

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
FORT THOMAS PLANNING COMMISSION
HELD AT THE FT THOMAS CITY BUILDING
ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2024
6:30 P.M.**

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

ABSENT: David Gwissdalla
Dan Fehler, Secretary

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

6:30 Business Meeting

Minutes – February 22, 2024

Members reviewed minutes from the February meeting. A motion was made by Larry Schultz and seconded by Pam Schweiss to approve the February 22, 2024 minutes as written. Motion carried 5-0.

Land Conveyance Plat Application

76 Tower Hill Rd. 999-99-14-098.00

Rob Adams, Applicant

112 Tower Hill Rd 999-99-16-101.00

Land Conveyance of 330.4387 SQ.FT.

From Anna Scott Mair, Owner

Mr. Barbian reported that the land conveyance appeared before the board a few years prior and was approved. He informed the Commission that the owner of the property at the time failed to file and record the paperwork with Campbell County. Mr. Barbian stated that the new owner is cleaning up the parcel with the transfer of the small area to better shape the lot.

With minimal discussion, a motion was made by Tim Michel and seconded by Jerry Noran to approve the Land Conveyance at 112 Tower Hill Rd to 76 Tower Hill Rd. as submitted. Motion carried 5-0

Re-Subdivision of Lot Plat

191 Miami Pkwy.

Bruce & Sarah Seidel, Applicants

999-99-15-242.00

Lot A 9.252 AC.

Lot B 5.000 AC.

Mr. Barbian reported that 191 Miami Parkway is a large lot with minimal access. He said despite frontage on Tower Hill Rd., there is a deep ravine creating limitations. Mr. Barbian stated that the owner appeared before City Council and obtained approval of an easement through city property on Mary Ingles Hwy. for access to the property. The intention of the owner is to build a single family home.

With minimal discussion, a motion was made by Tim Michel and seconded by Larry Schultz to approve the Re-Subdivision of Lot Plat for 191 Miami Pkwy., with the amendment that it is contingent upon applicable or recorded utility easements on lot B.

Motion carried 5-0.

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 III – Zoning Districts

- 3.1 Single Family & Two-Family Residential Districts
- 3.3 Residential Cluster Development Overlay District
- 3.4 Multi-Family Districts (R-3 & R-5)
- 3.5 Alexandria Pike Mixed Use District
- 3.6 Neighborhood Commercial/Office District (NC/O)
- 3.7 Central & Traditional Business District Regulations
- 3.8 Fort Thomas Avenue Overlay district (FTA-O)
- 3.10 Tower Park Historic Overlay District (TP-O)

Questions to the Commission:

Question: Should hotels and co-working spaces be permitted in one or both sub-zoning districts?

Discussion: PC members feel that hotels should not be permitted in both sub-districts. PC members feel the best location for hotels continues to be in the Ft. Thomas Plaza off the highway. PC members stated they are ok with co-working spaces along the corridor in both sub-zones.

Question: Should residential over non-residential continue to be permitted in the Alexandria Pike mixed use-1 & 2 district? Should there be density limitations? Should R-3 Standards be used?

Discussion: PC members would like to permit residential over non-residential, decrease the maximum height to 40 feet and apply the R-3 standards for density in both sub-zones.

Question: Should the required design standards apply in AP-MX-2 or apply only in AP-MX-1?

Discussion: PC members feel the design standards should only apply to the walkable area of AP-MX-1

Discussion: PC members feel that the standards of a usable entrance and a building oriented toward the street should apply in the AP-MX-2 district.

Question: Currently front yard parking is prohibited in the AP-MX-1 district. Should parking in the front yard be prohibited in AP-MX-2?

Discussion: PC members feel that parking in the front yard should continue to be permitted as it is now in the AP-MX-2 district.

Question: Currently the YMCA is split-zoned. Do you feel the YMCA should be zoned R-1C or AP-MX-2?

Discussion: PC members feel the YMCA should be zoned Alexandria Pike Mixed Use-2

Question: Currently the property at 20 Pleasant Ave. is split-zoned. Do you feel 20 Pleasant Avenue should be zoned Professional Office or R-1C??

Discussion: PC members feel that the entire parcel at 20 Pleasant Ave. should be zoned R-3

Question: Should places of worship be a permitted use in the Neighborhood Commercial/Office District?

Discussion: PC members talked about parking and attendance capacity issues and feel that it would be ok as a conditional use.

Question: Should short-term rentals be permitted in the AP-MX and the NC/O district?

Discussion: PC members feel that short-term rentals should be prohibited in the AP-MX and NC/O districts.

Question: Should hotels be permitted by right or as a restricted use in the Traditional Business District?

Discussion: PC members feel that hotels should be removed as a permitted use in the TBD while allowing co-working spaces as a permitted use in the Traditional Business District.

Question: Should co-working spaces be permitted in the Town Center Core? Should co-working spaces be permitted in the Town Center Supporting Districts?

Discussion: PC members feel that co-working spaces should be permitted in both the Central Business District Town Center Core (CBD-TCC) as well as Town Center Supporting (CBD-TCS).

Question: Should hotels be a permitted use in the Central Business District?

Discussion: PC members feel hotels should be removed as a permitted use in the CBD in Downtown as well as Midway.

Question: Does the Planning Commission have any concerns with adding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in the following sub-zoning districts? CBD-TCS, CBD-TCR, CBD-MR1 and CBD-MR2?

Discussion: PC members feel that given the number of single-family homes in these residential areas adding an integrated ADU to mirror what is in the R-1 districts would be acceptable.

Question: Does the Planning Commission have any concerns with how multi-family dwellings are classified in the CBD Town Center and Midway?

Discussion: PC members discussed the Cincinnati Bell building and potential future redevelopment. PC members had concerns about height and placement of potential new buildings on the property. PC members feel that multi-family should be permitted in the CBD-MC2 and the CBD-MC3 (Cinti. Bell Bldg.) if limited to 40 ft. max height.

Question: How should short-term rentals be classified in the Central Business District?

Discussion: PC members feel short-term rentals should be classified as an accessory use in the CBD Core and Supporting Districts.

Question: How should short-term rentals be classified in the Traditional Business District?

Discussion: PC members feel that short-term rentals as an accessory use in the mixed use buildings in the TBD should be permitted.

Question: Are there any concerns with applying the required design standards to the parcel with a terminated view?

Discussion: PC members feel the design standards should be applied.

Question: Should the required design standards be applied to the CBD-MC3?

Discussion: PC members feel that the CBD-MC3 should comply with the required design standards.

Question: Should 28 Midway Ct. be zoned as CBD or remain zoned R-1A as it is currently?

Discussion: PC members feel the parcel should be kept as R-1A

Members from the audience in attendance to address the Board:

Sharon MacKnight, who resides at 62 Miller Ln., asked questions about residential above commercial, text amendments, zoning map amendments, public hearings and suggested allowing public comment prior to the questions to the Planning Commission.

Peggy Maggio, who resides at 37 S. Shaw Ln., discussed public input, the comprehensive plan, the mixed-use district, density, scale and massing of buildings, historical significance, standards and setbacks.

Pat Lance, who resides at 5 Rosemont Ave., asked about side and rear setbacks in residential areas.

Joan Ferris, who resides at 66 Burney Ln., had questions about a height variance, hotel location, Inverness and short-term rentals.

Tiffany Huber, who resides at 26 Hawthorne Ave., talked about retaining a small town feel, height restrictions for Alexandria Pk. and the need for significant barriers between residential and non-residential zones.

John D. Coffman Jr., owner of 1100 S. Ft. Thomas Ave. and 9, 15 and 17 River Rd., shared concerns about zoning in the Midway District, parking, and delivery areas and times for businesses.

Paul Kruse, owner of 15 Midway Ct., discussed limits down the road and the cost of living.

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

Adjournment

A motion was made by Tim Michel and seconded by Larry Schultz to adjourn the meeting.

Approved: _____
 Dave Wormald, Chair Date

Secretary: _____
 Dan Fehler, Secretary Date