

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
FORT THOMAS PLANNING COMMISSION
HELD AT THE FT THOMAS CITY BUILDING
ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2023
6:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: Dave Wormald, Chairman
Pam Schweiss
Jerry Noran
Dan Fehler, Secretary
Tim Michel
Larry Schultz

ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Stewart, Building Inspector/Zoning Administrator
Kevin Barbian, General Services Director
Cheri Scherpenberg, G. S. Administrative Assistant
Tim Schneider, City Attorney

6:30 Business Meeting

Minutes – July 19, 2023

Members reviewed minutes from the July meeting. A motion was made by Tim Michel and seconded by Jerry Noran to approve the July 19, 2023 minutes as written. Motion carried 6-0.

Zoning Code Update

Alisa Duffey Rogers reminded the audience that there would be an opportunity for additional community engagement for the public to ask further questions and make comments about the zoning code update to CT Consultants representatives at Ft. Thomas Coffee from 10am to 11:45am and 6-8pm each Thursday following the Planning Commission meeting date.

Alisa Duffey Rogers with CT Consultants delivered a Zoning Ordinance Update presentation. The presentation revisited the zoning ordinance update process and addressed the following draft ordinance sections:

Article V – Regulations Applicable to All Districts

Alisa with CT Consultants said that most of the regulations were imported from the existing regulations with only a few minor changes.

- 5.0 General Regulations
- 5.1 Accessory and Temporary Uses
- 5.2 Environmental Regulations
- 5.3 Landscaping, Screening, and Lighting Regulations
- 5.5 Off-Street Parking, Loading, and Access Regulations

Questions to the Commission:

Question: Do the existing home occupation standards need to be updated?

Discussion: PC members decided it would be beneficial to add that an occupational license is needed and will discuss updating and defining remote workers and home occupations with City Council.

Question: Should ADUs be permitted by right or conditionally?

Discussion: PC members feel that ADUs should be permitted by Right in R-1 areas.

Question: Should detached ADUs be permitted?

Discussion: PC members would like to prohibit detached accessory dwelling units. They also feel that prohibiting separate utilities for an ADU should be added as a standard.

Question: Is the floor area limitation appropriate?

Discussion: PC members feel the floor area limitation is appropriate.

Question: Should parking be required for accessory dwelling units?

Discussion: PC members feel that parking should not be required for ADUs.

Question: Should the minimum side setback for HVAC condensing units & other mechanical devices be reduced to 3 feet?

Discussion: PC members feel the current language is sufficient and that the setback should be kept at 5ft.

Question: Are the proposed standards for integrated and rooftop solar energy systems appropriate, particularly the height exception?

Discussion: PC members feel the standards are appropriate.

Question: Should the existing Hillside Development Controls be amended?

Discussion: It was noted that Building Code allows for the request of a Geo-Technical investigation. CT will provide a map and make a change to a need for a development plan with a topographic element requiring the delineation of a 20% slope or more.

Question: Are the regulations for Tree Conservation and Restoration, in concert with Chapter 98, Trees, of the City's General Ordinances working well? Are modifications needed?

Discussion: PC members feel that the Tree Commission members should be consulted and the discussion should be tabled until CT covers subdivisions vs major subdivisions at the September meeting.

Question: Do the landscaping, buffering and screening requirements provide for sufficient landscaping and screening?

Discussion: PC members mentioned they are hesitant to require screening for pipes, conduit and cable power drops that are visible from the street.

Question: Are the changes to the lighting regulations appropriate?

Discussion: PC members proposed a maximum number for color temperature as well as adjusting light pole height from 41ft. to 30ft. and the ability for the PC to grant a waiver for the height. Lighting that needs to go out by 11pm as well as dimming options or motion detectors were mentioned. PC members discussed an exception for the illumination of the American flag as well as adding language for lighting in areas adjacent to R-1 districts.

Question: Is the reduced parking requirement appropriate?

Discussion: PC members asked about square footage and occupancy and determined there were no concerns.

Question: Are there factors that you would like considered for parking waivers to be granted in the TBD and CBD?

Discussion: PC members sought clarification on the definition of a traffic consultant for a parking assessment study. CT Consultants will update the language to say parking and or traffic consultant meaning a professional architect, engineer or planner. It was also mentioned that a marked pedestrian path in parking lots with ADA ramps would be beneficial.

Question: Are the proposed shared parking standards appropriate?

Discussion: No comments or concerns from PC members.

Question: Are there any concerns with new standards for off-site parking?

Discussion: No comments or concerns from PC members.

Members from the audience in attendance to address the board:

Peggy Maggio, who resides at 37 S. Shaw Ln., discussed shield requirements for condenser units, screening for electric drops, short-term rentals, side setback requirements in the CBD, historic aspects and suggested a consultation with Beth Johnson of the Cincinnati Preservation Association.

Joan Ferris, who resides at 66 Burney Ln., asked questions about parking for accessory dwelling units.

Alisa Duffey Rogers with CT Consultants concluded this portion of the zoning code update.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Larry Schultz and seconded by Dan Fehler to adjourn the meeting.

Approved: _____
 Dave Wormald, Chair Date

Secretary: _____
 Dan Fehler, Secretary Date