KENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 01, 2026

Vice Chairman Darpel called the meeting to order on October 01, 2026, at 6:15 p.m. ET [5:15 p.m. CT] and opened the proceedings with the Pledge of Allegiance, the Invocation, roll call, and the review of 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. Following roll call, Mr. Smith confirmed that a quorum was present.

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	X	X		
Margo Baumgardner	Crestview Hills	X	-	X*	X	X	X		X	X			
Todd Berling	Fort Wright	X	-			X	X		X		X		
Gailen Bridges	Bromley	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Mike Conway	Park Hills	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	X				
Paul Darpel, Vice Chair	Edgewood	X	-	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Gabriella DeAngelis	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Kevin Dicke	Fort Mitchell	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Brian Dunham, Chair	Kenton County	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Sarah Flem	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Tom France	Ludlow	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Ken Heidrich	Lakeside Park		-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Todd Herrmann	Erlanger	X	-	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Betsy Janes	Villa Hills	X	-	X	X	X			X	X			
Matthew Martin	Taylor Mill	X	-	X		X		X	X				
Kareem Simpson	Covington	X	-	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
Greg Sketch	Crescent Springs	X	-	X	X			X		X	X		
Maura Snyder	Independence	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Debbie Vaughn	Kenton Co	X	-		X	X	X	X		X	X		
Quin Wichmann	Ryland Hts.		-	X	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

Also present: Legal Counsel Mr. Matt Smith, and the following PDS Staff: Andy Videkovich, PDS Director of Planning; Patrick Denbow, PDS Senior Planner; Cody Sheets, PDS Principal Planner; Josh Wice, PDS Director; Nicole Cullum, PDS Deputy Director, and Pamela Bushelman, PDS Senior Secretary, Planning & Zoning.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS AND REPORTS

Vice Chairman Darpel presented the meeting agenda and asked if there were any questions or comments before calling for a motion. The motion to approve the agenda as presented was made by Commissioner Snyder and seconded by Commissioner Sketch. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.

Next, Vice Chairman Darpel presented the September 03, 2026, regular meeting minutes and invited Commissioners to review them. There were no comments or questions and he called for a motion to approve the

minutes. The motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Bridges and seconded by Commissioner Snyder. A roll call vote found Commissioners Bridges, Snyder, Vaughn, Armbruster, Darpel, Dicke, Flem, France, Heidrich, Herrmann, Simpson, and Sketch in favor. Commissioners Berling and DeAngelis abstained and the motion carried.

Vice Chairman Darpel then presented the report of receipts and expenditures and asked if there were any questions or comments. He noted that the Commission is only 17 percent of the way through its fiscal year and that nothing in the report stood out. The motion to approve the receipts and expenditures was made by Commissioner Snyder and seconded by Commissioner Sketch. The motion carried by acclamation of all members present.

Vice Chairman Darpel presented the report of subdivision plat reviews. He noted that the list reflected a considerable amount of ongoing activity. He further noted that the cities had subsequently taken up two of the items and that both had been approved. There were no questions or comments and no action was required.

Vice Chairman Darpel then presented the report of legislative body actions. There were no questions and no action was required.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice Chairman Darpel opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and reminded those present for a public hearing item to make sure they had signed in to speak.

Vice Chairman Darpel then introduced **FILE NUMBER: PC-26-0009-MA**

APPLICANT: Greg Berling on behalf of Fort Summit LLC

LOCATION: (1) An area of approximately 0.49 acres located on the east side of Grandview Drive, between Pinnacle Peak Way to the south and Fort Mitchell Lane to the north, approximately 90 feet north of the intersection of Pinnacle Peak Way and (2) an area of approximately 0.36 acres located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Grandview Drive with Pinnacle Peak Way, in Fort Mitchell.

REQUEST: A proposed Map Amendment and Concept Development Plan to the Fort Mitchell Zoning Ordinance (1) changing the described area from BP (Business Park) Zone to PUD (Planned Unit Development) Zone, and (2) a revised Concept Development Plan for a portion of an existing PUD Zone.

SUMMARY: The applicant proposes an addition to an existing PUD for six rear entry attached single-family residential dwellings fronting Grandview Drive. The total PUD area will be 12.85 acres, have 54 dwelling units, and 48 percent open space (a net density of 4.78 dwelling units per net acre).

Vice Chairman Darpel announced for the record that Commissioner Berling would recuse himself from this item and Commissioner Berling departed chambers at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Cody Sheets, PDS Principal Planner, presented the request for the approximately 0.85-acre site in the First Ring Suburban subarea, east of Grandview Drive, north of Pinnacle Peak Way, and west of Ascent Lane, and shared five

site photographs from September 2024 and September 2026. Area One, the map amendment area, is zoned BP with an existing land use of office/single-family residential/vacant and is now vacant after removal of a single-family home. Area Two, the amended concept plan area, is within the existing PUD with an existing land use of office/vacant and contains a pedestrian walkway and sign. Phase One of the PUD, to the east, has occupied and under-construction attached and detached single-family homes. Surrounding zoning is commercial, office, and PUD, with office, vacant, single-family residential, and recreation and open space uses. The Comprehensive Plan recommends Residential 7.1 to 14.0 dwelling units per acre with a northern commercial strip for Area One, and Commercial for Area Two and the existing PUD. The site has no developmentally sensitive areas or blue-line streams and is served by local streets, with sidewalks along the west and north sides of Grandview Drive; I-71/I-75 lies directly to the south, and the Buttermilk Pike interchange is one mile to the west.

Mr. Sheets provided history for the site and stated that multi-family map amendments in 2019 and 2021 received favorable Planning Commission recommendations but were disapproved by the city. In 2022, the city approved R-1D with an RCD overlay for 48 single-family homes at up to 4.4 dwelling units per net acre; the overlay later became the PUD Zone under Fort Mitchell's new ordinance, and a 2023 final plan replaced the planned Area Two parking with the walkway and sign. The BP Zone is intended for office use, while the PUD Zone allows flexible uses, clustered homes, and preserved open space. This concept plan adds six rear-entry town homes facing Grandview Drive, bringing the PUD to 54 units on 12.85 acres (4.79 units per net acre) with 48 percent open space, above the 30 percent required. He presented elevation and floor plan drawings provided by the applicant and stated each three-bedroom townhome, with an optional fourth bedroom, will have two parking spaces plus a garage and are estimated at $425,000 to $500,000; the plan also adds a private access road, nine parking spaces, and four-foot sidewalks along Grandview Drive. He added that the applicant will work with the city on a possible crosswalk.

Mr. Sheets stated that Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, allowing a variety of housing types and infill that naturally extends the existing PUD, in an area the Income-Aligned Housing Implementation Strategy and Action Plan identifies as suitable for housing. He noted that It meets the income-aligned housing benchmarks for annual housing production and for housing near jobs and infrastructure, but not those for studio, one- or two-bedroom units or for units affordable to the median household income and the rental benchmark is not applicable.

Mr. Sheets then provided Staff's favorable recommendation, finding the map amendment generally in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan as required by KRS Chapter 100 and the density consistent with the recommended land use. He noted that the PUD has developed as single-family residential despite the Commercial designations, and that items not required for the concept development plan will be required for future permits or final development plans. There were no questions for Staff.

Vice Chairman Darpel noted that two individuals had signed up to speak: Mr. Nels Nelson, neutral, and Mr. Greg Berling, in favor. He asked whether anyone else wished to speak, and hearing none, recognized Mr. Berling.

Mr. Greg Berling with Fort Summit, LLC identified himself for the record. He explained that the property developed in 2022 was also zoned Business Park and was part of a larger tract planned for an office development that never

materialized, and that the townhome development, terraced down the hill, has worked well for the city and his company. The subject property, which contained a house, was purchased separately; he had discussed incorporating it with the city at that time but lacked a suitable product, as the three-story rear townhomes did not fit well so close to Grandview Drive.

Mr. Berling stated that the builder, Fischer [Homes], has since developed a two-story, rear-entry townhome of approximately 1,800 to 1,850 square feet at a slightly lower price point than the rear units. The units will face Grandview Drive, each with a different elevation to avoid a monotonous streetscape, and front porches will connect to the new Grandview Drive sidewalk, providing a walking connection to General Ormsby Park, a main selling point of the neighborhood. A sidewalk will also connect the rear private drive to Pinnacle Peak Way, and the area between the private drive and Ascent Lane will provide guest parking to supplement the two-car garages and deeper driveways.

Commissioner Dicke asked whether on-street parking is permitted on Grandview Drive. Mr. Berling stated he did not believe so and had not observed anyone parking there. He added that the city did not want on-street parking within the neighborhood, which is why each unit has a two-car garage and driveway. There were no further questions for Mr. Berling.

Vice Chairman Darpel recognized Mr. Nels Nelson, who declined to comment for the record. There were no others signed up to speak, and there were no further questions of Staff. Vice Chairman Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners. There was no discussion.

Vice Chairman Darpel reconvened the public hearing and paraphrased a letter from the City of Fort Mitchell, from Mr. Edwin King, City Administrator. He stated that the city has no objection to the proposed map amendment and that incorporating the parcel into the residential development already underway behind it is consistent with the development pattern and represents a logical continuation. He marked the letter as EXHIBIT 1 for the file. There were no further questions or comments, and Vice Chairman Darpel closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Commissioner Dicke moved to make a favorable recommendation on file number PC-26-0009-MA, the proposed map amendment and concept development plan to the Fort Mitchell Zoning Ordinance (1) changing the described area from BP (Business Park) Zone to PUD (Planned Unit Development) Zone and (2) a revised concept development plan for a portion of the existing PUD Zone, based on compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and the Staff recommendations presented at the public hearing. Commissioner France seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion and a roll call vote found Commissioners Dicke, France, Heidrich, Herrmann, Simpson, Sketch, Snyder, Vaughn, Armbruster, Bridges, Darpel, DeAngelis, and Flem in favor. There were none opposed, Commissioner Berling having recused himself, and the motion carried. Vice Chairman Darpel reminded Mr. Greg Berling that the recommendation will now be forwarded to the city.

[Commissioner Berling returned to chambers at 6:39 p.m.]

Vice Chairman Darpel 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.

Mr. Patrick Denbow, PDS Senior Planner, identified himself for the record and explained that the request involves text amendments to the historic preservation provisions of the Ludlow Zoning Ordinance. He began with a background review and stated that in 2021, the city adopted map and text amendments establishing the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone and the Urban Design Review Board (UDRB) processes and procedures and adopted historic design guidelines. He reminded the Commission that the design guidelines are already in place, are not codified in the zoning ordinance, and are not changing as part of this request. In 2025, the city adopted a new zoning ordinance into which all of the historic provisions were carried over.

Mr. Denbow explained that the city has been in conversation with the Kentucky Heritage Council, the State Historic Preservation Office, about seeking Certified Local Government (CLG) designation. He stated that the proposed amendments result from the Heritage Council's suggestions to strengthen the ordinance toward that designation. He noted that CLG designation fosters collaboration among federal, state, and local governments, makes the city eligible for historic preservation matching grants, provides access to expert technical advice, and provides a formal role in the National Register nomination process. He added that the city adopted this language into its code of ordinances earlier this year and is now seeking to amend its zoning ordinance, and that the item had been tabled at the August and September meetings.

Mr. Denbow recapped the original request:
The first two parts expand and clarify the UDRB's administrative roles and responsibilities by:

- Requiring the UDRB to study all requests for designation
- Requiring historic design guidelines to be in place before any designation
- Creating a public hearing process with notification and UDRB recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council
- Establishing designation criteria substantively consistent with the National Register criteria for evaluation
- Requiring that any rescission of a designation follow the same procedures
- Requiring UDRB review of all National Register nominations under the CLG program
- Establishing the UDRB's right to receive, hold, and spend funds
- Clarifying what constitutes a conflict of interest for UDRB members
- Requiring the UDRB to prepare annual reports of its activities

Requests three and four:

- remove redundant language that was unintentionally inserted twice into the new zoning ordinance, deleting it from the processes and procedures article and retaining it under administrative roles and responsibilities.

The final request:

- establishes a separate definitions list specifically for UDRB purposes, similar to the separate lists used for flood protection and sexually oriented businesses.

Mr. Denbow then reviewed the updated language the city submitted since the item was last heard:
The first two parts:

- Replacing "City Administrator" with "Historic Preservation Officer" to reflect the city's administrative structure
- Moving the procedures language to a more appropriate section
- Changing all references to the "Planning and Zoning Commission" to "Planning Commission"
- Citing Section 13.04 in all references to the map amendment process
- Requiring property owner authorization before the UDRB studies a historic landmark designation
- Removing the Planning Commission from all processes involving the non-codified historic design guidelines
- Clarifying that historic landmarks are subject to certificates of appropriateness
- Clarifying special hearings of the UDRB
- Changing references to "historic district" to "Historic Preservation Overlay" (HPO) to reflect the zoning designation
- Correcting capitalization throughout

Requests three and four:

- Adding historic landmarks to the applicability section for certificates of appropriateness

The final request:

- Replacing the "historic district" definition with a reference to the HPO Zone in Section 3.04 BB
- Adding a definition of "property owner"

Mr. Denbow stated that although Comprehensive Plan compliance is not required for text amendments, Staff finds the amendments will strengthen the vitality of the urban core through historic preservation, and that CLG status will add preservation strategies and incentives that help protect vulnerable buildings and the character that draws people to urban areas. Citing the allowable content of zoning regulations under KRS Chapter 100, he stated that Staff provided a favorable recommendation with no conditions, unlike the prior presentation, finding the amendments appropriate, reasonable, and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the UDRB shall adopt general guidelines, including the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, with which Ludlow's 2021 guidelines already comply. There were no questions for Staff.

Vice Chairman Darpel noted that Mr. Andy Corn and the city's attorneys, Ms. Michelle Eviston and Mr. Zach Smith, had signed up to speak. Ms. Eviston indicated that Mr. Corn would speak first and that the attorneys were available to answer questions.

Mr. Andy Corn, (1 Clausen Court, Ludlow, KY), Historic Preservation Coordinator for the City of Ludlow, thanked those involved, including the Planning Commission, whose input over two rounds of review has made the UDRB's

duties and responsibilities more clearly defined. He noted that Ludlow has had a historic district since 2021 and that the CLG program will help the city grow through technical advice, partnerships, upgraded board education standards, historic tax credit training, and potential grant funding. There were no questions for Mr. Corn.

The city's attorneys stated that Mr. Denbow had covered the revisions thoroughly and that they were available for any specific questions. Vice Chairman Darpel observed that the amendments still set out in detail the procedures the Planning Commission must follow, largely mirroring the statute. He suggested that simply referencing the map amendment procedures might be preferable so the ordinance would not need revision if the statute or the Commission's procedures change. Ms. Eviston responded that the language was acceptable for now and that the city would return to amend it should the statute change.

Commissioner France stated that the revisions appeared to address everything the Commission had asked about. He noted that the Planning Commission's role is now limited to map amendments for districts and has nothing to do with landmarks, that property owners must consent to landmark designations, and that the design guidelines are not applied through the Planning Commission. He further noted that the guidelines are general in nature, do not limit new construction to any one style, and are intended to assist and encourage owners in maintaining their historic properties. He expressed his satisfaction with the changes.

Vice Chairman Darpel added that the amendments improve upon the language the city had already enacted and noted that the effort is worthwhile, particularly if it allows the city to obtain grants. He stated he saw nothing in the amendments of concern that would unduly burden anyone. The city's representatives thanked Staff for their assistance throughout the process.

There were no others wishing to speak and Vice Chairman Darpel recessed the public hearing for discussion among the Commissioners. He noted the Commission had seen the item several times and that the amendments were good, and he expressed hope that it would work out well for everyone. There was no further discussion.

Vice Chairman Darpel reconvened the public hearing, asked whether any further clarifications were needed of Staff, and hearing none, closed the public hearing and called for a motion. *Commissioner France moved to approve the text amendments for file number PC-26-0009-TX to the Ludlow Zoning Ordinance (1) adding language establishing procedures for designating historic landmarks and districts; (2) amending the Urban Design Review Board conflict-of-interest provisions and reporting responsibilities; (3) removing duplicative procedural language; and (4) defining related terms, based on the Staff recommendation and the comments addressed at the public hearing. Commissioner Sketch seconded the motion and a roll call vote found Commissioners France, Sketch, Snyder, Vaughn, Armbruster, Berling, Bridges, Darpel, DeAngelis, Dicke, Flem, Heidrich, Herrmann, and Simpson in favor. There were none opposed and the motion carried.* Vice Chairman Darpel noted that the recommendation will be forwarded to the city and wished the city well.

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

Executive Committee: Vice Chairman Darpel stated there was nothing to report.

Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee: Vice Chairman Darpel introduced the Housing Study, prepared by consultant CommunityScale, emphasizing that it is a starting point for discussion and not a policy document; it results from the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations and does not predetermine future policies. He noted that the Committee reviewed the scope, data, and draft report over several meetings, that a Housing Advisory Team of industry experts informed the consultant on local economics, and that questions are welcome.

Commissioner Simpson, Chair of the Implementation Committee, explained that the report is an in-depth look at the county's housing situation, prompted by overwhelming resident feedback on housing during Comprehensive Plan outreach. He asked the Commissioners to review it with an open mind and consider how planning can ensure the range of housing the county's residents, workforce, and neighborhood needs, noting that while the Commission does not yet have the answers, the study provides a stronger foundation for those conversations.

Mr. Andy Videkovich, PDS Director of Planning, explained that Staff has worked with Community Scale over the past year on an effort stemming from the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, during which residents described their experiences with housing affordability and availability, building on regional data from the 2023 Northern Kentucky Area Development District (NKADD) housing study. As a result, the Commission revised the Plan's housing recommendations to diversify the housing mix and density, target neighborhoods in need of improvement, and encourage new housing near infrastructure and amenities.

Mr. Videkovich stated that the tasks under the first recommendation led the Committee to hire the consultant: ensuring income-aligned housing options, identifying sites with adequate capacity, working with experts and stakeholders to understand physical, financial, and regulatory barriers, and considering increased densities where they would facilitate income-aligned housing. He noted that NKADD, the Brighton Center, and the Catalytic Fund are also discussing regional housing issues, and emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan is a guide, not a regulatory document; housing is only one of its elements, and Staff reviews the full Plan for every development, and applications are rarely consistent with every recommendation. The report complements the regional NKADD study by focusing on Kenton County, developing benchmarks for tracking progress, and identifying areas potentially suitable for future residential development.

Before the consultant's presentation, Commissioner Sketch asked why Staff reports have been making recommendations on zone changes using charts from a study that is not part of the Comprehensive Plan. He cited the Maher Road staff report as an example. Vice Chairman Darpel and Commissioner Simpson agreed that the use of the study and how it is analyzed should be discussed at a later time. In response to a clarifying question from Commissioner Flem, Mr. Videkovich confirmed that Commissioner Sketch was correct and that Staff began using the updated data from the May 2026 study a couple of months ago.

Mr. Nels Nelson of CommunityScale presented the Housing Study and Action Plan, including five benchmarks the advisory team encouraged for evaluating projects:

- Annual housing production: target of 550 units, exceeded in 2025

- Share of new housing near services and amenities: target of 50 percent; 26 percent in 2025
- Housing diversity: share of new studio, one-, and two-bedroom units
- Ownership affordability: whether a median-income household can afford the typical home price (currently met)
- Rental affordability: whether a moderate-income household can afford the typical rent (currently met)

He noted the 2023 NKADD study found production was mostly three- and four-bedroom single-family homes while demand favored smaller units for smaller households and downsizing seniors. The benchmarks are tied into the PDS permitting software, which now collects bedroom counts, and 2026 trends are positive.

Mr. Nelson explained that they used detailed census data on household size, income, and makeup to estimate what types of housing people will be looking for in the next five years. He noted that homes became less affordable after the pandemic because of higher interest rates, but affordability has been improving. Instead of a chart showing where there may be too much housing, which tends to fill up quickly when housing is scarce, the consultant used a chart showing where demand is strongest. To test what is realistic to build, they compared lot and home sale prices since 2010 and estimated development costs and returns. That analysis found that new single-family homes on vacant lots in existing neighborhoods cannot be built at prices local households can afford, that more units per acre would be needed to make such projects work, and that rents for new apartments are already about 80 percent of the area's median income.

Mr. Nelson presented the housing suitability index, which:

- Excludes flood zones, priority industrial land, steep slopes, and other environmental constraints
- Scores access to amenities (groceries, schools, health care), transit and jobs, water and sewer, and walkability
- Is available online as a parcel-level map, generally showing the most suitable areas along Dixie Highway and other corridors

He emphasized that the index does not override zoning, that low-density residential and agricultural areas should remain as they are, and that it could help in reviewing requests for increased density or future land use map updates.

Commissioner Sketch said some land values in the study look too high because certain sales, such as one in Alexandria, included several lots. Mr. Nelson agreed the main point still holds and infill homes will need to be built closer together to be affordable. He explained that an area scores 2.5 or higher on the suitability scale mainly if it has water and sewer. Commissioner Sketch noted that from July 2021 through December 2025, 291 units were built in the most suitable areas and 1,023, or 78 percent, elsewhere, and that areas such as Crescent Springs are mostly built out. Mr. Nelson said Staff has a memo on available land in those areas and that allowing apartments along business corridors could help. Commissioner Sketch replied that this pushes affordable housing toward apartments renting for $1,000 to $3,000 a month.

Commissioner France asked how the benchmark calling for 60 percent of new homes to be studios or one- or two-bedroom units was set. Mr. Nelson said it is based on who is likely to move here and what they can afford, as

households get smaller and more seniors downsize. Commissioner Sketch questioned whether the page 30 figures of 75 to 150 units per acre, or even 12.5 to 25 units per acre on a $200,000 lot, are realistic. Mr. Nelson agreed those levels are typical of a downtown. Commissioner France said nothing in the county's residential zones comes close to 25 units per acre, and Mr. Nelson agreed this is why new single-family homes are not affordable to local households.

Vice Chairman Darpel observed that, while the information confirms housing is expensive and infill is difficult, the Commission is also cautioned against development too far out, and he asked what the steps to resolve the issue would be. Commissioner Simpson responded that the Commission does not yet have the answers. He stated that the value of the report is in showing where the county stands so that options can be identified, and that the report is a menu of options rather than a policy, representing the first of many steps.

Commissioner Flem noted the report's emphasis on economic competitiveness and stated that, while the Commission is not required to act and has no plan today, it is important to be mindful of how income-aligned housing might be achieved.

Commissioner Sketch stated that he views it as a market issue, as demand exists and developers cannot find land, and that increasing supply would help keep costs lower. Commissioner Simpson responded that demand addresses only one sector, and that the county is building housing stock that accommodates higher-paid individuals while a broader supporting workforce also needs places to live.

Commissioner Vaughn observed that societal expectations for housing have grown, noting that families once commonly shared bedrooms in three-bedroom homes, and suggested more creative thinking may be needed to meet demand.

Commissioner Flem noted that the Comprehensive Plan specifically tasks the Commission with ensuring the availability of income-aligned housing options and that a resource defining income-aligned housing is needed to complete that task. Mr. Videkovich agreed, explaining that the NKADD study was previously used for that purpose. He noted that the NKADD study was referenced in, but not adopted as part of, the Comprehensive Plan, and that this report provides updated information.

Vice Chairman Darpel thanked Mr. Nelson, Staff, Commissioner Simpson, and the Committee for their significant effort and expressed hope that the Commission would continue to use the study rather than let it sit on the shelf.

Subdivision Regulations Review Committee: Vice Chairman Darpel reported that the Committee is still awaiting responses from those who provided comments on the proposed revisions, and that they had requested additional time. He stated the Committee would grant that time, as it is better to have a good product than a quick one.

Z21 Review Committee: There was nothing to report.

There were no Reports from Commission Members and Legal Counsel Mr. Matt Smith had nothing to report.

Reports and Announcements from Staff:

Ms. Nicole Cullum, PDS Deputy Director, reminded the Commissioners that, as noted when the current fiscal year budget was adopted, their e-mail accounts are moving from Network Solutions to Microsoft Outlook, which is more user-friendly, familiar to most members, and can be managed by PDS's IT service provider. She reviewed the instructions that were provided to each Commissioner. There were no questions.

Mr. Videkovich then reminded the Commissioners of the planning and zoning training offered by the Kentucky League of Cities, with an in-person session on October 12 and a virtual session on October 21. He asked those wishing to attend to notify Ms. Bushelman so she can register them. He noted that responses for the in-person session are needed by the end of the day this coming Monday [October 5, 2026] and for the virtual session by the following Monday [October 12, 2026], or as soon as possible.

Vice Chairman Darpel stated there was no General Correspondence, no New Business, and no Public Comments, then asked whether there was a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Bridges reminded the Commissioners that the date of next month's meeting has changed to Tuesday, November 10, 2026.

The motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Snyder and seconded by Commissioner Vaughn. The motion carried by acclamation and the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:48 p.m.

APPROVED:

Chair _____

Date 11-10-26