

CAMPBELL COUNTY & MUNICIPAL PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011
7:00 PM
AGENDA

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll call and determination of quorum
3. Approval of the August 9, 2011 minutes
4. FILE: 98-11-SPD-02
APPLICANT: Thomas More College – Biology Field Station
LOCATION: 14.95 acres located at 8356 Mary Ingles Highway, 1 mile south of Oneonta Road, Unincorporated Campbell County.
REQUEST: The submitted request is for approval of a Site Plan for the Biology Field Station located on 14.95 acres within the INST Zone.

PUBLIC HEARING:

5. FILE: 99-11-ZMA-01
APPLICANT: Thomas P. Krebs
LOCATION: An approximate 0.11983 acre area located at 14 Orchard Street, Southgate, Kentucky.
REQUEST: A submitted request for approval of a zone map amendment proposing a change in zoning from GC to R-1H.
6. Director's Report
7. Adjournment

**IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND THE MEETING,
PLEASE CALL THE P&Z OFFICE AT 859-292-3880**

The Commission will make every reasonable accommodation to assist qualified persons attending the meeting, if there is a need for the Commission to be aware of, contact the office.

**CAMPBELL COUNTY & MUNICIPAL PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2011 MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Larry Barrow
Ms. Lauri Harding
Mr. Robert Huck
Mr. Tony Pfeffer *arrived 7.10 PM*
Mr. Michael Williams
Ms. Deborah Blake, TPO
Mr. Justin Verst, Vice Chair
Ms. Cindy Minter, Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Kay Wright

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. Peter Klear, AICP, Director of Planning & Zoning
Mr. Matt Smith, Legal Counsel
Mr. Ryan Hutchinson, Planner
Ms. Stephanie Turner, Secretary

Ms. Minter called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM and asked for a roll call. Following roll call, a quorum was found to be present. Ms. Minter asked if everyone had reviewed the August 9, 2011 meeting minutes and asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Barrow made a motion to approve the August 9th meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Blake seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Huck, Mr. Williams and Ms. Blake in favor of the motion. Mr. Verst and Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter introduced case #98-11-SPD-02 Thomas More College request for approval of a site plan and asked Mr. Hutchinson to present the staff report and staff's recommendation to the Commission. Prior to Mr. Hutchinson beginning his presentation, Ms. Minter recognized Mr. Pfeffer's arrival at 7:10 PM. Mr. Hutchinson presented his report.

FILE NUMBER: 98-11-SPD-02
APPLICANT: Thomas More College
LOCATION: 14.95 acres located at 8356 Mary Ingles Highway, 1 mile south of Oneonta Road, Unincorporated Campbell County.
REQUEST: Approval of a site plan proposing the demolition of a house and construction of an education lodge.

Considerations:

1. The 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update designates the site for Rural Mixed Use. The Campbell County Zoning Ordinance classifies the area within the A-1 Zone.
2. The site in question was formerly used as a lock and dam. Currently, the property is used by Thomas More College as a biology field station.
3. The Transportation Plan Element of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update identifies Mary Ingles Highway as a collector roadway.

4. CAMPBELL COUNTY ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS:

A-1 (Agricultural - 1) Zone

The A-1 Zone is established to provide a location for the following: Single family residential (detached) and agricultural / farming activities.

INST (Institutional) Zone

The INST Zone is established to provide a location for the following: Churches, dorms, fraternities & sorority houses, *educational and medical related research facilities, institutions for higher education*, hospitals, clinics, libraries, medical offices, government buildings, museums, nursery schools, publicly owned and or operated parks, recreational uses, police and fire stations, public and parochial schools.

The area and density regulation for permitted uses in the INST Zone is as follows:

<u>Zone Requirements</u>	<u>A-1</u>
Minimum Lot Area	One Acre
Minimum Lot Width	One Hundred Feet
Minimum Front yard Depth	Fifty Feet
Minimum Side Yard	Total of Twenty Five Feet One Side Ten Feet
Minimum Rear Yard	Thirty Five Feet
Maximum Building Height	Thirty Five Feet

5. Review of the site plan in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations results in the following issues:
 - a. The plan shows five of the seven structures that exist on the 5.52 acre parcel.
 - b. The plan indicates the structure furthest north is to be removed in place of additional parking.
 - c. The plan indicates two structures north of the water tower each contain 850 sq. ft.
 - d. These two houses will be remodeled and a 1,700 sq. ft. building addition will be constructed between the two buildings. This new structure will house 12 sleeping rooms, a conference room, living room, lobby and kitchen.
 - d. The plan indicates a proposed outdoor social area 10'x10' feet.
 - e. The plan indicates 18 parking spaces to the north. This complies with the minimum number of parking spaces required in the Zoning Ordinance.
 - f. The site plan indicates the parking to be gravel however the Campbell County Zoning Ordinance requires parking to be paved.
 - g. The applicant has submitted a geotech report with this site plan.
 - h. The applicant has shown the location of the existing cisterns.
 - i. The applicant has not shown the location of the existing / proposed septic systems.
 - j. The site plan shows several hydrants on site.

6. On July 23, 1996 the Campbell County & Municipal Board of Adjustment reviewed case #BA-12-96 Thomas More College. The case involved a request to allow Thomas More College to run a biology field station in the A-1 Zone. The CC&MBOA approved the request with no conditions.

On August 9, 2011 the Campbell County & Municipal Planning & Zoning Commission reviewed case #98-11-ZMA-01 Thomas More College. The case involved a request to rezone the property from A-1 to Institutional. The CC&MBOA approved the request with three conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the submitted request.
2. That the applicant submits site development plans to the CC&MP&ZC for review and approval prior to construction.
3. That the applicant complies with all applicable building, subdivision and zoning

ordinance regulations.

Campbell County Staff Recommendation:

To approve the proposed site plan subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the zone change request.
2. No new building permits shall be reviewed or approved prior to final approval of the Zone Map Amendment.
3. That the applicant follows the recommendations from the Geotech report done by Alt & Witzig Eng, Inc. prepared on June 27, 2011.
4. That the applicant determines if the fire hydrants shown on the site plan are functional.
5. That the existing and proposed septic systems be placed on a revised site plan.
6. That any additional cisterns be placed on a revised site plan and submitted to staff.
7. That the 18 parking spaces be paved not gravel.

Bases for Recommendation:

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and the Campbell County Zoning Ordinance, except as noted below:

1. CAMPBELL COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 9.19 states: Site Plan Requirements: "Location of all water distribution systems including lines, size, width, type of pipe, locations and other appurtenances.
2. CAMPBELL COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 9.19 states: Site Plan Requirements: "Location sanitary sewer systems..."
3. CAMPBELL COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 11.2.M. states: Off street Parking: "All new off-street parking facilities shall be paved..."
4. The proposed use is a permitted use within the INST Zone. The Zone Map Amendment is pending subject to final legislative review and approval.

At the conclusion of the report, Mr. Hutchinson asked if there were any questions. Ms. Minter recognized Ms. Blake who asked if the term "education lodge" is a specific technical term or where it was derived from. Mr. Hutchinson replied it was the terminology submitted on the application. Ms. Blake asked Mr. Hutchinson to clarify his statement regarding the fire hydrants functionality. Ms. Blake wanted to confirm if it was the lack of presence of water, water pressure itself or if there was another factor involved. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it is his understanding that there is not enough water pressure to allow a fire to be put out should there be an emergency on site; however, Mr. Hutchinson wants the applicant to be responsible for clarifying this issue. Ms. Blake agreed and continued that she assumed there would have to be some type of sprinkler system with the living quarters being proposed. Ms. Blake asked Mr. Hutchinson to confirm that the water tower is also nonfunctional. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it was verbally expressed to him that the water tower was nonfunctional. Mr. Hutchinson stated he did not want to discuss the sprinkler system because that is a building permit issue that would be resolved during their application phase which did not involve the Commission. Mr. Hutchinson stated it was the applicants' responsibility to confirm which hydrants were functional or not. Mr. Verst added that it would be pertinent to the fire department to know which were functional so that if an emergency occurred, they knew which hydrants they could connect to their hoses.

Ms. Blake stated she wasn't certain if the propane tank was external or internal, how large it was, if it was going to be removed or what. Ms. Blake stated she thought the site was going to be all electric. Mr. Hutchinson began reviewing the plans in an attempt to locate an answer for her. Mr. Klear advised, and Ms. Minter agreed, that these questions should be directed to the applicant.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions of Mr. Hutchinson. There being none, Ms. Minter asked the applicants to come forward and state their names for the record. Representing the applicant, Thomas More College, was a team of four representatives consisting of Mr. Jay Bayer from Bayer Becker Engineering; Mr. Scott Vidourek from GBBN Architects; Mr. Jeff Kordenbrock and Mr. Chris Lorentz from Thomas More College. Mr. Bayer stated that he had an opportunity to review the staff report with his client and they agreed with a few of the conditions and disagreed with the remaining. Their team was present tonight to discuss those conditions.

Mr. Bayer stated the client agrees with conditions as stated in the staff report for conditions #1, 2 and 3. For condition #4, Mr. Vidourek explained that the old fire hydrants are tied into the water tower and are not operational. The fire hydrants are not even considered to be regulation sized by today's standards. The client is willing to remove these hydrants from the site to reduce confusion.

Mr. Vidourek continued that, in so much as condition #5 is concerned; there is existing wetlands on site that manages the waste disposal produced by the site. There is no septic system on site. The client is currently working with the Northern Ky. Health Department on the design and development of a structure that will be about 3-4 feet wide by 8 feet deep that will hold the waste of the development which will then be pumped down to the wetlands to be processed. As to the existing cisterns, we have a well for the portable water source and have a well for the rainwater capture as long as the cisterns are deemed satisfactory for these uses. Mr. Vidourek advised the Commission that the Biology Station was going after a Silver LEED certification since it was a research and education facility and they are trying to be as resourceful as possible. Ms. Minter stated that, as staff recommended, this information should all be reflected on the site plan. Mr. Vidourek agreed to submit a revised site plan showing the cisterns and the sanitation well with pump.

Mr. Klear asked Mr. Vidourek to provide information to the Commission on what LEED means. Mr. Vidourek explained that it stood for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. Mr. Klear added that it had to be sustainable. Mr. Vidourek agreed and continued that it is not about tearing down a building to build a new education lodge; it is about using the flooring from the original buildings in the creation of the new lodge. It is actually reusing as many of the supplies as possible to reduce the impact you have on the environment. You receive so many points based on the amount of supplies you reuse. Their goal is to obtain a "Silver" rating. Ms. Minter asked Mr. Vidourek to expound on how this would apply to the septic system and the water. Mr. Vidourek stated that the LEED rating also emphasizes using the site water supply to minimize reliance on irrigation. For this site, the strategy is to use the rainwater captured to water grass or plants. For septic, we are using a natural process to treat the waste naturally which feeds our system.

Mr. Vidourek stated that the LEED aspect is to use porous paving or concrete or even gravel. This way the rainwater dissipates through the material back to the earth without the typical run off. The parking lot had been and still is gravel. When the applicant began the process of updating the site for lodge, staff advised them that the driveway would now be required to come into compliance with the current Zoning Ordinance. It is Mr. Vidourek's opinion that this would be an unnecessary improvement given the rustic and rural nature of this project, the environmental education they provide to the community supports a gravel parking lot and the economic resources could be better spent improving the education lodge. Educationally, participants can go anywhere and see asphalt, but to see a system that works ecologically would really be beneficial for the community. If it weren't for the other improvements on the site, the parking lot would not need to be updated. For the reasons expressed above, Mr. Vidourek requested on behalf of the applicant for a waiver of this recommendation.

Mr. Verst asked if the present available parking was gravel and that the proposal was, after demolition, to expand the gravel lot for the additional parking that would be required on the lot. Mr. Vidourek agreed that Mr. Verst understood their intentions. Ms. Harding stated that she was concerned with the demolition of the structure because they are in the wetlands area. Given the history of construction resources and materials, there has to be lead paint and asbestos in the building materials of the original

structures located on this site. Has the College performed soil studies to see if any of these chemicals have leached into the soil? Has any research or steps been taken to insure when the demolition is done that the soil is not further contaminated? Mr. Kordenbrock stated that the College actually has researched this issue. They are going to abate the asbestos shingles on all three cabins. There are some asbestos materials in all three cabins as well as some lead paint in all three cabins. Ms. Harding asked if this information would be made a matter of record. Mr. Kordenbrock stated it would.

Mr. Pfeffer asked for a clarification of the waiver Mr. Vidourek was requesting. Mr. Pfeffer wanted to know if the waiver request was for the Commission to approve gravel only or to approve gravel or porous paver. Mr. Vidourek replied they wanted the Commission to approve gravel only. Mr. Pfeffer continued that his concern was that perhaps the LEED certification listed a specific mix of gravel particles by grade or size. Mr. Vidourek answered he was not aware of any such requirement other than general gravel drive mix. Mr. Bayer confirmed no specific terminology was used for LEED certification.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There being none, Ms. Minter opened the floor for discussion among the Planning Commission members. Prior to allowing any Commissioners to speak, Ms. Blake recognized Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith explained that the gravel parking lot currently in place on the site is considered to be a nonconforming use as it existed prior to the adoption of the current Zoning Ordinance. By statutory and case law, any time an expansion occurs on a site where "grandfather" provisions apply, all site conditions must be brought into compliance with the current Zoning Ordinance. There are no provisions anywhere in the Zoning Ordinance that would allow the Commission to waive that provision. In respect to the applicants request to waive recommendation #7, the Commission had no authority to take such an action. The applicant must comply. The applicants' only remedy would be to possibly request a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations which is heard by the Board of Adjustments. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Klear to confirm if the Zoning Ordinance allowed the Commission to alter the parking lot requirement. Mr. Klear stated that the Commission could not. The applicant could potentially request a waiver from the regulations, but it would be heard by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Verst commented that he understands that as far as the rural nature, a gravel parking lot may seem ok, but he is not a big fan of having to walk across gravel, chase children across gravel, nor push strollers or wheelchairs across gravel. For parking overflow, it would be sufficient. Mr. Verst thought the recommendation #7 was necessary and should remain as is. Ms. Blake asked if this location would be in use year round. Ms. Minter replied she believed that was the applicant's intention. Ms. Blake asked how you removed ice and snow from gravel. Ms Minter replied she had no idea how weather removal occurred on gravel roads or driveways. Ms. Blake continued that she used a crutch and gravel was definitely more difficult to maneuver in. Mr. Barrow asked about the material that was discussed approximately one or two years ago during a Commission training session that allowed the rainwater to pass through. Ms. Blake replied that she brought that in and it was permeable concrete. Mr. Barrow asked if that item was allowed in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Klear indicated it was not permitted within the current Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Verst asked if any Commissioners had any comments about removing the fire hydrants if they were not functioning. There was no indication anyone disagreed. Mr. Verst continued that it would be very misleading to show up for an emergency, see them in place, and then find out they didn't work when you really needed them. Mr. Verst asked how long the fire hydrants had been there. Mr. Vidourek replied since 1987. Mr. Verst asked the applicant if they had any issues or if the hydrants were of any historical value to them if the Commission requested the nonfunctioning hydrants be removed. Mr. Vidourek replied they did not have an issue. Ms. Minter asked if there were any other questions or items for discussion. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to approve case #98-11-SPD-02, Thomas More College request for approval of a site plan subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the zone change request.

2. No new building permits shall be reviewed or approved prior to final approval of the Zone Map Amendment.
3. That the applicant follows the recommendations from the Geotech report done by Alt & Witzig Eng, Inc. prepared on June 27, 2011.
4. That the applicant determines if the fire hydrants shown on the site plan are functional *and that the applicant remove from site all fire hydrants that are not functional.*
5. That the existing and proposed septic systems be placed on a revised site plan.
6. That any additional cisterns be placed on a revised site plan and submitted to staff.
7. That the 18 parking spaces be paved not gravel.

He cited the proposed site plan request is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance as the basis for his motion. Ms. Blake seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Huck, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

Ms. Minter opened the public hearing and introduced case #99-11-ZMA-01 Thomas P. Krebs request for a zone map amendment to the Planning Commission. Before recognizing Mr. Hutchinson to present the staff report, Ms. Minter advised the Commission that Mr. Klear had an announcement pertaining to this case. Mr. Klear advised the Commission that, per state statute, there exists a public notice requirement on any zone change. This requirement encompasses three items. First, you have to notify all adjoining property owners in writing. We've done that. Second, you have to post a sign on site. The contents of the sign must state what is going to happen, when the meeting will occur and where interested parties can obtain additional information about the zone change. We've done this. Finally, you have to post in the paper in record not less than 7 days and not more than 21 days. We have failed to meet this requirement. We have to post in the Campbell County Recorder which only comes out on Thursdays. Our legal notice was posted on September 8th which is one day short of the seven day requirement. We have met all other requirements and were just one day short so we have substantially met the requirements

Mr. Klear explained that staff notified the applicant immediately upon recognizing the administrative deficiency and gave the applicant the opportunity to push their case back to the October agenda so that all requirements could be met in full or the applicant could choose to proceed with the slight risk that any determination made tonight could potentially be challenged. The applicant made the decision to proceed so they could continue with their plans as quickly as possible. Mr. Verst asked what the statute of limitation was for an appeal. Mr. Smith replied it was approximately 30 days from the approval date by the City of Southgate; however, Mr. Smith continued that substantial compliance is material that staff has followed the intent of the statute. Being one day deficient with the care staff has exhibited in all other notifications would not be cause alone to overrule a decision.

Ms. Minter asked Mr. Hutchinson to present the staff report and staff's recommendation to the Commission.

FILE NUMBER: 99-11-ZMA-01
APPLICANT: Thomas P. Krebs
LOCATION: A 5,220 sq. ft. lot located at 14 Orchard Street in Southgate KY.
REQUEST: Approval of a zone map amendment proposing a change in zoning from GC to R-1H.

Considerations:

1. The 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update designates the area for Higher Density Single Family and Urban Mixed Use. The Southgate Zoning Ordinance classifies the area within the GC (General Commercial) and R-1H (Residential-1H) Zone.

2. The site in question is occupied by a single family house.
3. The request is to rezone the part of the lot that is GC to R-1H. This would allow the residential lot to be consistent with the rest of the lot and surrounding neighborhood.
4. SOUTHGATE ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS:

R-1H

The R-1H Zone is a single family detached zone.

<u>Zone Requirements</u>	<u>R-1H</u>
Minimum lot area	- 4,000 SQ. FT.
Minimum lot width at building setback line	- Forty (40) feet
Minimum front yard depth	- Twenty Five (25) feet
Minimum side yard width on each side of lot	- Five (5) feet
Minimum rear yard	- Twenty Five (25) feet
Maximum building height	- Thirty Five (35) feet

5. The submitted plan indicates the following:
 - a. The plan indicates a house exists on the parcel.
 - b. The plan indicates the zoning line goes through the middle of the parcel.

Staff Recommendation:

The CC&MP&ZC recommend approval of the Map Amendment to the City of Southgate subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the submitted request.
2. That the applicant complies with all applicable building, subdivision and zoning ordinance regulations.

Bases for Recommendation:

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance, except as noted below:

1. City of Southgate Zoning Ordinance, Section 9.19: "A site plan as regulated by Section 9.19 of this ordinance shall be required for any use in this zone."

Mr. Hutchinson asked if there were any questions for staff. Mr. Verst asked if the structure on the property being split was going to GC. Mr. Hutchinson explained the property was going to be R-1H. Mr. Pfeffer asked what was located to the right side of the property. Mr. Klear advised it was the St. Therese Church and School.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other questions for staff. There being none, Ms. Minter asked the applicant to step forward and state his name and address for the record. Mr. Thomas P. Krebs, 24 Hanover Place, Ft. Thomas, KY came forward. Mr. Krebs stated he is the power of attorney for his uncle, retired Rev. Paul Krebs who recently lived in the home until he moved into Carmel Manor. The property itself has been in the Krebs family for 81 years passed from one family member to the next without anyone realizing there was a zone issue. The plan was for the home to be remodeled and for Mr. Thomas Krebs' parents to take up residence there. When the building permit was submitted, the zone issue came to light. Mr. Krebs stated they just want to do some light remodeling to make the home more comfortable for his parents. Mr. Krebs asked if the Commission had any questions he could answer for them.

Ms. Harding asked if Mr. Krebs was aware if St. Therese planned to park any buses or make use of the property that abuts to the rear of this property. Mr. Krebs stated he was not aware of any such plans. Mr. Krebs stated that the reverend from St. Therese's is a close friend of his uncles, and he had been in conversation with him recently, but there was no mention of any specific plans.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any additional questions for Mr. Krebs. There being none, Ms. Minter polled the audience to see if there were any other persons who wished to speak. There being no audience members and no one signing in to speak, Ms. Minter closed the public hearing. Ms. Minter opened the floor for discussion among the Commission. Mr. Pfeffer stated that looking at the slide it appears the Commission should be fixing the property behind Mr. Krebs property as well. Mr. Klear stated he feels we should proceed one step at a time. This is really a straight forward request before the Commission. Looking at the slide, you can see that Mr. Krebs's property is literally split in half. There is no doubt that the zone change is necessary. However, the property behind Mr. Krebs's is just a small sliver off the rear property line. The thing you have to take into consideration is that the zone mapping lines may be off several feet from the overlay of the parcel lot lines. It is more likely that the zone line matches with their property line; however, when you have a situation like Mr. Krebs where the property is divided split in the middle, it is obvious it is not a mere mapping overlay error. This was a zoning error. Staff would be more than willing to look more closely at the property behind Mr. Krebs to make certain that the zoning lines and property lines match up.

Ms. Minter asked if there were any other question, comments or discussion items. There being none, Ms. Minter called for a motion. Mr. Verst made a motion to recommend to the City of Southgate to approve the zone change request subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Legislative Body adopts the map amendment portion of the submitted request.
2. That the applicant complies with all applicable building, subdivision and zoning ordinance regulations.

Mr. Verst cited that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the recommendations of the 2008 Campbell County Comprehensive Plan Update, the Campbell County Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Harding seconded the motion. A roll call vote found Mr. Barrow, Ms. Harding, Mr. Huck, Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Williams, Ms. Blake and Mr. Verst in favor of the motion. Ms. Minter abstained. Motion passed.

There being no other cases to come before the Planning Commission, Ms. Minter requested that Mr. Klear present his Director's Report.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Klear indicated that he had three items for the Commission's consideration tonight. Mr. Klear had sent the Commission a news article from Minneapolis. While visiting that area, Mr. Klear found an article that he thought might be interesting to the Commission concerning rain gardens and their efforts to reduce storm water runoff.

Mr. Klear distributed to the Commission copies of Section 370 of the County's Administrative Code regarding titled "Use of Technology in the Workplace". Through a grant, the County has been provided with iPads and there appears to be enough iPads for the members of the Commission should they determine that they would like to make use of the technology. Attached was a signature form that would need to be signed, showing the Commissioner had read and agreed with the Code. Mr. Klear advised the Commissioners that he wanted them to take the information home and read it carefully and, if they determined they wanted the iPads, he would prepare real signature sheets with individual iPad serial number assigned to each Commissioner.

The final item was to schedule the work sessions for the update to the Subdivision Regulations. After discussion among the Commissioners and staff, it was determined that the following two dates would be reserved: October 27th and November 17th. The meetings will start at 5 PM both evenings at staff's office in Newport. This will have to be considered a special meeting and a notice will have to be issued. The Commission will reserve both dates with the understanding that if all business is resolved at the October session the November session will be cancelled. Mr. Klear concluded his report.

Ms. Minter asked if there was any other business to discuss. There being none, Ms. Minter asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Verst made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion. An oral vote found everyone in favor. None opposed. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:31 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Approved:



Peter J. Klear, AICP
Director of P&Z



Cynthia Minter
Chair