

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
FORT THOMAS PLANNING COMMISSION  
HELD AT THE FT THOMAS CITY BUILDING  
ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2024  
6:30 P.M.**

**PRESENT:** Dan Fehler, Secretary  
Pam Schweiss  
Jerry Noran, Vice Chair  
Larry Schultz  
Tim Michel

**ABSENT:** Dave Wormald, Chairman  
David Gwisdalla

**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 – March 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024**

Members reviewed minutes from the March meetings. A motion was made by Tim Michel and seconded by Larry Schultz to approve the March 19, 2024 and March 20, 2024 minutes as written. Motion carried 5-0.

**Zoning Code Update**

Alisa Duffey Rogers informed the audience that the next proposed opportunity for community engagement at Ft. Thomas Coffee and Conversation would be June 20<sup>th</sup>. At the gathering the public is invited to ask further questions and make comments about the zoning code update to CT Consultants representatives.

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**

- 5.7 Sign Regulations
  - Sub-section 5.7.06 C. 2
  - Schedule 5.7.07 A
  - Sub-section 5.7.07 D

- Sub-section 5.7.07 E 1 and 2
- Sub-section 5.7.08
- Sub-section 5.7.13 B. 2. C

-Complete sign regulation discussion

-Complete discussion on outstanding topics including but not limited to:

- Maximum building width and height in core sub-districts
- Single-families in CBD
- CBD setbacks

#### Questions to the Commission:

Question: Are there any concerns with the signage proposed for Highland and Grand or the decrease in sign height in the CBD?

Discussion: PC members expressed no concerns.

Question: Are there any concerns with the prohibition of all ground signs in the R-3 District?

Discussion: PC members shared no concerns.

Question: Should electronic message centers be permitted in residential districts?

Discussion: PC members feel that electronic signs should be prohibited in residential areas.

Question: Should institutions, besides public schools, be permitted to install electronic message centers?

Discussion: PC members said they do not support institutions, besides public schools installing electronic message centers.

Question: Should there be a regulated duration of time or limitations for temporary signs?

Discussion: PC members feel that the maximum size for temporary signs in single and 2-family residential areas should be 9 square feet with no time limit as long as the sign is maintained. PC members said that temporary signs for non-residential use should be limited to 30 days per sign.

Question: Should murals be regulated in the UDO at this time?

Discussion: PC members feel that murals should be defined and prohibited.

Question: Should the Design Review Board be given the authority to grant waivers to the standards & requirements in the sign regulations?

Discussion: PC members feel that the Design Review Board should have the authority to grant waivers.

Question: Should the zoning of the parcel on River Rd. change from CBD-MR2 to CBD-MC2?

Discussion: PC members feel that the parcel at 17 River Rd. should change from CBD-MR2 to CBD-MC2.

Question: Should the parcels at 12 and 14 Garrison Ave. change from CBD-MR2 to CBD-MC2?

Discussion: PC members feel that the parcels at 12 & 14 Garrison Ave. should remain unchanged.

Question: Should a maximum number of stories be regulated in the CBD-TCC?

Discussion: PC members were divided on how they feel about limiting the number of stories

Question: Should maximum building width be regulated in the CBD-TCC?

Discussion: PC members feel that the width should be reduced to a maximum of 150 feet.

Question: Should Single-Family Detached Dwellings be permitted by right in the CBD-Town Center Supporting sub-zoning district?

Discussion: PC members were divided on how they feel about Single-Family Detached Dwellings being permitted by right in the CBD-Town Center Supporting sub-zoning district.

Question: Should the phrase critical mass be removed from the intent statement for the Central Business District?

Discussion: PC members feel that the phrase critical mass should be removed.

Question: Should the step back provision be removed in the CBD-TTC and the CBD-Town Center Supporting sub-districts?

Discussion: PC members feel that step back buildings are not very attractive and that the provision should be removed.

Question: Should the proposed 20 foot minimum front setback in the Town Center Supporting sub-zoning district be modified?

Discussion: PC members feel that the minimum front setback should be changed from 20 feet to 25 feet.

Question: Are intent statements for the Zoning Districts appropriate in the UDO?

Discussion: PC members feel that intent statements are helpful to determine if uses that are not listed in permitted areas fit the character of the neighborhood.

Question: Should the reference to the Community Plan remain in the UDO?

Discussion: PC members feel the reference to the Community Plan should remain in the UDO.

Members from the audience in attendance to address the Board:

Steven J. Megerle, who resides at 7 Greene Street, discussed regulations, overlays and the HOA.

Allison Alessandro, who resides at 8 Greene Street, talked about the HOA and regulations.

Bill Hoover, who resides at 16 Greene Street, discussed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, limitations, insurance and historical standards.

Bob Heil, former homeowner at Greene Street talked about federal funding and standards.

Peggy Maggio, who resides at 37 S. Shaw Ln., shared her support for an opinion of a historic consultant regarding the proposed overlay. Mrs. Maggio also talked about electronic signs, murals, building height, step back buildings, greenspace, the community plan and setbacks.

Melanie Powers, who resides at 13 Pearson Street discussed historical guidelines, the overlay and transparency.

Tiffany Huber, who resides at 26 Hawthorne Avenue, talked about feather signs, murals, height regulations, and character of neighborhood.

Sharon MacKnight, who resides at 62 Miller Lane, talked about building height and the ability of a building to return to residential use.

John D. Coffman Jr., owner of 1100 S. Ft. Thomas Ave. and 9, 15 and 17 River Rd., shared concerns about zoning and property values, “spot” zoning, building height and parking.

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 Tim Michel to adjourn the meeting.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
                    Dave Wormald, Chair                    Date

Secretary: \_\_\_\_\_  
                    Dan Fehler, Secretary                    Date