the buildings. She noted that parking is prohibited within the cul-de-sac area, and the duplexes feature longer driveways along with additional parking on the north-south road and in the condominium area of the lowest cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Bridges asked about the curb cut onto the four-lane highway, particularly if drivers could turn left to head south. Ms. Webb explained that vehicles traveling south on KY 17 could turn left into the development, but exiting would only allow a right turn, pending highway department approval and this might lead to a right-in/right-out access restriction, which will be evaluated in the traffic study. Commissioner Bridges also noted the lack of a turnaround, requiring those needing to go north to travel south to Summitview to make a U-turn.

Commissioner Ryan raised concerns about access for school buses, noting that the development's layout lacks a circular route for buses and emergency vehicles, requiring multiple point turns to exit. Ms. Webb confirmed that the cul-de-sac bulbs meet regulations and can accommodate these turns.

Commissioner France expressed concern about the proposed development's density, highlighting the existing 1.0 du/na and questioning the justification for the planned 7.2 du/na. He noted the prevalence of buildings along KY 17 and asked why the project did not align with the lower adjacent density of 4.8 du/na, wondering if economics drove the higher density. Ms. Webb noted the area that is zoned for 7-30 du/na, and stated they believe this density provides a suitable transition to neighboring higher-density areas, clarifying that 7.2 du/na was not their specific aim but an outcome of their design.

Commissioner Bridges inquired about how a school bus picking up children in the development would reach Simon Kenton if it cannot turn left to go south and there is no space to turn around on the four-lane highway. He questioned that the bus would have to go up to Summitview and then circle back. Commissioners Martin and Bridges engaged in a brief discussion about school bus routes and available turnaround options.

There were no further comments and Chairman Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners.

Chairman Dunham began the discussion by expressing his belief that the request was inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, citing the Small Area Study and future land use map. He emphasized that Commissioners should evaluate whether the current classification is appropriate and consider any unexpected economic, physical, or social changes that have altered the area's character. He also noted the high density at the site and recognized the impact of the Publix development but also questioned the appropriateness of developing the area with just 1 or 2 dwelling units per net acre. He mentioned uncertainty about whether the proposed plan might be overly extreme in either direction and stressed the importance of reviewing the plan from a legal perspective and adhering to relevant standards, acknowledging the reasoning behind various comments made during the discussion.

Commissioner Ryan inquired about the timing of when the Commission reviews the recommended land use and small area studies. He noted that one study, completed in 2007, seems to remain indefinitely and asked at what point does [the Commission] disregard these studies? He expressed concern about instances where the proposed land use is inconsistent with a Small Area Study that the city funded and developed and pointed out that there was no city representative present to inform the Commission whether the Small Area Study is outdated or to express support or opposition to the proposed plan.

Mr. Smith noted that Commissioner Ryan's comments align with what Chairman Dunham was discussing on the land use map and according to staff's report, the map is included, but it is inconsistent. He emphasized that the key question is whether there have been enough changes, particularly considering Publix and KY 17, to justify this

KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026

change. Commissioner Ryan suggested that the city should undertake a revamp, while Chairman Dunham added that the statute addresses this issue as well and admitted he was curious about the findings of the Small Area Study.

Commissioner DeAngelis noted the high demand for paired patio homes in Tuscany, which are selling quickly. She questioned if this area is the best location for such homes, saying that a 20% down payment—excluding HOA fees or upgrades—does not meet income alignment for housing. Chairman Dunham countered that income alignment can be achieved without it being in every location, acknowledging that some locations are more expensive to develop.

Commissioner Wichmann expressed that he shares similar thoughts about Tuscany, which is a promising development. However, he acknowledged that the pricing does not align with what empty nesters are typically looking for, and this is a valid observation. He emphasized that when it comes to Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), the Commission has a responsibility to be meticulous and discerning, as they cannot allow these developments to circumvent existing zoning regulations.

Chairman Dunham expressed uncertainty about the proposal but questioned why it could not be rezoned for higher density; he guessed that the Planned Unit Development (PUD) provides more certainty about future developments than standard zoning.

Commissioner Simpson raised concerns about the design aimed at divorced people and empty nesters, noting the assumption that they are usually high-income individuals. He argued that low-income families also need homes and emphasized the county's urgent need for more housing. He stressed the importance of ensuring that new developments address the needs of all residents and said that while he opposes denying construction outright, it should occur in areas where it is already allowed. He pointed to an unfavorable staff recommendation as a reason for his inability to support the proposal.

Commissioner Darpel agreed with Commissioner Wichmann, saying that a Planned Unit Development (PUD) should be unique, and the proposed increase in density from 1 dwelling unit per net acre (du/na) to 7 du/na is too drastic. He noted that the green space is only a detention pond and lacks distinctive features that would qualify it as a PUD. Chairman Dunham concurred, acknowledging that while the presence of Publix and providing a transition to higher density zoning nearby, the focus should be on ensuring uniqueness and protecting the city's interests. Commissioner Darpel emphasized that proper density and distinctiveness are crucial for meaningful community contributions.

Commissioner Ryan noted that he has learned that some communities are moving away from Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) due to misuse. He highlighted that land with a 75-foot buffer—where construction is prohibited—often counts as green space, even though it is unusable. He expressed mixed feelings about this practice and indicated that he somewhat agrees with Commissioner Darpel and Chairman Dunham. Chairman Dunham added that he believes the proposed density numbers align with what makes sense for the area.

Commissioner Flem remarked that the property adjoining the site to the higher density [land use] includes only a tiny wedge in the southwest corner—while the rest of the perimeter does not adjoin any high density [land use]. Chairman Dunham added that the topography slopes down toward the wood line and the creek, and they need to maintain a 75-foot setback from that area, creating a natural buffer against higher density. He also noted that if access to the site is from Oliver Road, then it would indeed make more sense to have a density more typical of single-family homes in that location, but since the new development will be located off KY 17, that buffer is important. Commissioner Flem emphasized that only a small part of the site is adjacent to a higher density area.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

Commissioner Bridges emphasized that the Commission's role is to ensure proposals align with the comprehensive plan. He noted that while adjustments are sometimes made, the current proposal deviates significantly and the staff opposes it. He added that everyone was aware that something substantial was planned for that corner, and it was expected to be a commercial development. He added that if a great development were proposed, they could utilize the parcel next door and seek out other available land that would accommodate their plans and build what they want.

Commissioner France agreed with Commissioner Darpel about the applicant's request for a PUD (Planned Unit Development) zone. He questioned whether the proposal meets the criteria for a PUD, as he felt its definition was unclear. He asked if staff evaluates whether a design qualifies as a true PUD, noting that essential amenities and open spaces seem lacking in the current plan. He also pointed out that the surrounding land allows for 4.8 dwelling units per acre, which could help reduce crowding. He considered 7.2 dwelling units per acre excessive and supported Chairman Dunham's view that 1 dwelling unit per acre is also unsuitable along KY 17. He urged staff to assess if the application meets the PUD definition.

There were no further comments, and Chairman Dunham returned to the public hearing for clarification. He asked Mr. Videkovich if he would like to add anything regarding the Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mr. Videkovich provided a summary of the purpose of a PUD and explained that staff do not initially determine whether a design qualifies as a PUD when it is first presented. He said this determination is what the hearing process is for and once the application is submitted, staff review it and compare it to the intended standards and that is what is presented at the public hearing for the Commission's recommendation. He also pointed out that while there is guidance available, it is not always clear-cut and Staff cannot simply say yes or no they must evaluate each application on its own merits.

Chairman Dunham closed the public hearing and moved to entertain a motion. Commissioner Snyder expressed her strong belief that landowners have the right to sell their farms or subdivide their land as they see fit. She emphasized that while this is their right, she feels there is a proper way to go about it, and she does not believe this proposal is the best approach. She expressed concern about using the Planned Unit Development (PUD) designation to meet a specific number, stating that it may not be beneficial for the community. She stated that she has lived in the community for many years, in a development that was likely a farm at one time and appreciated that someone sold their farm so she could live there. She said she loves Independence. She acknowledged that many people are passionate about preserving farms and maintaining the rural character of the area. However, she pointed out that it would not remain rural indefinitely unless everyone is willing to purchase their neighbor's farm, a statement she has shared with her neighbors and friends. *She then made a motion to deny development FILE: PC-26-0002-MA [finding] that it is not consistent with the Kenton County Comprehensive Plan and although the plan would provide housing options the proposed density is far exceeding the recommended land use map as well as the recommendations of the Independence Small Area Study and without providing housing types that are consistent with income aligned and based on the facts heard and provided in the staff report and testimony of staff and witnesses present at the public hearing; seconded by Commissioner Simpson.*

Chairman Dunham expressed that he feels the proposal may be "a bridge too far." Similarly, Commissioner Ryan indicated he believes a workable design for the site can be developed. He also described the motion as eloquent and shared his agreement with it. He emphasized that something needs to be established on the site but expressed uncertainty about whether the current plan meets the definition of a unique Planned Unit Development (PUD). He noted that it appears to focus primarily on maximizing the amount of development on the site and suggested that the applicant consider scaling back the proposal to allow for better flow, which could lead to a successful project. He also acknowledged that he agrees with Commissioner Snyder's perspective.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

There were no other comments and a roll call vote found: Commissioners Snyder, Simpson, Wichmann, Baumgardner, Bridges, Darpel, DeAngelis, Dicke, Dunham, Flem, France, Heidrich, Herrmann, Janes and Ryan in favor, and Commissioners Sketch and Martin opposed. The motion to recommend denial was approved.

Chairman Dunham explained that the Commission has recommended denying the map amendment and the request would go to the city for consideration, and those interested should stay in touch with the city.

Chairman Dunham then introduced **FILE NUMBER: PC-26-0001-TX**

APPLICANT: City of Lakeside per Paul Markgraf, Mayor

REQUEST: A proposed text amendment to the Lakeside Park Zoning Ordinance to permit fencing less than fifty percent open to enclose a swimming pool when the property line abuts an institutional use.

(Commissioner Darpel recused himself and left chambers at 8:18 p.m.)

Mr. Andy Videkovich presented the staff review for the proposed amendment which seeks to allow fences that are less than fifty percent open to enclose swimming pools when the property line adjoins an institutional use. He stated that the new Z21 zoning ordinance was adopted by the city in 2024 (PC-24-0008-TX) and the old ordinance was transferred directly to the new ordinance. He stated that currently, regulations mandate that a swimming pool must be enclosed by a fence and must be made of ornamental metal, wood, or similar materials that are over 50 percent open, prohibiting solid fences and the height of such fences must be a minimum of 48" and not more than 84".

He explained that the amendment would allow for a fence less than 50% open but only if certain conditions apply. He then clarified the conditions stating that the fence must be adjacent to an institutional use, comply with all relevant safety and zoning regulations, and the property owner must obtain written consent from neighboring property owners regarding the less open fencing. He pointed out that the amendment will add a cross-reference in Article 4.05 for swimming pool use specific standards.

Mr. Videkovich then reviewed maps highlighting properties that would be impacted by the proposed text amendment because they border an institutional use. He explained that these highlighted lots are located where the rear yard adjoins an institutional use, which is where swimming pools and spas can be built. Mr. Videkovich emphasized that most of these lots are adjacent to churches or city service buildings and there are a couple that are in Lakeside Park but border institutional properties located in different cities and are impacted by the proposed amendment. He noted that approximately 70 lots would be affected.

Mr. Videkovich stated that while compliance with the comprehensive plan is not mandatory for text amendments, the Staff Review found that the submitted request aligns with the goal of celebrating the unique identities of communities within Kenton County and provides flexibility to residents to build and enjoy recreational areas and avoid attractive nuisances from the adjoining institutional uses.

He then reviewed KRS 100, which outlines the allowable content that cities may enact. He provided the staff's favorable recommendation, stating that the changes are appropriate and reasonable, that the amendments will enhance privacy and safety on lots adjacent to institutional uses, where there is likely to be a higher number of people present, particularly children, and these changes will clarify proper fencing regulations for residents. He noted that the amendment aligns with the goals of the comprehensive plan and is consistent with what other jurisdictions allow for fencing around swimming pools. He also suggested that the city consider eliminating the requirement for adjacent property owners to provide written consent for fence permits. He argued that fence approvals should be treated as administrative zoning determinations rather than discretionary decisions. He

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

emphasized that zoning needs to be applied uniformly and objectively across all properties and introducing neighbor consent could lead to inconsistencies in applying the standards to similarly situated properties.

He then asked if there were questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Heidrich inquired whether the term "healthy lifestyle" only refers to swimming pools. Mr. Videkovich replied that, in the context of the comprehensive plan, it encompasses various activities, not just swimming pools specifically.

Chairman Dunham then asked if there had been any mention of other jurisdictions that allow solid fences. Mr. Videkovich explained that he was not aware of any specific examples, but to his knowledge, almost all other jurisdictions allow solid fences in rear yards for swimming pools.

There were no further questions from Commissioners and Chairman Dunham noted the following individuals signed up to speak on the request:

FOR

Dennis Landwehr, (27 Marion Dr, Lakeside Park, KY)

Paul Rizzo, (209 Applewood Dr, Lakeside Park, KY)

Councilman Dennis Landwehr, a council member for the City of Lakeside Park (27 Marion Dr, Lakeside Park, KY), addressed the Commission. Commissioner Sketch inquired if there was a specific reason for requesting the amendment. Councilman Landwehr confirmed that the specific property involved belonged to Mr. Rizzo.

Commissioner Heidrich inquired whether this request could have been addressed by the Board of Adjustment, questioning the decision to pursue a text amendment instead. Councilman Landwehr expressed his personal opinion, based on his ten years of experience as a council member, that the situation could have been resolved with just a few phone calls, rather than escalating into its current state. He believed the issue could have been settled more simply. Commissioner Sketch clarified that this matter would not require a variance to be reviewed by the Board of Adjustment.

There were no further questions and Chairman Dunham then called on Mr. Paul Rizzo, (209 Applewood Dr, Lakeside Park, KY), who addressed the Commission regarding concerns he has seen over the summer. He noted that he often has 30 to 40 children playing on the property behind his pool and he built the original, 50% open fence last winter but with the arrival of spring, he became worried about the possibility of these children climbing the fence and getting hurt. During his statement, Mr. Rizzo presented a short video (maintained electronically for the record) that shows the activity occurring behind his property. He explained that he initially erected a fence that was 50% open and after facing some issues, he decided it would be better to install a privacy fence, but he did not realize that he needed to consult the city or his neighbors before making this change.

There were no questions for Mr. Rizzo and Chairman Dunham recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners. He noted that the video was helpful and that the request made sense. He expressed his initial concern about how this proposal would affect many properties, but after hearing that having a solid fence is common in other jurisdictions, he agreed with the proposal.

Commissioner Heidrich remarked that he found it helpful to hear that the request was not a matter for the Board of Adjustment. He noted that Lakeside Park's fencing regulations were more restrictive, but he believes that simply comparing regulations to those of other cities is not always relevant, as these regulations were established in their own plans and adopted by their council. He expressed appreciation for the Staff's comments regarding the language but suggested that if a text amendment were to be made, it should allow for input from all properties

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

with similar uses. He also thought it might be beneficial for neighbors to have direct access to each other, possibly facilitated by neighbor letters, rather than creating a blanket option for 70 additional properties. He felt he may disagree somewhat with the city taking full responsibility for this issue.

Chairman Dunham clarified that an administrative decision should be straightforward—either a fence meets the criteria or it does not. He emphasized that the opinions of neighboring property owners should not influence the decision; if the fence complies with the criteria, it should be approved; if it does not, it should be denied. Mr. Smith added that there is case law in Kentucky aimed at removing subjectivity from the process, focusing instead on whether a proposed project complies with regulations to receive a building permit. He argued that allowing adjacent property owners to influence what can be done on someone else's property is an improper delegation of authority. He believes that only the Planning Commission and the city should have the power to establish regulations.

Chairman Dunham then returned to the public hearing for clarification. There were no comments and he closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. *Commissioner Heidrich made the motion in reference to **FILE: PC-26-0001-TX** the Lakeside Park text amendment, to approve the text amendment based on the facts and considerations contained in the staff report and based on the testimony of staff and witnesses present and finding that the proposed text amendment is reasonable with the regulations; seconded by Commissioner Flem. There was a short discussion about adding Staff's [suggestion] to the recommendation and Commissioner Heidrich agreed. A roll call vote found Commissioners Heidrich; Flem; France; Herrmann; Janes; Martin; Ryan; Simpson; Sketch; Snyder; Wichmann; Baumgardner; Bridges; DeAngelis; Dicke; and Dunham in favor; Commissioner Darpel recused himself and was not in the room. There were none opposed and the motion carried.*

(Commissioner Darpel returned to chambers at 8:28 p.m.)

Chairman Dunham then introduced **FILE NUMBER: PC-26-0002-TX**

APPLICANT: City of Bromley per Andrew Clift, City Council

REQUEST: A proposed text amendment to the Bromley Zoning Ordinance for neighborhood commercial zones (NC) to allow single-family detached residential dwellings.

Mr. Videkovich then introduced Mr. Zane Winkler as the spring planning intern with PDS. He said that Mr. Winkler would be presenting the case and they both would be available for any questions.

Mr. Zane Winkler presented the staff review for the text amendment to the Bromley Zoning Ordinance that would allow single-family detached residential dwellings in neighborhood commercial zones. He provided a brief history, noting that the city adopted the Z21 zoning ordinance in 2024. The proposed amendment would allow existing single-family detached residences in these zones, which currently do not allow them. Mr. Winkler emphasized that these dwellings would be subject to the intensity and dimensional standards of the Residential Urban zone and would not require a development plan process. He then presented a table of the [3.04.E Intensity and Dimensional Standards table] that outlines the existing requirements. Additionally, Mr. Winkler noted that the city has one neighborhood commercial zone, and the proposed amendment would affect approximately 28 lots in that zone, where most properties are already single-family detached residences.

Mr. Winkler noted that although compliance with the comprehensive plan is not mandatory for text amendments, the Staff Review found that the request aligns with key goals aimed at celebrating the unique identities of Kenton County communities. He stated the city is situated within the first-ring subarea, and the request supports the objective of developing and implementing policies, regulations, and incentives to preserve and enhance the existing community fabric and this amendment would help maintain existing single-family residential units within

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zone in Bromley, recognizing that residents could face hardships due to the current zoning ordinance.

He then reviewed KRS 100.203(1), which outlines the allowable content that cities may enact. Mr. Winkler provided the staff's favorable recommendation for the proposed text amendment, stating that it is both appropriate and reasonable. He explained that allowing single-family detached residential dwellings within a neighborhood commercial zone would enable residents to maintain their properties without being subject to nonconforming regulations. He added that the proposed amendment aligns with the comprehensive plan, which advocates flexible regulations to foster a more active and engaging built environment and the amendment would also offer alternative housing options within neighborhoods and support the need for a variety of housing choices in suburban areas.

He then offered to answer questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Dicke inquired whether the request applied only to existing properties and if, given that it is not currently permitted, the current residences are considered nonconforming. Mr. Winkler confirmed that this was correct. Commissioner Dicke then asked if this would allow for future residential development, to which Mr. Winkler responded that he believed the city's intention was for it to apply only to existing single-family residential dwellings.

Chairman Dunham noted that no one was signed up to speak and offered the opportunity for comments from the applicant.

Mayor Mike Denham of the City of Bromley expressed his support for the zoning change, explaining that citizens had attended council meetings to complain about their inability to do anything with their properties.

There were no questions from Commissioners and no others signed up to speak and Chairman Dunham then recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners.

Chairman Dunham stated he had some concerns when the request was submitted. Commissioner France noted that most properties in the NC zone are single-family residential homes, so the amendment is logical. Chairman Dunham also mentioned that the Z21 ordinance certainly simplifies this process.

There were no other comments and Chairman Dunham then returned to the public hearing for clarification. There were no concerns and he closed the public hearing and entertained a motion. *Commissioner Bridges, on behalf of the city of Bromley, made a motion on FILE: PC-26-0002-TX to approve the text amendment based on the facts and considerations contained in the staff report and based on the testimony of staff and witnesses present at the hearing and finding that the proposed text amendment is a reasonable regulation; seconded by Commissioner Darpel. A roll call vote found Commissioners Bridges; Darpel; DeAngelis; Dicke; Dunham; Flem; France; Heidrich; Herrmann; Janes; Martin; Ryan; Simpson; Sketch; Snyder; Wichmann, and Baumgardner in favor; none opposed and the motion carried.*

This concluded the public hearing portion of the meeting and Chairman Dunham moved on to Reports from Committees.

Reports from Committees

- **Executive:** there was nothing to report but he asked if there were any questions about the 2026 Budget Cycle memo. There was nothing to discuss.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

- **Direction 2030 Implementation:** Commissioner Simpson announced that they are in the final stages of the housing study, which will be sent for review to the full Commission. He mentioned that the draft has been received, reviewed, and sent back to the consultant. The Committee will meet again on Monday, March 9, 2026, to discuss how the Committee's comments have been incorporated into the report, and he hopes to present it to the full Commission soon. He also reminded everyone that this housing study is not a directive but rather recommendations for increasing density or housing when they choose to do so.
- **Subdivision Review** – Did not meet.
- **Z21 Review Committee** – Nothing to report.

Reports from Commission Members:

- Commissioner Ryan mentioned that he ran into Commissioner Bethell who said hello and sent his best wishes.
- Commissioner Sketch asked if the staff could rearrange the agenda to address brief text amendments first, avoiding a 2-3 hour wait for city officials. Chairman Dunham explained that the Commission can make a motion to amend the agenda at the start of the meeting, especially if there are lengthy cases, but that staff cannot do this without authorization as the Bylaws dictate the order. Commissioner Sketch inquired whether cases are listed in the order they are received, to which Chairman Dunham confirmed. Mr. Smith mentioned the order is structured by the Bylaws, and Commissioner Darpel agreed. Commissioner Sketch pointed out that both a mayor and a city council member had to sit through the long wait, suggesting the Commission should use their discretion to prioritize cases.
- Commissioner Martin inquired about the Splash top app and whether it was addressed. Mr. Videkovich responded that this issue was just discovered before the meeting, and staff would inform the county IT department. Chairman Dunham remarked that it is beneficial when an applicant presents their materials on screen.
- Chairman Dunham addressed the Park Hills Z21 matter, which involved a zoning area change included alongside a zoning ordinance update — an unprecedented combination. The Park Hills Mayor was upset over a comment made during the Z21 Committee meeting, where members questioned whether the city was attempting to introduce a zone change without proper oversight. After reviewing the situation, the Park Hills Z21 Committee learned that the developer had consulted all surrounding property owners with no objections, leading them to proceed under Z21. However, when the matter came before the Park Hills City Council, numerous upset neighbors prompted the city to withdraw the zone change from the update. Chairman Dunham informed the Mayor that he would publicly affirm that the Z21 Committee did not perceive any attempt by the Mayor or City Council to deceive anyone in the process and felt it was important for the full Commission to be aware of this.

- **Reports from Legal Counsel:**
Nothing to report.

Reports/Announcements from Staff

- Mr. Videkovich announced that members received updated continuing education reports that differ from earlier versions due to changes in KRS 100. He invited Ms. Pamela Bushelman to explain these changes. Ms. Bushelman, PDS Senior Secretary Planning & Zoning, clarified that the reports are sent out bi-annually at the end of the first and third quarters. She explained that members will also receive updates after submitting training. She noted that the updated form now includes two columns: one for planning-related credits and one for housing-related credits and members must complete their hours every four years instead of every two years. She added that new members must finish three hours of planning and one hour of housing training within their first year on the Commission. Next, she discussed the colored cells on the form, which help members track submitted training, noting that the same training cannot be submitted twice within the same

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 05, 2026**

reporting period. She pointed out that gray cells show closed reporting periods, where any training completed after the deadline cannot be applied. She then reminded members that training must be submitted within 30 days of participation and opened the floor for questions. Commissioner Ryan and Commissioner Snyder both expressed appreciation for the simplified form and the inclusion of training records.

General Correspondence:

- Chairman Dunham then noted the Boone County correspondence for their preservation and comprehensive plan update. There were no comments.
- He also referenced the meeting safety and security update. There were no comments.

New Business:

There was none.

Public Comments

- There were no public comments.

There being nothing further to come before the Commission, Chairman Dunham asked for a motion to adjourn. So moved by Commissioner Snyder; seconded by Commissioner Darpel. All in favor by acclamation. The meeting then adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair _____



Date _____

