

**BOONE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
VIA LIVE VIDEO TELECONFERENCE  
BURLINGTON, KENTUCKY  
PUBLIC HEARINGS  
APRIL 7, 2021  
7:30 P.M.**

---

Chairman Rolfsen opened the Public Hearing at 8:20 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission's April 7, 2021 Public Hearing via Live Video Teleconference.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Randy Bessler  
Mr. Kim Bunger, Secretary/Treasurer  
Ms. Corrin Gulick  
Mr. Steve Harper  
Mrs. Lori Heilman  
Mrs. Janet Kegley  
Mr. Kim Patton, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Charlie Rolfsen, Chairman  
Mr. Bob Schwenke  
Mrs. Jackie Steele  
Mr. Tom Szurlinski

**COMMISSION MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:**

Ms. Olivia Amlung  
Mr. Rick Lunnemann  
Mr. Don McMillian  
Mr. Steve Turner, Temporary Presiding Officer

**LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:**

Mr. Dale T. Wilson

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Kevin P. Costello, AICP, Executive Director  
Mr. Kevin T. Wall, AICP, Director, Zoning Services  
Mr. Michael D. Schwartz, Planner

Chairman Rolfsen introduced the first item on the Agenda at 8:20 p.m.

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – Michael Schwartz, Staff**

Request of **City of Florence (owner)** for a Zoning Map Amendment from Public Facilities/Planned Development/Parkway Corridor Study Overlay (PF/PD/PO) to Commercial Two/Planned Development/Parkway Corridor Study Overlay (C-2/PD/PO) for the approximate 1.06 acre site located at 8275 Ewing Boulevard, Florence, Kentucky. The request is for a zone change to allow medical, dental, optical and veterinary clinics and professional office uses that provide medical, dental, optical and veterinary administrative services in an existing building.

Mr. Michael Schwartz, Staff, referred to his PowerPoint presentation. The site is approximately 1 acre in size, located at the corner of Ewing Boulevard and Burlington Pike. It has approximately 150 feet of road frontage on Burlington Pike and approximately 330 feet of road frontage on Ewing Boulevard. Pages 1 and 2 of the Staff Report provide a summary of the site history. The site is currently occupied by a one story, 11,100 square foot office building. Fifty-two parking spaces are provided. Access is currently provided off Ewing Boulevard, approximately 270 feet south of Burlington Pike. Mr. Schwartz showed photographs of the site and adjoining properties. The current zoning of the site is PF/PD/PO. The proposed C-2/PD/PO zoning provides for a variety of retail, service and office uses. Pages 2 and 3 of the Staff Report offer a more thorough description of the current and proposed zoning districts. The site is located in the Central Florence Strategic Plan. Page 5 of the Staff Report provides the intent of the Study. The site is relatively flat with an average grade of less than 2%. The site is located in 60 DNL (Day and Night Noise Level) from aircraft noise. The Future Land Use Map from the Plan 2040 designates the site as Commercial (C). Mr. Schwartz mentioned that the submitted Concept Development Plan shows the existing conditions of the site. The City of Florence has identified uses that they prefer on the site and uses they would like to prohibit. The City is proposing to allow licensed practitioners, providing treatment on an outpatient basis, of physicians, dentists, optometrists, physical therapists, chiropractors, or veterinarians to occupy the existing building. The submitted request would allow: (1) laboratories to test patient samples and/or make medical appliances for patients that are treated on site; and (2) professional offices that provide medical, dental, optical and veterinary administrative services such as medical billing, data collection and records retention, and the processing of medical insurance claims. The applicant is specifically prohibiting non-medical or relaxation massage parlors, drug treatment facilities, call centers and/or professional office services that are not directly related to medical, dental, optical and veterinary practices. On Page 7 of the Staff Report, there are Staff Comments pertaining to the amendment procedure and timing should an alternate use be proposed for the site. The request needs to be evaluated based upon the necessary findings for a Zoning Map Amendment as noted in KRS 100.

Ms. Amlung stated that she just confirmed that she had a conflict with the request due to her relationship with the City of Florence as her firm is currently representing the City in legal matters. She recused herself from the Public Hearing.

Chairman Rolfsen asked if the applicant was present and wanted to proceed with their presentation?

Mr. Josh Hunt, Director, Business & Community Development, City of Florence, stated that Staff did a good job in presenting the request and that he was available to answer any questions.

At this time, Chairman Rolfsen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak in favor or against the Zoning Map Amendment request? Seeing none, he asked if any of the Board Members had any questions?

**Seeing no further questions or comments, Chairman Rolfsen announced that the Committee Meeting for this item will be on April 21, 2021 at 5:00 P.M. via Live Video Teleconference. This item will be on the Agenda for the Business Meeting on May 5, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.** If someone wants to observe the Committee Meeting, please contact the office and provide the necessary information for logging into the meeting. The Chairman closed the Public Hearing at 8:29 p.m.

**APPROVED:**

---

**Charlie Rolfsen**  
**Chairman**

**Attest:**

---

**Kevin P. Costello, AICP**  
**Executive Director**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Olivia Amlung  
Mr. Randy Bessler  
Mr. Kim Bunger, Secretary/Treasurer  
Ms. Corrin Gulick  
Mr. Steve Harper  
Mrs. Lori Heilman  
Mrs. Janet Kegley  
Mr. Kim Patton, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Charlie Rolfsen, Chairman  
Mr. Bob Schwenke  
Mrs. Jackie Steele  
Mr. Tom Szurlinski

**COMMISSION MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:**

Mr. Rick Lunnemann  
Mr. Don McMillian  
Mr. Steve Turner, Temporary Presiding Officer

**LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT:**

Mr. Dale T. Wilson

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Kevin P. Costello, AICP, Executive Director  
Mr. Kevin Wall, Director, Zoning Services

Chairman Rolfsen introduced the second item on the Agenda at 8:30 p.m.

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – Kevin Wall, Staff**

Request of **NorthPoint Development (applicant)** for **Greenfield Farm, Inc (owner)** for a Zoning Map Amendment from Agricultural Estate (A-2) to Industrial One (I-1) for an approximate 208.73 acre site located on the west side of Dixie Highway, south of the property at 11765 Dixie Highway and north of the properties at 12097 and 12119 Dixie Highway, and on the north side of Chambers Road at the northeast quadrant of the Chambers Road/I-75 overpass, and to the north, northeast, and west of the property at 262 Chambers Road, and south of the property at 60 Logistics Boulevard, Boone County, Kentucky. The request is for a zone change to allow a subdivision for warehousing, distribution, and light manufacturing uses.

Staff Member, Kevin Wall, presented the Staff Report, which included a PowerPoint presentation. The request is to rezone an approximate 209 acre site from A-2 to I-1. It is located between I-75 and Dixie Highway and from Park South Industrial Park to Chambers Road. Logistics Boulevard dead-ends into the site. It is currently a farm. There are 2 barns located on the property. The Future Land Use Map from the Our Boone County - Plan 2040 designates the site as Industrial (I). There is a small strip of land along Chambers Road that is designated Rural Lands (RL). The site has some history. A zone change from A-2 to I-1 application was withdrawn in 2007 after the the Planning Commission had recommended denial. The recommendation focused on road improvements, particularly the I-75/Richwood Road Interchange. Construction funding for the improvements to the interchange and Richwood Road were not in place or scheduled to be constructed.

The applicant has submitted two Concept Development Plans. Logistics Boulevard is planned to be extended south and then east to Dixie Highway. The minimum I-1 building setbacks and buffer yard requirements will be met and the developer has agreed to a maximum of 3 million square feet, which is about 14,373 square feet per acre. The Staff Report outlines the landscape or buffer areas as well which are proposed to be prohibited industrial uses. It is described in the applicant's narrative as well the attachments. No information was provided for building elevations at the time of the application. A Traffic Impact Study was submitted and excerpts from it are attached to the Staff Report. The Traffic Impact Study includes recommendations. Mr. Wall showed options of how the various buildings could be laid out on the individual lots. Mr. Wall showed photographs of the site and adjoining properties.

In terms of Staff Comments, Mr. Wall referred to pages 11-13 of the Staff Report in regard to Boone County Comprehensive Plan, both the text and the map. There is a key reference in the Land Use Element that talks about the area in question (Richwood East). There are also references to the Economy and Demographics Elements, the Future Land Use Development Guidelines and Goals and Objectives. Lastly, the governing bodies will also need to consider the alternate findings for the requested Zoning Map Amendment. The second comment refers to the proposed uses which would allow warehousing, distribution and light manufacturing. The developer is offering to prohibit 7 uses on the site. The staff recommends reviewing all uses at the Committee level as the I-1 zone allows O-1 and O-2 uses. Mr. Wall also mentioned looking at outside storage and loading docks in terms of location facing I-75 and residential uses. Mr. Wall suggested providing more detail about the proposed buffer yards particularly those that adjoin prominent roadways and those that adjoin agricultural and low density residential areas. In addition, there was a condition with the Park South development that require street trees and that should continue as the text of the Comprehensive Plan recommends the site be developed as a Business Park. In terms of building and retaining wall design, Mr. Wall suggested that the applicant provide representative images of building designs and/or a written architectural program for the Committee to evaluate as well as a lighting plan between the buildings and the overall site boundary. Much of the proposed street network is narrower than the present width of Logistics Boulevard. This needs to be explained why especially when it intersects with Dixie Highway. The existing Logistics Boulevard is 41 feet wide and the proposed road is 30 feet in width. How will truck parking on the street be addressed? What measures have been taken to avoid this problem? Mr. Wall noted the need to assure internal driveway connections among the sites. The submitted Traffic Impact Study recommends 5 specific improvements and some traffic related commitments are in the applicant's narrative. The County Engineer suggested dedicating additional right of way along Dixie Highway for future road widening. Written comments about

the project were received from the Walton Fire District, SD1, and the Boone County Water District.

In conclusion, the Boone County Planning Commission and the Boone County Fiscal Court need to evaluate the application in terms of the three criteria necessary for approving a Zoning Map Amendment as stated in Article 3 "Amendment" of the Boone County Zoning Regulations, the Our Boone County – Plan 2040, which is the adopted comprehensive plan, and the potential impacts on the existing and planned uses in the area. The Future Land Use Map will not need to be amended if this request is approved.

Mr. Wall also noted that the Staff just received comments from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and the applicant addressed these comments in an Addendum, Letters and emails were received from property owners in the area, including Susan Marshall, Jim Weaver, Charlotte Brewer, Robert Tagher, and Robert Tomlinson. Another adjoining property owner sent in some photos and Mr. Wall stated that he would show them at the appropriate time.

Chairman Rolfsen asked if the applicant was present and wanted to proceed with their presentation?

Marc Gloyeske, NorthPointe Development, introduced his team from Bayer Becker Engineers and the Graydon law firm. He described the company. It is based in Kansas City, Missouri with regional offices including one in Cincinnati. He showed a map of various industrial markets that his company is located in and a list of tenants across the country. NorthPointe is a long term holder of their assets. They don't build and sell. They manage their developments. They have in-house management. The site would be primarily accessed from the north. In the past, the site was not adequately served by infrastructure. However, that is about to change with the reconstruction of the I-75/Richwood Interchange. The site is designated mostly as Industrial (I) on the Future Land Use Map. They submitted two different Concept Development Plans based upon input from Staff and Tri-ED. Buildings 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 are cross dock buildings. Building 4 is a rear dock facility. They are proposing loop roads around the buildings for the purpose of truck stacking. All of it is on private property.

The alternate Concept Development Plan provides some flexibility to cater to 2 different types of tenant mixes. The A version shows some flexibility to allow for more tenants and more variety of uses including different manufacturing. This is what Tri-ED suggested due to the lack of different products and available sites. He showed examples – the West Chester Trade Center which has different size buildings for manufacturing in as little as 27,000 square feet. This development has 40% manufacturing and 60% warehousing. The second example is a development in Kansas City, Missouri. There are buildings that have multiple tenants involved in manufacturing. Mr. Gloyeske showed some representative examples of building architecture and colors.

As previously mentioned, the site is discussed in the Our Boone County – Plan 2040. It is identified in Area 21. It mentions not allowing access to Chambers Road. No access is planned. It mentions the requirement of submitting a Traffic Impact Study. One has been submitted and there are recommended improvements. It also states the need to develop roads running parallel to Dixie Highway because of its condition. They are doing that by extending Logistics Boulevard. The basis for granting the zone change is the project meets Criteria #1 or the request is in

agreement with the adopted Comprehensive Plan as well as the Future Land Use Plan. Mr. Gloyeske outlined the five recommended transportation improvements.

- 1 & 2 - Add northbound and southbound turn lanes on Dixie Highway at the proposed site access.
- 3 - Construct an eastbound right turn lane on the proposed site access at Dixie Highway.
- 4 - Install a traffic signal at Dixie Highway and the proposed site access.
- 5 - Modify/optimize the traffic signal timing at the intersection of Dixie Highway and Logistics Boulevard to include a northbound left turn phase and a southbound right turn overlap.

Mr. Gloyeske noted the need to dedicate additional right-of-way for Dixie Highway widening. He stated that he will discuss this with the County Engineer to determine how much land to dedicate.

Mr. Gloyeske concluded that the proposal conforms with the Future Land Use Map designation. They meet several areas of the Comprehensive Plan. It is a \$200 million investment with close to 3 million square feet of industrial space. The completion of the interchange project will coincide with the completion of the first building. That improvement and the one proposed for Dixie Highway will provide adequate infrastructure to serve the size of the development. Lastly, they meet the criteria for granting a zone change.

At this time, Chairman Rolfsen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak in favor or against the Zoning Map Amendment request.

Ms. Sandy McMillian, 12219 Dixie Highway, stated that she lives 2 houses down from the new traffic light at Chambers Road and Old Lexington Pike. The back-up of traffic is ridiculous. All the truck traffic will be horrendous. She prefers that the project not go in because of the traffic and pollution. It won't be the same rural neighborhood. How can a Traffic Impact Study be done when the interchange is not completed?

Ms. Shannon Tomlison, 262 Chambers Road, thanked the Staff, Chairman Rolfsen and the applicant in allowing her to speak tonight. She is an attorney and owner/operator of a thoroughbred farm as well as a boarding facility. She wants to make sure due process is met and she has the opportunity to cross examine as granted under Kentucky law and local ordinances including Article 3 of the Zoning Regulations. One of her concerns is having expert testimony regarding the development. She would like the opportunity to do their own traffic study and present it to the Board. It is crucial because the development impacts adjoining land owners. She understands by the Staff Report that the Planning Commission is considering those issues seriously. She wants to have the same opportunity to present their own evidence in a Public Hearing format. The Staff Report requests that the applicant provide more details on the Concept Development Plan. The applicant admits that they don't want to be locked into a Concept Development Plan. The Staff Report identifies many deficiencies and how the development will impact the adjoining land owners. An example of this is grading the site. The site will require large amounts of dirt to be moved since it has a lot of hills and valleys. They really haven't met

the requirements of a Concept Development Plan. Early stage knowledge of the site is important to know. She would like to have experts address how to remedy these problems mentioned in the Staff Report. With only a 14 day notice, it is a little short to accomplish this task. According to the Kentucky Revised Statutes, the Planning Commission must have at least one Public Hearing. Due to the need for details involved in the project as noted in the Staff Report, Ms. Tomlinson requested a second Public Hearing so that more evidence could be given to the Planning Commission to make a decision. We should not rely on a somewhat vague plan that relies on information produced later. This is our only shot to cross examine. It raises some due process issues and also completeness issues so we can have a proper decision by this governing authority. This meeting is difficult by Zoom since some people don't have access to a computer or the internet. Can the Planning Commission hold a second Public Hearing? The applicant has waived the 60 day time limit until July so that the public has adequate time to respond.

Mr. Wilson stated that tonight's trial type hearing is probably not the best time to say yes to a second Public Hearing. The Planning Commission should wait and see after hearing all of the facts to make that type of decision.

Ms. Tomlinson stated that it seems reasonable to her but she would just like to consider it in the course of its business. She sent pictures of her property and noted that she abuts the site in question. These pictures show how the proposed project will destroy the historic value of her property. She noted that another developer tried to acquire the property under review. They applied for an industrial use permit before the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. The historical society and the state environmental agency have grave concerns. As a result, the application was withdrawn by the developer and the contract was terminated. Mr. Wall showed the photographs of Ms. Tomlinson's property. It included the paddock area, the historic home, a guest house, a small and large barn with 20 stalls. The project site affects her horse farm. What about grading and drainage? Her property has 3 streams of which some may be considered intermittent, a lake and pond. They are fed by streams that cross the property in question. The Staff Report raises questions about impacts such as noise and odors from industrial uses. There is a difference between a business park and an industrial park. Her property should be shielded from the development. She said the character of the area has not changed in over 100 years plus. That is why she is in need of experts that will know how to address the impact of the proposed use. In reference to Article 3, it requires that a Concept Development Plan be submitted. How do you advocate your interest in either submitted plan? How do you make a decision of something that is moving in place? The standard of review is the worst case scenario as noted in Article 3 which applies to this situation. The pictures show that if further proof is not admitted at a later date. Article 3, Section 308 states that the proposal has to be in agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. While the applicant has argued that it has met the criteria, he fails to address the specifics. She noted page 140 of the Comprehensive Plan that states commercial areas must be adequately buffered from existing residential areas. This impacts all of us. We have no assurances of how these impacts will be mitigated. The application fails to address the ridges and valleys. There have been no grading plans produced. She has met with the developer and has toured the property. The developer readily admits they will level the property. This will affect the water system and the environment. Page 6 of the Staff Report recognizes the potential impacts that must incorporate a transition – visual, noise, vibration, odor, dust, smoke and light. None of these impacts have been addressed by the applicant in terms of mitigation. Only setbacks and traffic

concerns have been addressed. What about landscaping? While the applicant may provide additional materials, they would like to review them. The Staff has requested a detailed plan and she agrees wholeheartedly. Finally, the Plan demonstrates that there has been no contact to the USDA Conservation District. These streams affect the Big Bone Lick Watershed. It will impact the streams in this watershed. She requested another Public Hearing and that the application be denied on its face because it fails to meet the requirements under local law.

Mr. Chet Hand, 674 Chambers Road, owns a 25 acre rural family farm. He supports Ms. Tomlinson's points, requesting a second hearing so additional impacted property owners can provide additional input. It would involve traffic, grading and irrigation, noise, and safety issues. The proposed project is going to have a significant impact on the adjoining property owners. It is unfortunate that this farm is being considered for an industrial use according to the 2040 Plan. On the other side of Chambers Road, his property is significantly higher so he can see the site clearly from his house. Visually, he only sees a farm now and some houses across the street. This Plan was not in place when he bought his farm and if it was, he would never have bought it. The top concerns are traffic and access on Chambers Road. There will be more traffic on Chambers regardless of no curb cut. They frequently have semi-trucks travel on Chambers and turn around before the tunnel a lot of times on private property. Workers will use Dixie Highway which is a narrow street. He expressed a concern about safety with 6 children living on his farm. The view and character of the area will change. It is a rural area. We don't see any industrial or commercial buildings. This will change once the buildings are in place. There are a number of historic buildings in the Chambers Road area. His suggestion is to deny the zone change request or at least have another Public Hearing for other property owners to voice their concerns.

Mr. Mark Byron, 262 Chambers Road, echoed what Ms. Tomlinson has said. He referred to the topographical map. It is a very hilly area. How will they construct a few million square feet of building without leveling the site? There will be a lot of noise pollution because trucks will be circling around in the back portion of the development due to the only access point being on Dixie Highway. He also requested another Public Hearing in order to be more thorough and allow others to make comments and address the impact.

Mr. Jim Dressman, part owner of Greenfield Farm, Inc., stated that the cancelled contract for the subject site had nothing to do with opposition of the wetland mediation. The farm that Ms. Tomlinson owns was originally part of the Greenfield Farm. The Company sold it to Lanny Holbrook years ago. For over 20 years, the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designated this site for industrial use. The Tomlinsons bought the farm from a bank who took it from Lanny Holbrook. At the time, they could see the industrial IDI buildings in the foreground and the stubbed street that goes into the property.

Mr. Andrew Gore, 123 Chambers Road, echoed his support of the previous comments. He asked the Board to deny the request until the roads are completed and improved and a traffic study is completed by a neutral party showing that the roads can handle this type of development. There is a big safety concern about 53 footer trucks and box trucks.

Ms. Debbie Rowe, 12097 Dixie Highway, expressed a concern about traffic on Dixie Highway at shift changes. It is impossible to pull onto Dixie Highway. What will it do to the property values?

She is speaking on behalf of her father. Road widening on Dixie Highway is difficult because one side is landlocked due to the railroad. What will this project do to her Dad's property value?

At this time Chairman Rolfsen asked if the Board Members had any questions or comments?

Mrs. Kegley stated that the Zone Change Committee will give the neighbors a chance to respond to some of the information or details brought to the meeting. They will have a chance to look at all the information the Planning Commission is reviewing. Also, before the full Board votes on the request, the public for either side is allowed to comment on the project for up to five minutes. Mr. Costello stated that the public is welcome to review the information received in the office. The public can contact Staff at the office. The information has been available.

Ms. Amlung inquired about a timeline to widen Dixie Highway since there was a \$50 million unscheduled needs project? Mr. Costello replied there is no construction funds for the project, but the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet will be hiring an engineering firm to design the project in the next 2 months to widen Dixie Highway from the end of the Interchange project to KY 14. Mr. Costello suggested that perhaps access to Dixie Highway could be contingent on the road widening project? Ms. Amlung asked about the traffic from this project and its impact on the new Steeplechase Elementary School? Mr. Costello responded that the school is located on the other side of I-75 away from the project. The Redistricting Plan for the school shows traffic going mostly north and west of the school site. There is some traffic going east but that traffic will use I-75 or Richwood Road and then travel north on Dixie Highway. The boundary between the Boone County School District and Walton-Verona School District is Chambers Road. The new interchange will increase road capacity. There is no immediate plan at this time to extend Grand National Boulevard south to Chambers Road even though the School District owns the land. Mr. Costello stated there are improvements to Dixie Highway from Richwood Road to Park South Subdivision. The applicant stated that they wouldn't occupy their first building until the interchange was opened or substantially completed. This is similar to what was required when Biggs was opened on Houston Road and the Turfway Road exit. Mr. Gloyeske explained that the widening of Dixie Highway is 5 lanes to Transport Drive and 3 lanes to Logistics Boulevard. They plan on breaking ground in 2022 and complete the first building at the end of 2022. The interchange is scheduled to be completed by November, 2022. They would be open to a condition that they could not obtain a Certificate of Occupancy for the first building until the interchange is open and substantially completed.

Mr. Bunger asked if a second Public Hearing could be considered? Mr. Costello replied that he didn't know the purpose of it. In the past, there have been cases where someone wasn't properly notified at the fault of the applicant so a second Public Hearing was held. The Fiscal Court can hold a second Public Hearing after they receive the Planning Commission's recommendation. The Planning Commission would have to determine that they don't have enough information or conflicting information. The Public Hearing was advertised properly according to State law. We followed the same procedure compared with the last application. We are hearing the testimony now and those who want to speak at the Public Hearing are able to. Mr. Bunger stated that perhaps it might be more of a second Zone Change Committee Meeting as the Committee might request additional information from the application based on the Public Hearing. Mr. Costello noted that the details will be provided at the Committee meeting as a response to the public comments. This includes the traffic study and it may take more than one Committee meeting.

Mr. Bunger stated that it is important that the applicant take notes and address the comments to provide detailed answers at the Committee meeting.

Chairman Rolfsen asked if the neighbors could provide a neutral/unbiased Traffic Impact Study? Can they hire a firm and present it to the Zone Change Committee? Mr. Wall stated that he provided a copy of all the materials including the Traffic Impact Study to an attorney and Mr. Wall didn't see him at the Public Hearing. It was provided to Mr. Alex Edmonson and we are not aware of who he was representing.

Mr. Patton cited the KY 237/I-275 exit as an example. Industrial didn't happen until after the exit was built. The State didn't upgrade the roads until IDI built the industrial subdivision and residential development occurred. It was appropriate to turn the industrial zone change done 17 years ago because the exit wasn't fixed. It is the right time since it has been in the Comprehensive Plan for the last 25 years and the new interchange is being built. There are subsequent reviews by the Planning Commission with detailed engineering drawings and permits. This is pretty early in the process. There is plenty of opportunity in the process for interaction with the public. Chairman Rolfsen mentioned utility plans, grading plans, landscaping plans, etc.

Mr. Wilson stated that the record made tonight will go to the Committee. The Committee will decide what they need to take action. Mrs. Kegley explained that anyone will be able to comment of any revision to the plan presented to the Committee. Let's don't make any decisions. Let's see what the process requires.

**Seeing no further questions or comments, Chairman Rolfsen announced that the Committee Meeting for this item will be on April 21, 2021 at 5:00 P.M. via Live Video Teleconference. This item will be on the Agenda for the Business Meeting on May 5, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.** If someone wants to observe the Committee Meeting, please contact the office and provide the necessary information for logging into the meeting. The Chairman closed the Public Hearing at 9:51 p.m.

**APPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Charlie Rolfsen**  
**Chairman**

**Attest:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kevin P. Costello, AICP**  
**Executive Director**