

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Chairman Dunham called the meeting to order on August 06, 2026, at 6:15 p.m. ET [5:15 p.m. CT] and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance, invocation by Commissioner Darpel, 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	-		X				X				
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills	X	-	X*	X	X	X		X				
Todd Berling	Fort Wright	X	-			X	X		X				
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Mike Conway	Park Hills	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	X				
Paul Darpel, Vice Chair	Edgewood	X	-	X	X		X	X	X				
Gabriella DeAngelis	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X		X				
Kevin Dicke	Fort Mitchell	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Brian Dunham, Chairman	Kenton County	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Sarah Flem	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Tom France	Ludlow	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Ken Heidrich	Lakeside Park		-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Todd Herrmann	Erlanger	X	-	X	X	X		X	X				
Betsy Janes	Villa Hills	X	-	X	X	X			X				
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	-	X		X		X	X				
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X		X				
Greg Sketch	Crescent Springs	X	-	X	X			X					
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	-		X	X	X	X					
Quin Wichmann	Ryland Hts.		-	X	X	X	X	X	X				

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

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

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Also present: Legal Counsel Mr. Matt Smith, and the following PDS Staff: Andy Videkovich, PDS Director of Planning; Patrick Denbow, PDS Senior Planner; Steve Neltner, PDS Director of Infrastructure Engineering, and Pamela Bushelman, PDS Senior Secretary, Planning & Zoning.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS AND REPORTS

Chairman Dunham presented the meeting agenda and asked if there were any questions, comments, or changes before calling for a motion. There were none and the *motion to accept the agenda as presented was made by Commissioner Snyder and seconded by Commissioner Darpel. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.*

Next, Chairman Dunham presented the July 7, 2026, special meeting minutes and invited commissioners to review them. There were no corrections or changes and he called for a motion to approve the minutes. *The motion to accept the minutes was made by Commissioner Bridges and seconded by Commissioner Snyder. A roll call vote found Commissioners Bridges, Snyder, Wichmann, Armbruster, Berling, Conway, Darpel, Dicke, Dunham, Flem, France, Heidrich, Herrmann, and Martin in favor. Commissioners Baumgardner, DeAngelis, Janes, and Simpson abstained and the motion carried.*

Chairman Dunham presented the report of receipts and expenditures for the month of June and asked if there were any questions before calling for a motion to approve it. *Commissioner Snyder made the motion to approve the report; seconded by Commissioner Darpel. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.*

Chairman Dunham presented the reports of last month's staff actions: Plat Letter, Stage II Updates, and legislative body actions. There was no action required and no comments.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Dunham then introduced **FILE NUMBER: PC-26-0008-TX**

APPLICANT: City of Fort Wright

REQUEST: Proposed text amendments to the Fort Wright Zoning Ordinance (1) permitting Delivery Drone Stations as an accessory use in the GI (General Industrial) Zone, subject to conditional use approval; (2) establishing use specific standards for such facilities; and (3) defining related terms.

Mr. Videkovich, Director of Planning with PDS staff, presented the three text amendments concerning delivery drones and delivery drone stations. The first component adds formal definitions for "Delivery Drones" and "Delivery Drone Station Accessory Use", drawn from research into how other jurisdictions define these terms in order to provide clarity and consistency in administering the zoning regulations.

The second component will allow delivery drone stations as an accessory use within the General Industrial (GI) zone, subject to conditional use approval by the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Videkovich emphasized that a delivery drone station cannot stand alone — it must be an accessory use to another permitted use already on the site, and it must go through a public hearing and receive conditional use approval from the Fort Wright Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment will also retain authority to impose additional conditions beyond the specific use standards if needed to properly integrate the use into the surrounding area. He described the General Industrial zone's purpose (manufacturing, research, warehousing, flex space, outdoor storage, heavier traffic uses

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

and select business services) and noted that a full list of permitted and conditional uses was attached to the Staff Report.

He then reviewed the geography of the General Industrial zoning areas in Fort Wright, both located along Madison Pike running north-south through the city — one area north of I-275 near the Sanitation District site, Howard Litzler Rd., and the driving range, with a small extension up Highland Pike, and another area south of I-275 extending onto Old Madison Pike and Helen Ruth Drive.

The third component establishes new specific use standards for delivery drone stations to ensure compatibility with surrounding properties, covering loading, placement, and screening. Mr. Videkovich pointed out the key standards that include:

- the station must meet the same location requirements as vehicular loading facilities (side or rear yard in Fort Wright),
- rooftop placement on a principal structure may be possible if all equipment is screened from public view;
- the area must be paved (no gravel or landscaped surfaces);
- loading spaces must remain permanently available for loading and cannot be in dual use for drone stations;
- the station cannot conflict with required off-street parking, loading, or vehicular access/circulation;
- any accessory storage building (commonly used to house equipment overnight or when not in use) cannot be a shipping container and must meet Kentucky Building Codes;
- the station must be enclosed with a fence or wall and meet standard industrial landscaping requirements;
- overall, the use must comply with all federal, state, and local licensing and operational regulations.

Mr. Videkovich noted that while compliance with the Comprehensive Plan is not required for text amendments, the Comprehensive Plan's mobility element recommends preparing for new mobility technology, so the amendment is in alignment. He also noted that state statutes govern what content cities may enact in this area.

Mr. Videkovich stated that Staff issued a favorable recommendation, finding that the definitions provide the needed clarity and consistency, and that permitting drone stations as accessory/conditional uses with specific standards allows adoption of the new technology without impairing the integrity or character of the surrounding area. He concluded by offering to answer questions.

Commissioner Flem raised a regulatory-gap concern, noting new use types are typically paired with operational standards, and asked whether concerns about noise, walkway clearance, fire suppression, and accessibility would be handled under existing General Industrial standards or needed drone-specific provisions. Mr. Videkovich said most of these fall outside local zoning authority, since the FAA governs drones once airborne and the city can only regulate site/location and ground-level buffering. He noted General Industrial noise standards would serve as a catch-all, and that battery-related fire suppression falls under the Kentucky Building Code.

Commissioner Bridges asked if this was the Commission's first encounter with such a proposal; Mr. Videkovich confirmed it was. Commissioner Bridges then asked about size restrictions on drones. Mr. Videkovich said there are none — drones are currently large but trending smaller, comparing their size to a parking space, and noting the FAA likely sets its own size rules. Commissioner Bridges noted large bomb-carrying drones are used in the war in Europe as evidence that drones can be quite large.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Mr. Matt Smith, KCPC Legal Counsel, stated he has researched the Commission's authority: ground-level matters like buffering and takeoff zones are regulable, but flight-related matters (hours, appearance, lighting) are not. He added that FAA licensing varies by drone size and that local size regulation would likely be federally preempted.

Commissioner Flem asked whether fire suppression should be required for the structure housing drones and batteries. Mr. Videkovich agreed it was a good point but said it falls under the Building Code, not zoning.

Commissioner France asked whether stations would receive goods, deliver them, or both. Mr. Videkovich said the examples in his research were delivery-only. Commissioner France noted the proposal does not limit operating hours. Mr. Videkovich agreed but said hours are an FAA matter, adding that deliveries are currently federally restricted to daylight hours.

Commissioner Herrmann pointed out on the topic of fire suppression that comparable retail stores already carry fire-safety concerns, and drone stations would still face the same fire codes and inspections as any other use.

Commissioner Wichmann asked about other noise-based zoning rules. Mr. Videkovich cited outdoor dining near residential areas as an example, but noted it is fixed in place, unlike the mobile, intermittent nature of drone delivery, which could be harder to regulate.

Chairman Dunham noted a drone is still ground-based machinery before takeoff. Mr. Videkovich agreed, saying General Industrial noise standards would apply as a general catch-all if complaints arise.

Commissioner Heidrich asked about the operating history elsewhere. Mr. Videkovich confirmed rollouts including Houston, calling it Walmart-driven — unsurprising, since Walmart is the potential Fort Wright applicant — and noted expansion plans across the greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky area. Commissioner Heidrich predicted real-world issues (drones landing in yards, etc.) that would eventually push residents to raise concerns with local councils, though he noted the Commission's authority covers only the physical site, not airborne activity — calling it a learning process. Mr. Videkovich said the city is being deliberate, using the conditional-use process to control siting. He noted the ordinance is currently silent on drone stations, so confining the use to General Industrial zoning intentionally excludes the Walmart site and neighbors, reflecting a controlled approach to new technology.

Commissioner Bridges asked whether the use was delivery-only or would also allow something like a recreational drone club. Mr. Videkovich confirmed it covers delivery only, excluding recreational use.

Commissioner Dicke asked whether stations would function as hubs, with delivery vehicles dropping goods for drones to then deliver, and how goods would arrive generally. Mr. Videkovich said a warehouse-style staging model is plausible, though a retail-based model with staff filling orders directly is also possible since approaches may evolve.

The Chairman asked if anyone else had questions or signed up to speak, then recognized Ms. Jill Bailey, City Administrator for Fort Wright.

Ms. Bailey opened by calling this a unique, unfamiliar topic that has been a learning experience for staff, noting the effort was informally dubbed "the Walmart project" after Walmart's regional government relations director contacted the city about expanding drone delivery into Michigan, Ohio, and part of Kentucky — specifically Fort

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Wright. She said the city has very little information to work with, having invited Walmart to a public meeting multiple times so council could ask questions, but Walmart declined and as a result, council passed a moratorium, currently extended to October 15th.

She framed this text amendment as a first, tentative step toward managing drone delivery regionally, stressing this is not really about Walmart specifically — she noted the Cleveland Clinic has started prescription drone delivery, a pizza chain has discussed it, and Amazon is likely to enter the space next. She said additional city-level policy will likely be needed beyond zoning, especially around noise, which is a major council concern — but she noted local cities lack the equipment to measure noise levels, leaving enforcement largely to officer discretion, similar to existing unregulated noise sources like trains.

She then compared the situation to regional efforts 20 years ago to regulate sexually oriented businesses, saying drone delivery similarly needs a regional approach. She stated that the city reached out to CVG airport representatives to understand regional airspace and FAA rules, noting primary flight patterns run over Covington toward CVG, and that Walmart had mentioned a five-mile delivery radius — meaning the impact would extend well beyond Fort Wright to Fort Mitchell, Edgewood, Taylor Mill, and Covington. She said the mayor has spoken with neighboring mayors, several of whom are interested in addressing the issue jointly, though conversations with CVG remain preliminary.

She noted the process only began four to five months ago with a small staff moving quickly, and that the city consulted the water department, since state regulations prohibit flights over critical infrastructure like hospitals and water towers; the water district said it is already working with the FAA on drone delivery issues. Ms. Bailey acknowledged many open questions remain — Walmart's specific flight plans, potential revenue from use of city airspace, new burdens on police response, and liability for accidents like dropped packages — but said this amendment represents the necessary first step, and she offered to take questions.

Commissioner Darpel asked how the city arrived at this proposal given Walmart's lack of formal commitment or specifics. Ms. Bailey said Walmart shared only a tentative outline, including a video of the drone "nest" design, which the city supplemented with its own research. She noted Walmart mentioned fencing but could not address noise, lighting, or takeoff patterns given the area's valley topography and related airspace issues. She described Walmart as largely non-communicative, possibly due to focus on other state projects, and said the city remains open to further talks if a firmer proposal emerges.

Ms. Bailey stated that Fort Wright has always been business-friendly and sees this technology as part of that, but stressed more dialogue is needed. She noted the amendment is not final and may need revisiting later. Based on current information and PDS Staff input, General Industrial was chosen as the most appropriate zone, since the code was otherwise silent — acknowledging the framework is not perfect and may need adjustment.

Commissioner Berling commended Ms. Bailey and the city council for being proactive, praising the amendment for giving the Commission some control via the accessory/conditional-use structure, while noting this is just the beginning.

Commissioner France asked whether Walmart's property fell within the General Industrial zone. Ms. Bailey said it did not — Walmart's site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial (clarified by PDS staff as being zoned PUD). Commissioner France asked what practical effect the amendment would have if it did not cover Walmart's property. Ms. Bailey explained Walmart does not own land in the General Industrial zone, so the amendment

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

would not currently let Walmart operate there — a separate amendment would be needed later. She added council would likely support that step, and the city remains open to further discussion.

Commissioner Berling added a personal note, thanking Ms. Bailey for her years of service, noting this was her last month before retirement. Ms. Bailey thanked him, reflecting on her 31-year career and calling it an honor to have appeared before the Commission often. She thanked the Commission for its work and volunteer hours, thanked PDS Staff for being excellent colleagues, and closed with a final note of gratitude.

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

Commissioner Darpel opened by calling the amendment just the beginning, predicting more amendments would follow, but said the city had to start somewhere. He saw nothing overreaching in the draft, calling it reasonable baby steps. Chairman Dunham agreed, noting federal regulation already limits the city's options, so starting conservatively and expanding later made more sense than risking overreach now.

Commissioner Heidrich noted a recurring pattern where unanswerable questions get deferred to another authority — currently the water department on watershed issues — and predicted the FAA would similarly become the default authority for drone-related questions.

Commissioner Bridges raised a grandfathering concern: if the language proves inadequate, an early applicant could be exempt from stricter standards added later. Commissioner Darpel asked whether the conditional-use structure addressed that, and Commissioner Berling agreed it did. Commissioner Darpel explained that because it's a conditional use, future applicants still must go through conditional use approval with the Board of Adjustment rather than automatically qualifying under old rules — meaning grandfathering is not as automatic as it sounds, since the Board retains the ability to stop or restrict projects that do not meet requirements. Commissioner Bridges noted the Board of Adjustment can also attach conditions to approvals. Commissioner Darpel agreed, adding that his comfort was specifically tied to this being conditional rather than a use permitted by right — had it been permitted outright in the General Industrial zone, he would have been more concerned.

There was no further discussion and Chairman Dunham returned to the public hearing, asking if any clarifications were needed before closing the public hearing and calling for a motion. *Commissioner Berling moved to approve the text amendment for file number PC-26-0008-TX, the City of Fort Wright's request related to delivery drones, based on Staff's report and its favorable recommendation, and noting that the amendment supports and addresses several of the mobility element goals in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Simpson seconded the motion and a roll call vote found Commissioners Berling, Simpson, Snyder, Wichmann, Armbruster, Baumgardner, Bridges, Conway, Darpel, 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-26-0009-TX**

APPLICANT: City of Ludlow

REQUEST: Proposed text amendments to the Ludlow Zoning Ordinance (1) adding language establishing procedures for designating historic landmarks and districts; (2) amending Urban Design Review Board conflict-of-interest provisions and reporting responsibilities; (3) removing duplicative procedural language; and (4) defining related terms.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Mr. Denbow, Senior Planner with PDS staff, identified himself for the record and explained that these amendments relate to historic preservation in Ludlow. He noted that in 2021 the city established historic preservation overlay zones, created the Urban Design and Review Board (UDRB), and adopted historic design guidelines, all of which carried over into the city's new 2025 zoning ordinance under the Z21 process. He then explained that the city has since been working with the Kentucky Heritage Council toward obtaining a Certified Local Government (CLG) designation, and this amendment reflects language the Council suggested to help the city qualify. He pointed out that CLG status brings added grant opportunities, technical preservation expertise, and a formal role in National Register nominations. He added that the city has already adopted parallel language into its code of ordinances and is now seeking to align the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Denbow then outlined the substantive changes. The first two components expand the UDRB's role:

COMPONENT 1:

- Requiring the UDRB to study all designation requests (which may come from the UDRB itself, city council, a property owner, an individual, or a neighborhood organization)
- Requiring design guidelines to be in place before any designation
- Establishing a public hearing and notification process, with UDRB recommendations going to both the Planning Commission and City Council
- Setting designation criteria consistent with National Register standards
- Requiring rescissions to follow the same procedure as designations
- Giving the UDRB a review role for National Register nominations under the CLG program
- Allowing the UDRB to receive, hold, and spend funds
- Clarifying UDRB conflict-of-interest standards
- Requiring annual activity reports open to public inspection

COMPONENT 2:

- Removes language unintentionally duplicated during the Z21 process
- Consolidates the UDRB's established language under administrative roles rather than leaving it repeated elsewhere
- Adds a new UDRB-specific definitions list, similar to existing supplemental lists already in the ordinance for flood protection and sexually oriented businesses

Mr. Denbow noted that Comprehensive Plan compliance is not required for a text amendment, though several plan sections are relevant and Staff found the amendments will strengthen the urban core through historic preservation and expand the city's preservation tools while maintaining character, consistent with cities' authority under KRS 100. He then stated that Staff gave a favorable recommendation with two conditions:

- correcting references from "planning and zoning commission" to "Planning Commission,"
- removing language that requires the Planning Commission to amend the Comprehensive Plan while clarifying its actual role.

He explained these conditions reduce future confusion, since the Kenton County Comprehensive Plan does not map historic districts, and noted the city has already agreed to both conditions via a submission letter from the mayor. He then offered to take questions.

Chairman Dunham said the recommended conditions addressed his concern, which Commissioner Darpel shared. He confirmed the language needed to remove provisions requiring the Commission to amend the Comprehensive Plan and needed to clarify the Commission's actual role, asking what that role would be. Mr. Denbow explained

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

the clarified language would limit the Commission's role to map amendments — specifically creating a historic preservation overlay zone — under the ordinance's existing map amendment process. He noted the original language had also given the Commission a role in landmark designations, which it does not actually handle, so that would be removed in favor of the map amendment process.

Chairman Dunham said he was uncomfortable with language stating the Commission "shall" do certain things. Mr. Denbow agreed that it was being removed, along with language suggesting the Commission "approves" designations, since it only makes recommendations. Chairman Dunham wanted the section narrowed to avoid obligating the Commission beyond its statutory authority. Mr. Denbow confirmed the working draft removes the landmark role entirely from Planning Commission review, limiting the Commission strictly to map amendments under Article 13. Chairman Dunham then asked how the Commission could be confident in the final language. Mr. Smith said Staff has been refining it with the city, and that even an out-of-scope application would have to be rejected, since a city cannot grant the Commission jurisdiction beyond what state statute allows.

Commissioner Darpel raised a procedural concern about how unsettled language would affect the vote at this meeting, since the Commission would not be comfortable recommending adoption without finalized wording. Mr. Smith suggested it would likely be a recommendation to deny, and Commissioner Darpel agreed that the reason would be the absence of clearer language. Chairman Dunham echoed this and asked whether the item could be tabled so the city could return with specific language.

Commissioner France questioned why the Commission should have any role in what a city like Ludlow designates as historic, calling it a local decision. Commissioner Darpel responded that the Commission does have a role since Ludlow already has a historic preservation overlay and expanding it would come through as a map amendment. He noted the language as written appeared to require the Commission to amend the Comprehensive Plan, which is not accurate, and said the amendment is essentially defining the Commission's role going forward.

Commissioner France acknowledged the overlay exists but was not sure the Commission originally approved it, though he agreed expansion would require review. Chairman Dunham guessed it likely came through an earlier text amendment creating the overlay, followed by a map amendment setting boundaries. Commissioner France said Ludlow's goals were good but he was worried unnecessary Commission involvement could undermine them. Mr. Denbow explained the state had provided generic template language that now needs tailoring to the city's actual regulations. Chairman Dunham said he understood but would have preferred the language be tailored to Ludlow before reaching the Commission and remained open to tabling the item for revisions.

Commissioner Darpel raised further concerns, saying he could not tell whether the amendment expanded the city's original intent and suggested asking the applicant. He wanted clarity on who could initiate a landmark designation — the property owner only, or someone else against the owner's wishes — given the real consequences involved. He disclosed owning property in Ludlow within a historic overlay, supporting some aspects but raising concerns about financial impacts on remodeling, where even replacing a window can become difficult. He recommended material-replacement language allow modern, affordable alternatives that look identical to originals, arguing costly requirements like custom wood windows discourage owners from taking on historic properties, and said the goal should be preserving the guidelines' purpose without excess restriction. Mr. Denbow noted separate historic design guidelines govern material requirements outside the zoning ordinance. Commissioner Darpel said this was part of his uncertainty about what was being expanded versus clarified and wanted it addressed when the applicant spoke. Commissioner Simpson agreed, discussing it directly with the applicant would help.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

There were no further questions for Mr. Denbow and Chairman Dunham called Mr. Andy Corn, (421 Closson Ct, Ludlow, KY) who explained he is a Ludlow resident and consultant to the city, working for about two years to help secure Certified Local Government (CLG) status. He stated that once achieved, he would serve as liaison between the Kentucky Heritage Council and the Urban Design Review Board (UDRB) a board he previously chaired but stepped down due to the dual role. He then provided background stating the current historic district and UDRB date to 2019, replacing an earlier, disbanded preservation board; in seven years the UDRB issued over 80 certificates of appropriateness and enforced at least one stop-work order.

Next, he addressed the amendment and said the Heritage Council reviewed Ludlow's guidelines and recommended additional language — sometimes minor wording, sometimes new procedures — to meet CLG standards, particularly around landmarking, which previously consisted of just one line in the guidelines. He pointed out that only one building, the storehouse, has been formally landmarked, through a process that required owner permission. He stressed Ludlow has no intent to landmark properties against owners' wishes, and that the CLG goal is simply to access grants and programs available to other CLG cities.

Chairman Dunham asked how many CLGs exist in Kentucky (Mr. Corn estimated 40) and pressed on where the language actually guarantees owner consent for landmarking. Mr. Corn admitted he could not point to the specific text.

Commissioner Simpson asked directly whether owner permission is required to initiate a designation and Mr. Corn said no such requirement currently exists.

Commissioner France asked whether the storehouse was Ludlow's only landmark. Mr. Corn clarified the distinction between National Register buildings/districts, UDRB-only landmark status, and a separate, non-regulatory Historic Society awards program.

Commissioner Berling asked whether CLG status was sought to gain more control over landmarking. Mr. Corn said no, it is solely about accessing grant funding already available to Covington and Newport, and the Heritage Council will not approve the CLG without this amendment.

Commissioner Darpel raised more detailed concerns indicating that the draft appeared to let the UDRB initiate a landmark designation without owner consent, which he felt should be fixed regardless of intent, especially once paired with stricter CLG-driven rules. He also flagged the material-replacement standard, which as written would block modern materials even if visually identical to the historic original, illustrating with his own Ludlow property, where future upgrades using better materials might not qualify despite matching the historic look. He said the underlying goal was right but the language needed more review, particularly around the Planning Commission's role, before he could support it.

Commissioner France raised the same concern using the storehouse's 50 windows as an example where true historic materials would be impractical. Mr. Corn agreed enforcement in practice is more flexible than the text suggests, focusing strict standards on major buildings while accommodating owners with fewer resources — calling it a "gray scale" rather than black-and-white.

Chairman Dunham warned that inconsistent enforcement based on an owner's perceived means creates real legal exposure, and suggested pausing so the city, its attorney, and PDS Staff could align the written language with

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

actual practice. Commissioner Berling agreed, noting future board members may not share the same discretion, making the current ambiguity risky to codify.

Chairman Dunham reaffirmed he has been a strong supporter of Ludlow's preservation work but said the CLG goal was worth getting right rather than rushing.

Commissioner Flem asked whether Ludlow could still modify this language and still obtain CLG status. Mr. Corn confirmed yes, noting only this language (plus a wording fix referring to the Planning Commission) stood between the city and its application. Commissioner Simpson asked about any deadline and Mr. Corn said there was none, despite the two-year process so far.

Commissioner France asked about Covington and Newport's CLG status and suggested learning how they had handled similar issues and asked whether Mr. Corn could pause the application. Mr. Corn stated he could since it has not yet gone to city council.

Chairman Dunham confirmed Mr. Corn was appearing on behalf of the City of Ludlow as the applicant.

Commissioner France then asked about the Commission's statutory action window and Mr. Smith confirmed 60 days unless tabled.

Commissioner Darpel explained the options: proceed to a vote (with a non-approval recommendation still able to be overridden by city council), or table for up to six months at no extra fee to refine the language with Staff before returning without reapplying. Mr. Corn said he would prefer to table.

Chairman Dunham then closed the public hearing and called for a motion. *Commissioner France moved to table the item for up to six months to clarify the Planning Commission's role, assess the impact of stricter CLG guidelines, and add a requirement that property owners provide consent before landmark designation. Commissioner Simpson seconded the motion and the motion carried by acclamation.*

Chairman Dunham then closed the public hearing portion of the meeting and opened Reports from Committees.

Executive Committee: Chairman Dunham reported there was no additional update beyond welcoming Commissioner Snyder as the Commission's new treasurer.

Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee: Commissioner Simpson reported that the Implementation Committee has a meeting scheduled for August 11th to review several items, including how the housing study connects with and is used in the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Dunham followed up on a related administrative point, asking whether Commissioner Snyder had received a meeting notice as a member of the Implementation Committee specifically, or only in her capacity on the Executive Committee. Ms. Bushelman confirmed that Commissioner Snyder serves on the Implementation Committee; Chairman Dunham said that detail would be looked into after the meeting.

Subdivision Regulations Review Committee: Commissioner Darpel opened the item, explaining that the Committee had met and was bringing forward a set of general "cleanup" changes to the Subdivision Regulations that had been discussed over several months. He noted everything was marked in the packet for review, and said the proposal was to recommend these items be placed on next month's agenda for a vote, giving Commissioners

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

roughly 30 days to review the details in the meantime. He asked Mr. Steve Neltner to give a quick, high-level synopsis rather than walking through every item individually.

Mr. Neltner, Director of Infrastructure Engineering for PDS, summarized the proposed changes:

- **Section 4.3-2 (stormwater drainage):** Requires a minimum of three feet of cover over any pipe beneath a roadway, matching the standard SD1 already applies to lots over an acre, to properly cushion the pipe beneath the road surface.
- **Section 4.6-1 (general requirements):** Relocates the existing cold-weather guidelines — currently referenced only under street pavement — so they apply broadly as a general concrete requirement, since curbs and sidewalks are not currently covered.
- **Section 4.6-2 (concrete pavement) and 4.6-3 (concrete curbs on asphalt streets):** Updates testing standards from the older 6x12-inch cylinders (one set of three) to the now-standard 4x8-inch cylinders (one set of five), broken at 7 days, 28 days, and held in reserve.
- **Section 4.7 (asphalt):** Mirrors 2026 updates to KYTC Section 400 — prohibiting RAP/RAS (recycled asphalt pavement/shingles), adjusting material percentages to match KYTC's updated standards, and restricting tack coat placement below 40 degrees to prevent freezing.
- **Proof-rolling requirement:** Replaces the vague "fully loaded truck" standard with a specific minimum weight of 18 tons (triauxle rather than dual-axle, reflecting larger modern dump trucks), used to verify soil stability before street construction.
- **Appendix A, Figure 8.1, Detail 2:** Classifies catch basins and manholes uniformly as "drainage structures" to eliminate field confusion; reinforces the three-foot cover requirement for shallow trenches; and adds non-woven geotextile fabric between backfill and #57 stone in deep trenches to keep fine soil particles out of the drainage material — a change geotechnical engineers he consulted also supported.
- **Detail 3 and Detail 23:** Add sand around edge drains in clay-soil areas, which drain poorly, to improve performance.
- **Expansion joint detail:** Adds a one-inch expansion joint between concrete and metal curbing on asphalt streets (currently absent) to prevent cracking from differential expansion.

Chairman Dunham asked who had been involved in developing these changes. Mr. Neltner said the primary input came from his field inspectors and internal discussions and noted the Subdivision Regulations Review Committee would continue to meet monthly on further items like secondary access and traffic studies.

Commissioner Simpson asked whether local city engineers or the broader building community had weighed in and Mr. Neltner said he had informally consulted a few outside engineers for feedback on specific items, but not through formal committee meetings. Commissioner Darpel noted this was part of why the item was being brought forward for a vote next rather than at this meeting to give developers and engineers a chance to review and comment first.

Commissioner Berling noted, for the record, that Commissioner Sketch, a civil engineer with more than 40 years of experience, serves on the Subdivision Regulations Review Committee, and Commissioner Darpel acknowledged his significant contribution. Chairman Dunham praised the Committee's long-standing ability to balance necessary updates against avoiding unnecessary added costs, and Mr. Neltner added that many of these changes simply formalize what is already being done in the field.

**KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 06, 2026**

Commissioner Darpel closed by noting that the Committee is also working on multiple-access requirements for developments — seeking input from fire departments — and broader traffic study implementation, with further updates expected over the next year.

Chairman Dunham moved through the remaining agenda items, noting there was nothing to report on the Z21 Review Committee, no Reports from Commission Members, and no Report from Legal Counsel, before asking if there were any Reports from Staff and Mr. Videkovich, Director of Planning for PDS Staff, raised two items:

- He reported that Kenton County is working with the Transportation Cabinet and OKI to update the county transportation plan, an ongoing effort Staff has been involved in and one that would also be discussed at the Implementation Committee's meeting the following week. He noted a series of upcoming public meetings related to this effort, with details displayed on screen, and encouraged Commissioners to attend, if possible, both to stay informed and to offer input, given how central transportation issues are to development across the county.
- He mentioned upcoming training sessions offered by the Kentucky League of Cities, available both in-person in Lexington and virtually, with similar content but different registration details for each option. He asked if any Commissioner interested in attending let Ms. Bushelman know and set a deadline of early October for responses.

Chairman Dunham then noted that Mr. Smith had pointed out the need for a formal vote to place the Subdivision Regulations revisions on next month's public hearing agenda and asked for a motion. *Commissioner Darpel moved to place the proposed Subdivision Regulations revisions on next month's agenda; seconded by Commissioner Berling. The motion carried by acclamation.*

Chairman Dunham stated there was no General Correspondence, no New Business, and no Public Comments, then asked whether there was a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Snyder made the motion; seconded by Commissioner Martin. The motion carried by acclamation and the meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair _____

Date _____