The Owensboro Metropolitan Planning Commission met in regular session at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 9, 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
Manuel Ball
Fred Reeves
John Kazlauskas
Mike Edge

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

CHAIRMAN: I would like to call the August 9, 2018 Planning Commission meeting to order.

We always start our meeting with a pledge and a prayer. Commissioner Edge will lead us in that tonight.

(INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Edge.

Since we are a quasi legal meeting, there's a few housekeeping rules that I want to make everyone aware of before we actually start our meeting.

If you wish to speak, please approach the
podiums, clearly state your name and be sworn in by our counsel. It's very important that our commissioner hears all the information very clearly so Lynnette is able to have everything recorded. Direct all your questions and answers to the chair, especially if there's going to be multiple speakers. Be respectful of others who may wish to speak, and please stay on topic with all the discussions and the comments and questions specific to the agenda item that we're talking about.

All the commissioners hopefully have received and read through the minutes from our July 12th meeting. Are there any comments or discussions or changes concerning those minutes?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none Chair is ready for a motion.

Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Move to approve by. Do we have a second?

MR. EDGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Edge. 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.

MR. HOWARD: I will note that 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 CHANGES

ITEM 3

9117 Aubrey Road, 0.397 acres
Consider zoning change: From B-4 General Business to R-1A Single-Family Residential
Applicant: Scott Bean

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

MR. PEDLEY: Trey Pedley.

(TREY PEDLEY SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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
Community Plan Area, where urban rural small lot
residential uses are appropriate in general locations;

3. The subject property is an existing lot of
record with adequate frontage along a public road;

4. At 0.397 acres the subject property does
not meet the current lot size requirements for a
septic system; however the applicant has received
approval from the Health Department permitting an
on-site septic system; and

5. The proposal is a logical expansion of
R-1A Single Family Residential zoning to the south.

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: Is there anyone in the audience
that would like to speak on behalf or in opposition of
this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

(NO RESPONSE)

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

MR. JEAN: I would like to make a motion we approve based on the Staff Report and Findings of Facts 1 through 5.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made by Commissioner Jean for approval based on the Staff Recommendations and Findings of Fact 1 through 5. Do we have a second?

MR. BALL: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Ball. 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.

ITEM 4

2130 Breckenridge Street, 0.202 acres
Consider zoning change: From B-4 General Business to R-4DT Inner City Residential
Applicant: Brandon Blade

MS. KNIGHT: Please state your name.

MS. EVANS: Melissa Evans.
PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

CONDITION

Install a 10-foot wide landscape easement with a 6-foot tall continuous element and one tree every 40 linear feet along all common property boundaries.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Staff recommends approval because the proposed R-4DT Inner City Residential zoning is more appropriate than the current B-4 General Business zone;

2. The subject property is located in a Business Plan Area, where urban low-density residential uses are appropriate in very-limited locations;

3. The subject property has been used as a residence for more than 60 years; and,

4. The proposed zoning change will bring the property use that has exists on the site into conformance with the zoning ordinance.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit B.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Melissa.
Is there anyone here representing the applicant?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Do any of the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak 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 for approval based on Planning Staff recommendation with one condition and Findings of Fact 1 through 4.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made for approval based on the one condition and the Findings of Fact 1 through 4. Do we have 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.

ITEM 5

1203 Center Street, 0.34 acres
Consider zoning change: From B-4 General Business to
R-4DT Inner City Residential
Applicant: Owensboro Health Regional Hospital

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

CONDITION

Access shall be limited to Center Street with
no access permitted to East Parrish Avenue.

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
Professional/Service Plan Area, where urban
mid-density residential uses are appropriate in
limited locations;

3. The proposed use, as a multi-family
development, conforms to the criteria for
urban-residential development;

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

5. The proposal is a logical expansion of
R-4DT Inner-City Residential zoning to the south,
east, and west;

6. At 0.340 acres, the proposal is not a
significant increase in R-4DT Inner-City zoning in the
vicinity; and

7. With access limited to Center Street, 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 C.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Trey.

Is there anyone here representing the
applicant?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Yes, Commissioner Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Maybe Staff can help us out
here.

It says "multi-family development consisting
of 48 one-bedroom units." Is that going to be
separate or is that going to be in one building or is
there a development plan?

MS. EVANS: The hospital currently owns most
of the properties on this block. There are some houses that are individually owned still. They have an overall plan. If they gain access to these other lots that they don't currently own to development the 48 one-bedroom units, it's my understanding that their intent is then to close that alley as well, and I believe it will be in one building, but we do not have any sort of development plans or site plans or anything like that, conceptual plans submitted at this point. That's just what they have written in their application.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Then they would be old and the administrative by the Owensboro Health Regional Hospital, right?

MS. EVANS: I don't know that. I don't know the answer to that question. I just know that the hospital owns the corner property which is proposed for rezoning tonight and the vacant parcels that are in that block they own also. I don't know if they would own and operate the development if it came to that or if someone else would.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, Commissioner Reeves.

MR. REEVES: My question, and you may not be able to answer this, Melissa.
I'm assuming this number of units would not be on this one lot because they certainly couldn't have the required parking on a third of an acre; is that correct?

MS. EVANS: That's correct. You know, their overall plan is to obtain all those lots, close the alley, I believe. Probably consolidate all of those into one large lot and then do that development, but all of that is contingent on, you know, obtaining ownership of those lots that they don't currently even own.

In my conversations, I think they're applying for grant money to do something. So my conversations, this was kind of the first step that with this lot not zoned inner-city residential like the other lots, this was the first step that had to be done before they could even start applying for any grants or anything to start the ball rolling on this development.

MR. REEVES: That answered my other question too. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: You're welcome.

MR. HOWARD: And I'll add that whenever they do submit, you know, it would require a final development plan that would have to be reviewed by our Staff. All the utilities and the Engineering Staff
and we check with the city engineers office and those to see if a Traffic Impact Study might be needed. So we're exploring all of those things as well, but at this point with just this small parcel it didn't require any of those larger studies or plan type documents.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Melissa.

Thank you, Brian.

Any other questions from the commissioners?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to step forward and ask questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: Motion to approve this application based on Planning Staff Recommendation with the Condition relating to the access and Findings of Fact 1 through 7.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made by Mr. Reeves for approval based on the one condition and the Findings of Fact 1 through 7. Do we have a second concerning this?
MR. EDGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Edge. 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 6

3104 Fairview Drive, 0.502 acres
Consider zoning change: From R-1A Single-Family Residential to B-4 General Business
Applicant: RKM, LLC

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

CONDITIONS

1. The existing residential access to the subject property shall be closed at the time of redevelopment.

2. Access to the property shall be in compliance with the access management manual and approved by the OMPC and City or County Engineer.

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 Business Plan Area where general business uses are appropriate in limited locations;

3. The proposed use as office conforms to the criteria for nonresidential development;

4. The proposal is a logical expansion of existing B-4 General Business zoning to the north and east; and,

5. At 0.502 acres, the proposal does not significantly increase the extent of general business zoning in the vicinity and should not overburden the capacity of roadways and other necessary urban services that are available in the affected area.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit D.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Melissa.

Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

DR. MATHEW: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Would you like to say something about that?

MS. KNIGHT: Sir, could you please state your name for the record.

DR. MATHEW: Roshan Mathew.
DR. MATHEW: I would request approval based on the Zoning Staff Report. It’s just an expansion of the already existing property that I own.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Mathew.

Do any of the commissioners have any questions of Dr. Mathew concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: Motion for approval based on Planning Staff Recommendations, Conditions 1, 2 and Findings of Fact 1 through 5.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made for approval based on Conditions 1 and 2 and Findings of Fact 1 through 5. Do we have a second?

MR. BALL: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Commissioner Ball. Any discussion or question 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 7

412, 422 East Second Street, 212 Clay Street, 0.61 acres, Downtown Core Overly District
Consider zoning change: From R-4DT Inner City Residential & I-1 Light Industrial to B-2 Central Business
Applicant: Terry Woodward

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

CONDITION

Access shall be limited to Clay Street only, no access shall be permitted to West 2nd Street.

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 Central Business Plan Area, where central business uses are appropriate in general locations;

3. The subject property is located within the downtown overlay district as adopted by the City of Owensboro and the request is consistent with the concepts of that plan;
4. The use of the property as a physical therapy office is nonresidential in nature; and,
5. The B-2 zoning will promote the redevelopment of the downtown area consistent with the downtown master plan.

MS. EVANS: We would like to enter the Staff Report into the record as Exhibit E.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Melissa. Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

MR. RINEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Riney, would you like to say anything on its behalf?

MR. RINEY: No, I'm good.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Riney.

Any commissioners have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience that would have any questions for which to speak about this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I move for approval based on Staff Recommendation with the one condition and Findings of Fact 1 through 5.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made by Mr. Moore for approval based on the one condition and Findings of Fact 1 through 5. Do we have a second?

MS. McENROE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. McEnroe. Is there any discussion concerning 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 8

1535 Frederica Street, 207 Phillips Court, 0.820 acres (Postponed from July 12, 2018)

Consider approval of a final development plan
Applicant: WBW Properties, LLC

MR. HOWARD: This item was postponed at the July 12th meeting. We have a request from the applicant's attorney to postpone this item again this evening. It is an action that you'll need to take to postpone until the September meeting, which is the
CHAIRMAN: So my understanding is we will need a motion for postponement to move it to the September meeting, correct?

MR. HOWARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We need a motion for that.

Mr. Kazlauskas.

MR. KAZLAUSKAS: I make a motion to postpone the item until the September meeting.

CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made to postpone until the September meeting.

MS. McENROE: Second.

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

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: All those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: A motion to suspend it until the September meeting has been approved.

MINOR SUBDIVISION PLATS

ITEM 9

8466 Crisp Road, 5.18 acres
Consider approval of a minor subdivision plat.
Applicant: Thomas & Pamela Dickens, Keith Dickens

MR. HOWARD: This plat comes before you as an
exception to the 3 to 1 requirement. The existing lot exceeds that. They're adding a little over 1.1 acres to the back of it. They're not creating any new building lots or any additional tracts with this consolidation of additional property. So we would recommend that you consider it for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard. Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

APPLICANT REP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to say anything on its behalf?

APPLICANT REP: Not unless you need me to.

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

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience would have any discussion concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Jean.

MR. JEAN: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to approve by Mr. Jean.
MR. ROGERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Rogers. 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 10

5614, 5638 Lane Road, 3.14 acres
Consider approval of a minor subdivision plat
Applicant: Debra Kay Stevens

MR. HOWARD: This plat comes before you as an exception for a lot which is a little over 1.8 acres. They're creating what we call a flag lot. It does have frontage on Lane Road, but it's a narrow frontage that goes back to wider acreage in the back. The existing parcel is a little over 3 acres so this will allow for one additional building site on this property. They have added a note to the plat that says that the property won't be able to be further subdivided without meeting the requirements of the subdivision regulations. So with that we would recommend that you consider it for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Yes, please.
MS. STEVENS: I'm Debra Stevens. This is my property. My parents currently reside there in the existing residence and my son is going to build a home in the front. The property will always remain in the family. I just wanted to come, you know, to tell you all that because I know flag property is not a normal thing for you.

MS. KNIGHT: Ms. Stevens, would you mind to raise your right hand and I'll swear you in.

(DEBRA STEVENS SWORN BY ATTORNEY.)

CHAIRMAN: Does any of the commissioners have any questions for the applicant?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience that would have any questions for the applicant?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Reeves.

MR. REEVES: Move to approve this application.

CHAIRMAN: Move for approval by Mr. Reeves.

Is there a second to that?

MR. EDGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Edge. Any discussion about the motion or the second?
CHAIRMAN: There being none all those in favor raise your right hand.

(ALL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT RESPONDED AYE.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

ITEM 11

5892, 5910 Old Highway 54, 58.629 acres
Consider approval of a minor subdivision plat
Applicant: Connie Hagan & Francis E. Hagan

MR. HOWARD: This plat comes before you as an except; although the acreage listed is quite large. What's being proposed really is a lot in the upper right-hand corner of the parcel, the northeast corner there. It's a little over a tenth of an acre, but in the area any lot that's under three-quarters of an acre, you know, isn't allowed if it's not on sewer; however, this lot is being created so that the sewer utility can build some infrastructure on that property. There's a notation on the plat that says that it's for utility infrastructure only and it's a non-buildable lot otherwise. So we would certainly recommend that you consider this plat for approval.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

Is there anyone here representing the applicant?

APPLICANT REP: I'm representing RWRA, if you
all have any questions.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any of the commissioners have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: Anyone in the audience that would have any questions concerning this application?

(NO RESPONSE)

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

Mr. Ball.

MR. BALL: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to approve by Mr. Ball.

MR. JEAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Jean. 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.

----------------------------------------------

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 12

Consider approval of June 2018 financial statements
CHAIRMAN: All the commissioners hopefully have received their financial statements and have had a chance to look through those. Is there any discussion about the financial statements or questions from any of the commissioners?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIRMAN: There being none the Chair is ready for a motion.
Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Move for approval.
CHAIRMAN: Move for approval by Mr. Moore. Do we have a second?
MR. REEVES: Second.
CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Reeves. Any you 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: The final statements are approved.
ITEM 13
Comments by the Chairman
CHAIRMAN: The Chair really doesn't have much in the way of comments other than if you went through

Ohio Valley Reporting
(270) 683-7383
the financial statements I think it was pretty evident that our Planning and Zoning department as a whole and our director have done a great job on managing all of the financial side and are leaving everybody in a good position, very good position based on them working really hard to try to be as fiscally responsible as they can.

I commend, Brian, you and the department for doing a great job on keeping the department well positioned from a financial standpoint.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That's all I have from the chairman side.

ITEM 14

Comments by Planning Commissioners

CHAIRMAN: Do any of the commissioners have any comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

ITEM 15

Comments by the Director

* OMPC Fiscal Year 2018 Activity Report

MR. HOWARD: Each of you received in your packet our year-end Activity Report. We generate one of these every year to distribute not only to you all, but we'll also send a copy to the local elected
officials as well. It just gives an overview of what
our office has done over the last fiscal year.

So the top portion is the Planning activities.

Of course, you can look through there.

Say, for example, under Zoning Changes, this
year we had 41. Quite an even split between city and
county. We had 19 in the city and 20 in the county, 2
within the City of Whitesville.

We did well over 200 subdivision plats this
year.

When you look at site plans and development
plans, those are quite heavily weighted towards the
City.

Final Development Plans we had 31 in the city
this year, this past year, and only 16 in the county.

Site plans we had 35 in the city and 16 in the
county.

So certainly more of those plan activities
taking place in the city jurisdiction.

We did 10 Conditional Use Permits, 17 Variance
applications, and various other things that you see
there.

On the building side we had a busy year there.

For part of the year we had four inspectors, but right
now we're running with three inspectors which is our
general staff load for inspectors.

For the year we had a little over 1,000 total building permits. Over 1250 electrical permits, over 350 HVAC permits. So we had quite a busy year there.

Then the last section breaks down the building inspection aspects of our office. So common the three to four people that we had last year we did 6165 total building inspections. Seems like every year when we talk about this I do highlight the fact that all of our building inspectors at least try to an have achieved cross-training for them and cross-inspection ability for them. We don't have one person that goes out and does the building inspection and then another person that goes out and does the electrical inspection and a different person that goes out and does the HVAC. All of our people are either currently certified or are in the process of being certified to do all three at the same time. So it makes the effort of our inspectors I believe much more efficient and time savings that we have over other communities that don't do that.

I want to commend our Staff on what they do. That's a lot of inspections that they deal with on a daily basis among the three gentlemen that we have on staff right now.
Does anybody have any questions about any information or data that's included on this? If not, like I said, we'll prepare a memo and send it out to the elected officials early next week so they can have a copy as well. Again, that's something that we've done every year as part of our year-end recap.

CHAIRMAN: I've got just one quick question. I tried to find my records because I usually keep a year and a half back of all of our meetings. I couldn't find, how does this compare with last year's?

MR. HOWARD: It was a couple hundred less than what we had last year, but it was on par with what we've had over the last five, six years. We've been pretty consistent as far as the total numbers of most everything.

Since the upswing after the recession in the mid to late 2000's and leading into the early '10 and '11, we've seen a pretty consistent number year in and year out.

CHAIRMAN: I think it really flows well in the sense that we've got cross-trained personnel who really take on a pretty good amount of these inspections, but they're doing it efficiently and working really hard to get these all taken care of in
the course of a year. Job well done for sure.

MR. HOWARD: It's worked out well. It's been a couple of weeks ago, but I spoke with the head of the building department for the City of Bowling Green, you know, just to kind of talk about what they do. We're always looking for ways to improve things. In my discussion with him, you know, we looked at our plan review process over the last six months. Our plan review, that's where the builder comes in with a plan set and Kyle Trunnell, our main plan reviewer, he'll sit down with that plan set. Go through it, look for all the pertinent stuff relating to building code requirements. I would say our average over the last six months for turnaround time on those in the three to four day range, business days.

When I was talking to the folks in Bowling Green, what I have to say or what I'll say comes with a caveat. That they're a city agency and he says that they actually work in some ways as a catch-all. So one of the things that they have to do whenever a plan set comes in for their plan review is they have to check and make sure that they have a business license with the city, and they do various and sundry other things that's weighs upon other agencies. He says that they try and get 85 percent of their plan review
comments and feedback to the applicant within 15
business days. So they're looking at three weeks on a
turnaround versus the three, four, five day
turnarounds that we do. Now, granted, they have other
things on their plate that they have to deal with as
well, but we still feel like with the dedicated
person, Kyle, that's all he does is review these
things all day every day. He's, you know, not getting
interrupted by the phone and all that stuff. He does
review plans. So we're able to get those turned
around quickly.

The other thing is on a single-family
residential permit application we turn those around I
would say 98 or 99 percent of the time within 24
hours. Often we can do them in the same day, but
otherwise it's the next day. Very rarely it might
take two days.

He said that they average, in Bowling Green
they average anywhere in the three to five day range
to get those turned around. They're within the city.
They've had a lot of building activity. They have a
dedicated person just like we do. They're busy.
We're busy. Everybody is busy, but we do, you know, I
think it does help that we have the dedicated staff
that specifically that's their job, to get these
things moved through the process.

I felt good after discussing that with the folks down in Bowling Green. That, you know, we're on the right track. They're on the right track. We're all doing the best we can.

Just thought I would highlight some of those numbers and some of that information for you guys. Again, any time that you have questions or comments or feedback or you hear things or whatever, just let us know. We're always glad to hear feedback.

MR. REEVES: Just a couple of comments.

I had the opportunity with Mr. Jean to go to the State Planning Conference this year. I will tell you that this Planning Staff is the envy of the rest of the state. Had dinner with folks and they again and again about how much they respected this staff and what they do.

Secondly, and I think Mr. Ball, what's so important about that turnaround, that's money in your pocket. Every day that builder is not building something, that's interest they're paying. I think that turnaround time is significantly important.

I hope when you send the report to the City Commissioners and the Fiscal Court that you'll have a cover letter to explain to them how important it is...
that all of these inspectors are cross-trained.

MR. HOWARD: Yes, we do. I send a memo with
it and we will highlight that as part of what we send
them because it is important. The inspections and all
of that, it all goes hand in hand with how quickly
things move through the process.

Since you mentioned that, in Bowling Green I
asked them, you know, typically when somebody calls in
requesting inspection, we the majority of time can get
out the next day. They're in the same thing. They
get out the next day as well.

Again, we're all trying to get through and be
as quick and efficient as we can. Appreciate the kind
words from your experience at the State Planning
Conference. You know, we're doing our best. We're
not perfect. Nobody is perfect, but we are certainly
trying to do our best to expedite things, move things
along as quickly as we can.

CHAIRMAN: All great points, Commissioner
Reeves.

Any commissioners have any comments or
questions concerning this report?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRMAN: There being none then we have the
most important motion to come up.

Ohio Valley Reporting
(270) 683-7383
Mr. Edge.

MR. EDGE: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn. Do we have a second?

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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