The Owensboro Metropolitan Planning Commission met in regular session at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 8, 2018, at City Hall, Commission Chambers, Owensboro, Kentucky, and the proceedings were as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Larry Boswell, Chairman
Larry Moore, Vice Chairman
Lewis Jean, Secretary
Brian Howard, Director
Terra Knight, Attorney
Irvin Rogers
Beverly McEnroe
Fred Reeves
John Kazlauskas
Mike Edge
Angela Hardaway

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CHAIRMAN: I would like to welcome everybody to the Owensboro Metropolitan Planning Commission February 8, 2018.

We start our commission meetings off with a prayer and a pledge. Commissioner Moore will guide us in that tonight. Please rise with us.

(INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

CHAIRMAN: I would like to welcome everyone to the meeting tonight. Since we're a quasi legal meeting, a few ground rules to make everyone aware of.

If you wish to speak, please approach the
podium. Clearly state your name and be sworn in by
counsel. It's very important we hear all the
information so the commission can make good informed
decisions.

Please direct all your questions and answers
to the chair, especially for multiple speakers at each
one of the podiums. Please be respectful of the time
for speaking so that others have an opportunity to
speak as well. Please stay on topic with the specific
item that we're discussing at that particular time.

Thank you.

We want to consider the minutes of our last
meeting, January 11th. I think all the commissioners
have received those minutes. Are there any
corrections or questions concerning those minutes?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Just one comment about the minutes.
There is one correction on the Hayden Road address.
That should be 4171 in the minutes. That would be the
only correction that I see. Any commissioners have
any other changes they would like to make?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready
for a motion.

Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Move to approve. Is there a second?

MS. McENROE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. McEnroe. Any discussion about the motion or the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MR. HOWARD: I will note that all the zoning changes heard tonight will become final 21 days after the meeting unless an appeal is filed. If an appeal is filed, we will forward the record of this meeting along with all applicable materials to the appropriate legislative body for them to take final action.

GENERAL BUSINESS

ZONING CHANGE

ITEM 3

4779 Free Silver Road, 1.04 acres
Consider zoning change: From EX-1 Coal Mining to A-R Rural Agriculture
Applicant: Anthony V. Lanham; William and Elizabeth Butterowe

MS. KNIGHT: Please state your name for the
record.

MR. PEDLEY: Trey Pedley.

(TREY PEDLEY SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Staff recommends approval subject to the findings of fact that follow:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in a Rural Maintenance Plan Area, where rural large-lot residential uses are appropriate in limited locations;

3. The subject property is a large tract at 1.04 acres;

4. The subject property has access to Free Silver Road with no new roads proposed;

5. Strip-mining activity on the property has ceased; and,

6. The Owensboro Metropolitan Zoning Ordinance Article 12a.31 requires that property shall revert to its original zoning classification after mining.

MR. PEDLEY: We would like to enter the staff report into the record as Exhibit A.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Trey.

Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Do the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience that would have a question or comment about this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Jean.

MR. JEAN: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we approve this application based on the Staff Report and Finding of Facts 1 through 6.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made by Mr. Jean for approval based on Findings of Fact 1 through 6.

Is there a second?

MR. EDGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Edge. Any discussion or comment about the motion and the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor
raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

ITEM 4

4171-4195 Hayden Road, 48.9 acres (Postponed from the January 11, 2018 meeting)
Consider zoning change: From R-1A Single-Family Residential & A-U Urban Agriculture to R-1A
Single-Family Residential
Applicant: WPT Non Woven; MW Parrish, LLC

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The Planning Staff recommends approval subject to the conditions and findings of fact that follow:

CONDITIONS

1. Access to Hayden Road shall be limited to a single access point as shown on the conceptual plan submitted with the Traffic Impact Study.

2. Significant changes to the proposed development will require the Traffic Impact Study be updated.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community's adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in an Urban Residential Plan Area where Urban Low-density Residential uses are appropriate in limited locations;
3. The proposal is a logical expansion of existing R-1A Single-Family Residential zoning to the south, east and west;

4. Sanitary sewer service is available to be extended to the subject property;

5. The subject property has road frontage along Hayden Road, a major street; and,

6. The Traffic Impact Study submitted by the applicant indicates the proposal should not overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area.

MR. PEDLEY: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit B.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Trey.

Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

APPLICANT REP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to speak concerning the application?

APPLICANT REP: No.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Do any of the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?
CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready for a motion.

Ms. Hardaway.

MS. HARDAWAY: I move to approve based on the Staff Report with Conditions 1 and 2 and Findings of Fact 1 through 6.

CHAIRMAN: Ms. Hardaway has made a motion to approve based on Conditions 1 and 2 and Findings of Fact 1 through 6. Is there any discussion about the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Kazlauskas. Any discussion about the motion or the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

ITEM 5

5027 Old Hartford Road, 0.399 acres
Consider zoning change: From A-U Urban Agriculture to R-1B Single-Family Residential
Applicant: J.R. Acquisitions, LLC; Marvin D. & Kathy Keller

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
The planning staff recommends approval subject to the condition and Findings of Fact that follow:

CONDITION

Access to Old Hartford Road shall be limited to the existing single access point.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposal is in compliance with the community’s adopted Comprehensive Plan;

2. The subject property is located in an Urban Residential Plan Area where Urban Low-density Residential uses are appropriate in limited locations;

3. The proposal complies with the criteria for urban residential development; and

4. Sanitary sewer service is available to be extended to the subject property.

MR. PEDLEY: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit C.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Trey.

Is anyone representing the applicant?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to say anything concerning this?

MR. BAKER: No, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Do any of the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Mr. Wilson?

MS. KNIGHT: Please state your name for the record.

MR. WILSON: My name is Harold A. Wilson.

(HAROLD WILSON SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. WILSON: We have four gentlemen here tonight actually from the adjoining property that we're talking about. We have some questions primarily about drainage from that property and the other property that's going to be mentioned in Item 6.

The county engineer, as well as state people, and also Commissioner Mike Koger met with Mr. McKay and myself. We discussed the drainage that's coming off of all of that land. It's where the 43 house subdivision is going in. I understand is 43. We wonder where all the excess water, how we're going to handle it because we already get flooded. Been a lot of work done out there. We have new sewer lines which is making it possible for that subdivision to go in, but we also are worried about the excess water that we're going to get now possibly.

We were told in that meeting that particular
day that we would have two retaining reservoirs, water reservoirs. Right now there's only been one built and it's built in to what we think instead of what we think was told to us where it would be deep, it was built like a cone, which it's going to hold about half the water that it should. Plus the other reservoir was never built. So what we were told was going to happen didn't happen and you're fixing to, they're putting in that subdivision now. I'm just wondering if anyone here has an answer for what's going to happen to the excess water that's coming off of that. Anyone? He has additional question. Thank you. I didn't know I was going to be speaking. We do have that question.

CHAIRMAN: Do we need to get an answer to your question from the applicant before --

MR. WILSON: Please.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to address that question?

I think that would be a good time to get the answer while you're there.

MS. KNIGHT: Please state your name for the record.

MR. BAKER: Jason Baker.

(JASON BAKER SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)
MR. BAKER: I think what's on the agenda today is rezoning of a small area of the back one of the tracts that faces out on Old Hartford Road.

With regard to the drainage, the drainage design has not changed from the original submittal. There is a basin that was constructed to mitigate the impact of the increased runoff. I believe that has all been constructed. It's not any different than it was when we designed it and got it approved originally. No proposals of change are proposed at this time. I believe much of the, I know the basin construction is completed. That was built up front.

CHAIRMAN: In essence nothing has changed since it was approved?

MR. BAKER: No, nothing has changed. They're still operating on the same plan that was originally approved. Nothing has really changed.

MR. HOWARD: Jason, if I could. Would you explain a little bit just so everybody knows? I know you're familiar with and we're familiar with how the process for drainage approval works, but would you explain how as the civil engineer that you all prepare drainage report, looking at what the current situation is, what the build out situation is and how the county engineer reviews that just so everybody kind of has a
feel for that?

MR. BAKER: Sure. I'll try.

What we are charged with as designers when we're doing a development like this, by building rooftops you're taking area that's converted from a grass area and creating rooftops and so forth. So there's a slight runoff caused by that. We then design retention basins such that the water leaves at a controlled rate and mitigates the impact of that. We do a design that is submitted, reviewed and approved through the county engineer's office. Then we come to this commission to address questions for final approval from the commission.

The intent is that retention basins are designed such that they mitigate the impact of that runoff.

CHAIRMAN: Does that somewhat answer your question, Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: What he said there is I'm sure what scientifically speaking that works. However, the county engineer, Mr. Brasher, told us there was supposed to be two retention basins and they're supposed to be deep enough to hold a certain amount of water, and I don't have those figures, how many cubic feet of runoff per second it would be. That's what he
told us in that meeting with Mr. Koger, myself, Mr. McKay and Mrs. McKay. We're hearing one basin. We were told two. I just know what I was told and these pictures here says one. Is that what you're going to show me?

MR. HOWARD: This is just a copy of the preliminary plat and shows the basin on a common area. Mark Brasher's signature is on it so that's what he has reviewed. I just want to give you all a copy of it so that you have it to see.

MR. WILSON: What happens down the road when this thing is built and finished, and it's being built, we're in the midst of it, what happens down the road if we suddenly find ourselves swimming in our house down the road?

CHAIRMAN: Correct me if I'm incorrect, Mr. Howard.

Irrespective of what the county engineer told you earlier, if he has already reviewed it and signed off on it, then it's sort of a done deal at that point in time. I'm not sure why he may have told you two.

MR. WILSON: When it comes back and we do get -- because there's several houses we've had water just flood. It just goes right through their house. What happens if at that point it's even worse?
CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: I don't want anybody not to be heard, but it seems to me like we're talking more about something we've already approved than we are about this four-tenths of an acre here. That may be a fair discussion for --

MR. HOWARD: Yes. This item right now is for a rezoning. The preliminary subdivision plat is next, which is what I just gave Mr. Wilson a copy of, that the county engineer has reviewed and signed off on. You're probably correct. That may be the better opportunity to talk about drainage.

MR. REEVES: I want everybody to be heard, you understand, but I want it to be relevant to the item that's on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN: Essentially we're looking at rezoning on this particular application rather than the discussion that may occur on the next one that will be coming up at some point in time. I'm not sure if that addresses it.

MR. WILSON: I thank you and I thank the gentleman for explaining it from the other side.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

MR. McKay: My name is Michael A. McKay. I live in the same subdivision --
CHAIRMAN: You need to be sworn in.

(MICHAEL McKay sworn by attorney.)

MR. McKay: Like I'm going to say what Mr. Wilson said. We were said that there were going to be two retention ponds. The retention pond already is full, where the inlet and outlet is. We had a little rain the other day. It was probably a half inch of rain, and it was already full. There's only one house in the subdivision, and it's not even completed. The dirt is running off from the property that's already been constructed into the ditch, which is not natural. The grass before, before the subdivision was built, retained the water unless you had a massive amount of rain. We're getting water from the lake up in Crescent Hill Drive too, and then from the property across the road. This all drains down through our subdivision and from the parkway. If that lake ever breaks up above where this Number 5 is, the whole subdivision is going to be wiped out. Even the new subdivision where there's supposed to be 43 houses, probably half of them are going to be gone.

CHAIRMAN: I think like Mr. Reeves said, we want to hear all the comments, but the things you're referring to right now really are not necessarily related to this particular rezoning application.
MR. McKay: I believe it is too because this property, I went up and looked at it. The dirt has already been dug on this property right here and it's draining into our ditch also. So I think there needs to be another retention pond like we were promised.

Chairman: But that would have been something the county engineer would have done at the time he approved it and apparently he's already --

MR. McKay: He actually told us a fabrication then.

Chairman: That will be a discussion you may have with him.

MR. McKay: Is this property going to be adjoined to the other property?

MR. Howard: This four-tenths of an acre?

MR. McKay: Yes, sir.

MR. Howard: What we see, what's being proposed is taking a portion of the rear of that property and adding it to the subdivision, but then the home lot, the home is on an existing lot. It will still be on a lot by itself, but it will be smaller than it was originally.

MR. McKay: We were concerned about the dirt from all of this accumulating in our drainage ditch because it's raising the water level than what it is
already. It's already caused a problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. HAWKINS: Steve Hawkins.

(STEVE HAWKINS SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

MR. HAWKINS: My eyes, I couldn't see the little map up there real good awhile ago.

I had heard they were going to use this property we're talking about as a road, another road out of that subdivision. Now, is this just going to be a house sitting there or is this going to be another road onto Old Hartford out of the subdivision?

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Baker, could you address that question, please?

MR. BAKER: No additional access is proposed to Old Hartford Road.

MR. HAWKINS: So will there be a driveway from the house?

MR. HOWARD: So the single-family residence there that has an access now, that would remain, but there is no new street being proposed to Old Hartford Road that would access the neighborhood.

MR. BAKER: That's correct.

MR. HOWARD: What our plans show.

MR. HAWKINS: That was my concern because there's a curve right there.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments concerning this particular application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Any questions from the commissioners concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: The Chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: Move to approve this application based on Staff Recommendations with Condition 1 and Findings of Fact 1 through 4.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. ROGERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Rogers. A motion has been made to approve this application based on Findings of Fact 1 through 4 and the one condition. Is there any discussion about the motion and the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MAJOR SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLATS
ITEM 6

Stone Crest, 30.869 acres
Consider approval of an amended major subdivision
preliminary plat
Applicant: J.R. Acquisitions, LLC c/o Mike Martin

MR. HOWARD: This plat has been reviewed by
the Planning Staff and Engineering Staff and it's
found to be in order and consistent with the approved
zoning of the property subdivision regulations, zoning
ordinance requirements and all of that. So it is
ready for your consideration.

Of course, you all have heard tonight some
questions about drainage. We as Staff will be glad to
convey those to Mark Brasher, the county engineer, so
he knows that there have been some concerns raised
tonight about that. Of course, the applicant's
engineer is here and has heard him as well.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Is there anyone here representing the
applicant?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Any comment concerning the
application?

MR. BAKER: I guess since there's some
question about the plan. I just wanted to indicate
the change that's being proposed here is to bring in
that rezone, that that area is being rezoned and add it to the back of the lot. Then one of the street's intersections is being modified slightly. Again, no changes to drainage are proposed as part of this plan.

MR. HOWARD: If I could ask a question just based on the discussion we've previously heard. Was this basin designed to be a wet or dry basin?

MR. BAKER: It is a wet basin.

MR. HOWARD: They made a comment that it's full now. Was this the first rain that really had the opportunity to fill the basin up since it was dug?

MR. BAKER: I haven't really monitored the level of it over time, but by design that basin should come up and down. It does that because we throttle down the discharge. So more running in that can't run out and that's the reason it functions. It's actually holding back that water and letting it out at a slower rate. Seeing that water come up and down tells you it's working the way it's supposed to.

MR. HOWARD: Of course, the county engineer signed off on this plan, the submitted plan, but you met with him and discussed, you, or David, or whoever from your office met and discussed the changes?

MR. BAKER: Yes. I have not heard of any
issues so I was not aware of any concerns or anything.

Nothing was raised as part of this review.

CHAIRMAN: I think you indicated nothing had changed from what we see here.

MR. BAKER: No change with regard to drainage at all.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

MR. McKAY: I have another question. The pond has already retained, it's already eroded and it's gone down into the retention pond and that's raised the water level. Probably three, four, maybe five pickup loads of dirt has already drained off behind Mr. Wilson's house. Not this Mr. Wilson, but another Mr. Wilson. The retention pond goes right up to his property and it's eroded and gone down into the retention pond already so that water level's already raised up. It's going to have to be dredged out because it's not holding its capacity right now because the grass wasn't put on there to stop the erosion.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Baker.

MR. BAKER: So with regard to retention and the erosion. I have not witnessed that issue. Although, when you have a pond that holds the normal elevation, the way that's designed the elevation is
controlled by the discharge pipe. So if erosion goes below the water level, it's not really impacting the function of the basin. It still may be required to be dredged out as the gentleman mentioned. What is required by ordinance and the county engineer will require that we go in and do an as-built certification of that basin after it is complete and the sides are stabilized and so forth. So that is something that will happen; to certify that all of the design volumes were obtained. And if they're not, the developer will have to fix that before it will be accepted, and those things are normally bonded by the developer. There is a way to get it done.

CHAIRMAN: I think you answered my question that I was just thinking about.

I think what you just said was the site work all the work is not completed yet. I didn't look at the basin, but I noticed the site work is not totally complete with the basin at this point in time; is that correct?

MR. BAKER: I think the grades were established. I think the volume was there. Now, if something has happened with erosion, that will have to be fixed at the time of certification.

CHAIRMAN: Are you willing to work with these
folks, I guess, concerning that issue?

MR. BAKER: On certain issues, yes. We want it to work as well.

MR. McKAY: I have another question.

Our ditch through our subdivision has already collected silt from the runoff from Number 6, Mr. Martin's subdivision. I believe that's a violation. I feel like that ditch is going to have to be dredged out because it's going to raise the water level in our subdivision already. You could probably go over and measure it probably an inch, inch and a half all the way down through there. The county used to clean out our ditches through our subdivision and through other subdivisions. We're going to have to correct this. I mean one of my neighbor's water comes right up to his door and into his house, and he just remodeled his house recently. It's pretty sad, you know.

CHAIRMAN: Is that problem related to necessarily what he's doing or is that a county issue that you need to discuss --

MR. McKAY: This is related to all of this. The dirt that's been dumped into the ditch from doing the ground work for this new subdivision. That's what we're concerned about. The county engineer said he
couldn't clean out the ditches any more. In the past every four or five years they've cleaned out ditches. When you keep adding subdivisions, you know, somebody is going to get the excess water from it. I'm concerned about it.

CHAIRMAN: I think I heard Mr. Baker say he would try to work with you all as much as he could to try to rectify what he's involved with.

MR. BAKER: Yes, and I will bring your concerns up to the developer as well. Again, I was not aware that there were active erosion issues and so forth. That is something that the contractor is responsible for preventing. We will raise that concern to the developer as well.

MR. HOWARD: As I said earlier, we will get in touch with the county engineer to let him know the concerns that were expressed here tonight. We can't speak for him. He's not a part of our office, but we'll convey the message.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

Yes, Mr. Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: I understand that this is a bonded projected. So maybe our director could explain that since it's a bonded project that bond is not released until this retention meets the
MR. HOWARD: Yes. When it comes time for a final plat, things are bonded. That can be the drainage basins, the streets, curb and gutter, potentially sidewalks, fire hydrants, all of that stuff can have bond to protect the public in the event that work isn't completed. Part of what the county engineer will do is review all this stuff. As Mr. Baker laid out before, the county would fully accept the basin and they'll do an as-built drawing and make sure that everything is done in compliance. There is bond money posted in the event that things are not done correctly and held for a certain amount of time. Then once everything is built and constructed and in conformance, then the bond would be released. Since this is a county subdivision, the county does not maintain basins. They're turned over to Homeowners Association and it's their requirement then to make sure that everything is maintained on a routine basis and functioning properly.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: I just wanted to let these people know that there is a safeguard there with that bond in place. That the retention is going to have to meet specifications.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: Another thing I noticed here, and I want to point this out to these homeowners.

If you look at this plat on the left-hand side in the notes, look at Number 26, because this may be some recourse you have down the line if necessary. It says, "Developer will maintain, on a routine basis, the detention basins (such as routine cleaning and silt removal)." So that's where you can hold their feet to the fire a little bit.

CHAIRMAN: Does that somewhat answer the questions that you folks may have?

MR. WILSON: That's the basin. That don't take care of the ditch filling up.

CHAIRMAN: Any other commissioners have any questions or comments concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Any other comment from the audience?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moore has made a motion for
approval.

MS. McENROE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. McEnroe. Any discussion or comment about the motion or the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

ITEM 7

4424 Springhill Drive, 1.235 acres
Consider approval of a final development plan
Applicant: Hayden Development Company, LLC

MR. HOWARD: This plan comes before you. It's been reviewed by the Planning Staff and Engineering Staff and it's found to be in order. It's consistent with the underlying zoning of the property and conditions that have been placed upon it and it is ready for your consideration for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

APPLICANT REP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to speak?

APPLICANT REP: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Do the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience that has any questions or comments about this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to approve by Mr. Rogers.

Is there a second?

MS. McENROE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. McEnroe. Any discussion or comment about the motion or the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 8

Ohio Valley Reporting
(270) 683-7383
Consider approval of December 2017 financial statement

CHAIRMAN: Commissioners, we were sent and hopefully have had a chance to look through the financial statements for the period ending December 31, 2017.

Is there any comment or discussion or changes or questions concerning the financial statement?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none the chair is ready for a motion.

MR. REEVES: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to approve by Mr. Reeves.

Is there a second?

MS. HARDAWAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. Hardaway. Any discussion about the motion or the second?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

ITEM 9

Comments by the Chairman

CHAIRMAN: Chairman has no comments tonight.

ITEM 10
Comments by the Planning Commissioners

CHAIRMAN: Any comments by the commissioners?
(NO RESPONSE)

ITEM 11

Comments by the Director

CHAIRMAN: There being none I guess the next order of business is comments by the director.

MR. HOWARD: I only have one thing. As we discussed a little bit earlier tonight in our work session, there is a conflict in May with a State Planning Conference that will take place. If it's the pleasure of this commission, maybe we could have a motion to amend our filing deadline and date so that the meeting for the Planning Commission in May will take place on May 3rd. That will be the same night as the Board of Adjustment. There will be a double meeting that night. This will allow the potential for some of our Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment members to attend this conference and earn continuing education credits and that type of a thing.

If we could get a motion to make that change to our forum and then we'll distribute that out to the engineering folks and the newspaper and all the people that get that.
CHAIRMAN: The chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to move the May meeting to May 3rd, to go after the Board of Adjustments meeting.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made to move the May meeting to the 3rd, the same night as the Board of Adjustments meeting. Is there any discussion or comment about the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. JEAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Jean. Any comment or discussion about the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: May 3rd is approved.

Unless there’s any other business, the next important decision is the motion for adjournment.

MR. EDGE: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Edge.

MS. McENROE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. McEnroe. All those
in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned.

--------------------------------------------------------
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STATE OF KENTUCKY )
    SS: REPORTER’S CERTIFICATE
COUNTY OF DAVIESS )

I,LYNNETTE KOLLER FUCHS, Notary Public in and
for the State of Kentucky at Large, do hereby certify
that the foregoing Owensboro Metropolitan Planning
Commission meeting was held at the time and place as
stated in the caption to the foregoing proceedings;
that each person commenting on issues under discussion
were duly sworn before testifying; that the Board
members present were as stated in the caption; that
said proceedings were taken by me in stenotype and
electronically recorded and was thereafter, by me,
accurately and correctly transcribed into the
foregoing 33 typewritten pages; and that no signature
was requested to the foregoing transcript.

WITNESS my hand and notary seal on this the
28th day of February, 2018.

LYNNETTE KOLLER FUCHS
NOTARY ID 524564
OHIO VALLEY REPORTING SERVICES
2200 E. PARRISH AVE, SUITE 106E
OWENSBORO, KENTUCKY 42303
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