

Henderson City-County
Planning Commission
July 6, 2021

The Henderson City-County Planning Commission held a meeting July 6, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., at the Henderson Municipal Building, 222 First Street, 3rd Floor, and via teleconference. Members present: Chairman David Dixon, Vice-Chairman David Williams, Bobbie Jarrett, Dickie Johnson, Gary Gibson, Mac Arnold, Stacy Denton, Kevin Herron, Doug Bell, Kevin Richard and Tommy Joe Fridy. Gray Hodge was absent. Staff present: Director Brian Bishop, Jennifer Marks, Theresa Curtis, Heather Lauderdale and Chris Raymer.

MEETING BEGAN AT 6:00 PM

Chairman Dixon: I would like to call this Tuesday, July 6, 2021 regular meeting of the Henderson City-County Planning Commission to order. Welcome to all those who are here in person and those joining us otherwise.

I need to read the following;

“Due to the emergency resulting from the Coronavirus (COVID19), and to help protect the community from the spread of COVID19 by limiting in person contact, this regular July 6, 2021 meeting of the Henderson City-County Planning Commission is being held by video teleconference as well as in person.

This video teleconference meeting is being telecast live on Facebook at www.facebook.com/HendersonPlanning/live/ page and elsewhere for the media and the public to view. During the public hearing segments of the meeting, the public may offer evidence, comments, positions, suggestions and questions in accordance with the meeting rules.

Madame Clerk, will you please call the roll?

Heather Lauderdale: I will be happy to.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, do we have a quorum?

Heather Lauderdale: Yes we do.

Chairman Dixon: We need to go into public hearing for several items, I need a motion to go into public hearing.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MAC ARNOLD, SECONDED BY KEVIN RICHARD TO GO INTO PUBLIC HEARING.

Chairman Dixon: Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: We're in public hearing.

The first item of business is approval of the Minutes from the June 1, 2021 meeting that continued on June 22, 2021.

MOTION WAS MADE BY BOBBIE JARRETT, SECONDED BY KEVIN RICHARD TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM JUNE 1, 2021 AND JUNE 22, 2021.

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion and a second, any discussion?

All in favor say aye.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, thank you.

The next item is **Easement Extinguishment Plat, Lot #9, Bluegrass Estates Subdivision.**

I think Mr. Bishop will lead that?

Brian Bishop: Yes sir.

Can everyone see the screen at home? Theresa and Commissioner Bell, can you see the plat?

Theresa Curtis: Yes.

Brian Bishop: Easement Extinguishment Plat, Lot #9 of the Bluegrass Estates Subdivision submitted by Casey and Ashley Beals for the property located in Henderson County at 5570 Hwy 283, Robards, Kentucky.

The applicants are requesting to extinguish a ten-foot (10') public utility easement on Lot #9 of Bluegrass Estates Subdivision.

You'll notice on the plat that is shown, this is the easement they are requesting being extinguished. The reason they are requesting this they would like to build an accessory structure in this area.

The property is currently served by the opposite public utility easement which houses their power; their electric comes in this way. Water is on the front so this public utility serves no purpose.

We have received all necessary approvals from the public utilities and anyone having interest.

With that, staff recommends approval and I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Dixon: Does the Commission have any questions for staff?

Would anyone like to speak to this matter, for or against?

No questions? No other speakers?

I'll entertain a motion in regard to the Easement Extinguishment Plat for Lot #9 of the Bluegrass Estates Subdivision.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DICKIE JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE EASEMENT

***EXTINGUISHMENT PLAT, LOT #9 BLUE GRASS ESTATES
SUBDIVISION SUBMITTED BY CASEY AND ASHELY BEALS
FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED IN HENDERSON COUNTY AT
5570 HWY 283, ROBARDS, KENTUCKY.***

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion and a second, any discussion?

Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, the motion passes.

Next item is **Rezoning #1120 with a Development** Plan, Mr. Bishop?

Brian Bishop: Rezoning #1120 with a Development Plan is submitted by Joe Mattingly III for the property located in the City of Henderson on Old Madisonville Road (PID #56-27), adjacent to Sterling Creek Subdivision, and containing approximately 4.9+ acres (the “subject property”). The applicant is requesting a zoning change/map amendment from Medium Density District (R-2) to Multi-Family Residential District (R-4), with a Development Plan to build twelve (12) condominiums.

This is the proposed Development Plan. As you can see, this is Old Madisonville Road here, Sterling Creek Subdivision is here, Country View Subdivision is to the area that you see to the west.

The applicant is requesting the zoning change to construct condominiums as shown. One thing of interest that you need to know is that a portion of this property, you’ll notice on the heavier blue lines is in a floodplain. The applicant has submitted a Stream Construction permit to place fill here which would allow him to build the property up to ultimately construct the condominiums.

If this is approved, it will come back before you with a site plan which will show more technical details such as water, sewer and things of that nature.

With that, I will do my best to answer any questions that you might have. We have provided proposed motions and findings that you'll see at your desk. This is for #1120.

Chairman Dixon: Would you like to read those findings of facts into the record?

Brian Bishop: I can do that.

Rezoning #1120 With a Development Plan- Submitted by Joe Mattingly III for the property located in the City of Henderson on Madisonville Road (PID#56-27), adjacent to Sterling Creek Subdivision, and containing approximately 4.9+ acres (the "subject property"). The applicant is requesting a zoning change/map amendment from Medium Density Residential District (R-2) to Multi-Family Residential District (R-4), with a development plan to build twelve (12) single family condominium units.

I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Henderson Board of Commissioners (the "City") APPROVE Rezoning Application # 1120 changing the zoning classification from Medium Density Residential District (R-2) to Multi-Family Residential District (R-4) with a development plan which is incorporated herein by reference to build twelve (12) single family condominium units, for the subject property, and I leave the motion open for other members of the Planning Commission to add findings of fact in support of this motion, because;

The existing R-2 zoning classification is inappropriate and the proposed R-4 zoning classification is appropriate, because:

The proposed zone change/map amendment will not be detrimental to the surrounding property and nearby area.

The development plan restricts the development of the property to twelve (12) separate free standing single family residential units. Much like twelve (12) separate single family residences.

The transition from R-2 to R-4 is a natural and gradual progression.

The proposed area is adequate to handle the density.

The subject property will result in little if any adverse impact to the surrounding area and the community as a whole.

There is a housing shortage in the City of Henderson, and this proposed development will help alleviate the need by providing housing opportunities, without adverse impact to others.

This proposed development will provide a positive infill in the area.

This proposed development is served by adequate infrastructure/utilities.

This proposed development will promote a desired mixed use neighborhoods to create a vibrant built environment.

The proposed rezoning is not in agreement with the future land use map of the comprehensive plan, which planned for the property to develop as medium density residential (R-2).

Chairman Dixon: Very good.

Tommy Joe Fridy: Do adopt the factual portion of that statement as your testimony?

Brian Bishop: I do.

Chairman Dixon: Excuse me, counselor?

Tommy Joe Fridy: I asked him to say it but my question was do you adopt the factual portion of that statement as your testimony and he said he did.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, thank you.

David Williams: Brian, did you mean to say High Density Residential as opposed to Medium Residential?

Brian Bishop: Yes, it should be Multi Family instead of High Density Residential. Is there a type-o, I'm sorry. Multi Family (R-4)...

David Williams: In that last statement the proposed rezoning is not in agreement with the future land use map... I may be wrong.

Brian Bishop: Ok, I'm sorry.

Chairman Dixon: The proposed rezoning is from R-2 to R-4.

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Chairman Dixon: Any other questions from the Commission for staff?
Is the applicant here this evening?

Sir, would you like to address the Commission?

Very good, does the Commission have questions for the applicant?

Is there anyone here who would like to speak in favor of this? Anyone among us who would like to speak in opposition of this or has other questions about this?

Do we have anybody on Facebook or otherwise who have indicated an interest in speaking? No further discussion by party?

Excuse me, would you like to speak ma'am?

Could you please approach the microphone here?

I need your name.

Lisa Brown: It's Lisa Brown.

Chairman Dixon: Your address?

Lisa Brown: 1839 Old Madisonville Road.

Chairman Dixon: I would like for you to promise to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth here this evening.

Lisa Brown: I do.

Chairman Dixon: Thank you very much, please proceed.

Lisa Brown: My main concern is the road and traffic that it's going to start. The road in front of my house is not... I mean there's pot holes and it's just the traffic that is going to occur. People are going to speed up and down the road all the time and I just don't think it's a good idea.

Do you want to add anything Cassie?

Actually we thought there would be more people here opposing but it's just us.

Chairman Dixon: Thank you. I need your name.

Cassie Brown: My name is Cassie Brown.

Chairman Dixon: Your address?

Cassie Brown: 1839 Old Madisonville Road.

Chairman Dixon: I would like you to promise to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth this evening.

Cassie Brown: I do.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, thank you. What can you share with us?

Cassie Brown: I am also not in favor of this. I do agree that the traffic that it will bring in traffic. I agree that the road right now is not being well taken care of by the City. There are a lot of potholes. The flooding is a huge issue. I don't know if the ditches aren't big enough but it's a huge issue.

I know they would take care of the flooding issues on the lot but where these families would be coming into the property and driving on the street, Old Madisonville Road that would not be taken care of because

those streets are taken care of by the City. So, that is a huge issue that would need to be addressed with it as well.

Lori Brown: I think maybe the State takes care of that road. There is a main water line in front of our house which busted and the City came out and fixed the water lines but the damage that it did to the road was never fixed, or my ditch which holds water.

Brian Bishop: Ma'am, I'm sorry what is your name?

Lisa Brown: Lisa Brown.

Brian Bishop: Lisa is correct, that is a State maintained road maintained by KYTC. We have been working with them through the entire process and they have been involved. They have not given us any indication that it was going to be an issue, as far as traffic count. They have given us the indication, I believe, that they have no issues with it and they plan to give Mr. Mattingly an encroachment permit for the development.

So from what we've been told from their engineers is that it's not going to be a problem. That's all I can really say to address it, I'm sorry.

We depend on their expertise and they have not given us any reason not to trust them.

Cassie Brown: I do feel like from a building standpoint and an engineering standpoint it would be different because we do drive those roads every, single day. We have had a huge pot hole right in front of our house and it looked like half the road fell off but they did fix it but it still isn't enough; it's still falling apart as we speak. It's not being taken care of and I still feel like that is a huge issue that would need to be addressed if this were to happen. Like twelve (12) whole families...like Sterling Creek is a little bit right before all that stuff happens. All of the flooding and all of the broken roads...so I feel like with twelve (12) families coming in and out of those streets, that would be a huge issue that would need to be addressed.

Brian Bishop: I can address the drainage on this portion a little bit, ok?

So, with this development you're not seeing it on this because it is just a Development Plan for the rezoning. Mr. Mattingly will come back with a site plan that we referred to earlier. He will be required to contain all of his drainage on his property so that way it's not being directed away.

Mr. Bart Boles with Henderson Water Utility can address that far better than I can. But at least this area is not going to contribute to other drainage that you're referring to as... with the ditches, because this water will be collected and discharged directly to the creek as quickly as possible so it's not impacting local flooding.

Did I just....is there something else I missed, I'm sorry.

Callie Brown: No it's just the roads and the flooding in front of it, not necessarily on the lot and not necessarily flooding that would come from building it, it would just be the traffic that would be leaving the lot.

Brian Bishop: So the maintenance of 285...

Callie Brown: Yes, Old Madisonville Road in general.

Brian Bishop: Chairman Dixon, we can certainly convey those concerns to KYTC.

Chairman Dixon: Could we provide these ladies with a contact person?

Brian Bishop: Yes sir.

Chairman Dixon: That could perhaps take a look at the maintenance of this roadway?

Brian Bishop: If you guys would give us your phone number and emails, we'll gladly give it to you.

Lisa Brown: Ok.

Chairman Dixon: I have another question for staff, perhaps it would be useful to explain the difference in potential uses from the current R-2 zone to the proposed R-4. What could be put there now?

Brian Bishop: I would rather ask Mr. Nix to address that, that's more of a zoning issue. Ray, would you care to address that?

Chairman Dixon: Thank you ladies.

Thank you sir, I need your name.

Ray Nix: Ray Nix, 2319 Sunset Lane, and yes I agree to tell the truth.

Chairman Dixon: Thank you. Can you help us on the proposed uses?

Ray Nix: Sure. R-2 is primarily single-family and duplexes are also allowed and that's pretty much the maximum for R-2.

R-4 does allow pretty much anything else but specifically that is the zone that allows for condominiums and that is a multi-family residential district (R-4).

So, slightly more density.

Chairman Dixon: So someone could put one (1) duplex on there, only one (1) duplex would be allowed there in the current zone?

Ray Nix: No.

Chairman Dixon: How many duplexes can we fit in there?

Ray Nix: Well, if they're separated off in different parcels, I mean we're talking one (1) parcel, right?

Brian Bishop: Yes, so right now the way...let me make sure I'm saying this correctly.

Chairman Dixon: I'm sorry.

Brian Bishop: So, with 4.9 acres you can have one (1) duplex but with 4.9 acres you could divide that multiple times and then say get six (6)

units and get twelve (12) that way. So then you would have multiple entrances onto the road and actually probably make it less safe so if you're going to have that level of density, it's probably better to configure it the way it is because you have one (1) access point.

Did that answer that?

Chairman Dixon: Yeah, I was just trying to...

Ray Nix: So it allows a multi-family use one (1) large parcel instead of splitting it up into ten (10) or twelve (12) parcels.

Brian Bishop: Is the minimum lot size 8,000 square feet?

Ray Nix: Yes.

Brian Bishop: So, I think that may be a good way to get to what the question was. Out of 4.9 acres, the minimum lot size is 8,000 square feet with fifty-feet (50') of road frontage so you could go in and just chop up small, little lots along 285 and have that number, whatever the math is, I would have to do that real fast.

David Williams: They would have to have fifty-feet (50') of road frontage?

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Gary Gibson: The good thing about it is we only have one (1) driveway coming out on the main highway; that's the main thing right there.

Ray Nix: Exactly.

David Williams: This would have to be rezoned for a Planned Unit Development, right?

Brian Bishop: It wouldn't.

Chairman Dixon: Are you saying it would?

Brian Bishop: It wouldn't. Ray, an R-PUD or a PUD. That was the question right?

Ray Nix: I mean it could be but R-4 is the appropriate zone for this.

David Williams: The reason I was asking that is what can be put there now without any rezoning.

Brian Bishop: Your question was is it possible to go to PUD?

David Williams: Not with this current zoning.

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Ray Nix: It would be R-1 or R-2.

Mac Arnold: If you look at Sterling Creek and I'm not sure exactly the size of the lots there but there are fourteen (14) lots right there and if those would be a size that you could get a duplex, you'd be talking about fourteen (14) duplexes could be potentially built on this property but yet we're only calling for twelve (12) single family units. So, you would have...

Brian Bishop: Let me share the screen so everybody can see the same thing. That's what you're referring to, correct?

Mac Arnold: Yes.

So, if you considered each of those lots...because the property looks roughly about the same size as Sterling Creek's, maybe slightly smaller but not much difference. But if you had, like a say in a configuration the way it is set up there, you know...

Brian Bishop: To Mac's point; just picking a random lot, that lot is .22 acres which is 9,583 square feet so that's roughly, a little larger than the smallest allowable lot.

So, I think to Mac's point, you can have much more density going that way.

Mac Arnold: Yes, that's what I was saying. I think you would have a lot more density, you know, if you had ten (10) duplexes, that's

technically twenty (20) family units that can go in there as opposed now he's only calling for twelve (12), correct?

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Mac Arnold: So you would be...it's going to be less dense, what he's planning as opposed to what could go on there.

Brian Bishop: The way I understood the ladies' comments it the largest objection was to the state of the road and the drainage, correct?

David Williams: Increased traffic.

Chairman Dixon: This rezoning would be restricted to this particular development plan as well, correct?

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Chairman Dixon: The developer has to do what he's saying he's going to do.

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Chairman Dixon: Or the rezoning is not in effect.

Tommy Joe Fridy: It would have to come back.

Brian Bishop: Yes, it would have to be updated which would be the same process; they would be notified and there is still the site plan approval process which verifies that everything can work there from a technical standpoint; water, sewer, drainage and things like that.

David Williams: What we learned from Preliminary is the state has no plans for upgrading this road at all but would a higher traffic count on this road due to a development such as this make that more likely?

That's a hard question for you to answer for you guys but it seems like it would make it more likely that they would come in and update this road with higher density traffic.

Brian Bishop: It's almost using "if you build it, they will come" logic. I really can't address that Commissioner Williams, I'm sorry.

David Williams: I know I'm putting you on the spot there but I was just trying to think ahead here for the best solution to this.

Mac Arnold: My thoughts are that these young ladies here probably should get their other neighbors in the neighborhood together and produce a petition or something to the State Highway Department that you would like to see some improvements done to the road and push it that way because I don't think we've got any control over them.

Chairman Dixon: Ok, does the Commission have any other questions for Mr. Nix? Very good, any other questions from the Commission for staff or any party?

Anyone on Facebook indicate an interest? No other thoughts to share? All good discussion, I appreciate it.

I'll entertain a motion in regard to Rezoning #1120 with a Development Plan.

I think Mr. Bishop has provided a motion.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DICKIE JOHNSON, SECONDED BY MAC ARNOLD TO RECOMMEND TO THE HENDERSON CITY COMMISSION WHAT BRIAN HAD PREPARED OR STAFF HAD PREPARED FOR US IN REGARD TO REZONING #1120 WITH A DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS IT WAS READ INTO THE RECORD BY STAFF.

Chairman Dixon: Ok, we have a motion and a second to approve this proposed rezoning, actually we are recommending it to the City Commission, correct?

Dickie Johnson: Yes.

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion and a second, any further discussion by the Commission?

Heather Lauderdale: Who was the second?

Chairman Dixon: Mac.

No other discussion? Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, the motion passes.

I appreciate everyone's input. You're going to get back with the ladies about the State's contacts?

Brian Bishop: Yes, Ms. Marks has already got their information.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, thank you.

The next item in the public hearing is **Rezoning #1121 with a Development Plan**. Ms. Marks?

Jennifer Marks: Thank you.

So this Rezoning #1121 with a development plan was submitted by Robert Cornbleet for the property located in the City of Henderson at 524 Harding Avenue (PID#3-5-1-1) and containing approximately 22,905 square feet. The applicant is requesting a zoning change/map amendment from Medium to High Density Residential District (R-3), to Highway Commercial (HC), with a development plan to construct an office building.

So, if everyone will look up here, this is kind of a plat showing what Bob is planning to do there. He is planning to rezone from R-3 to HC. There is electric and potable water available already at the site.

The surrounding property owners consist of M-1, R-MH and then R-3 to the west. The R-3 is already buffered by a vegetative buffer in trees and things like that so that wouldn't need to be necessary for this.

This development plan would be contingent upon a consolidation plat as well as bonding for the erosion control in the amount of \$3,850. Staff does recommend approval of this rezoning. You do have findings of facts in front of you there that I can read into the record as my testimony and then if you have any questions.

Chairman Dixon: Please enter those findings of facts.

Jennifer Marks: Again, I will enter this as my testimony.

REZONING #1121- Submitted by Robert Cornbleet for the property located in the City of Henderson at 524 Harding Avenue (PID# 3-5-1-1) and containing approximately 22,905+ sq. ft. The applicant is requesting a zoning change/map amendment from Medium to High-Density Residential District (R-3), to Highway Commercial (H-C), with a development plan to construct an office building.

I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Henderson Board of Commissioners (the "City") APPROVE Rezoning Application #1121, contingent upon an approved consolidation plat and bonding, changing the zoning classification from High Density Residential (R-3) to Highway Commercial (H-C) with a development plan which is incorporated herein by reference, for the subject property, and I leave the motion open for other members of the Planning Commission to add findings of fact in support of this motion, because;

The existing R-3 zoning classification is inappropriate and the proposed H-C zoning classification is appropriate, because:

The property is adjacent to industrial and commercial properties.

The proposed use will not adversely impact the other uses in the area.

The proposed use will have a lesser impact than the current zoning classification.

This development will provide positive infill in the area.

The proposed office will be used to support maintenance and services of several residential developments in the general area.

The property is served by adequate infrastructure/utilities.

The proposed rezoning is not in agreement with the future land use map of the comprehensive plan, which planned for the property to develop High Density Residential (R-3).

Chairman Dixon: Could you repeat what the surrounding zones are please?

Jennifer Marks: I can. We have got Highway Commercial as well as Industrial on the north, then to the south you've got Industrial, to the east you've got a residential manufactured home park, I believe that is Harding Place and then to the west is R-3 but that is a few lots down. The ones right next to this proposed development are vacant and there is a vegetative buffer already existing there.

Chairman Dixon: Thank you.

Jennifer Marks: You're welcome.

Chairman Dixon: Does the Commission have any questions for staff in this regard?

Brian Bishop: Chairman Dixon, can I interject something real fast?

Chairman Dixon: Yes, of course.

Brian Bishop: I believe the last time that we actually met in person, Claudia was in this chair, some of you guys have not officially met Jennifer; this is Jennifer by the way, I'm sorry.

David Williams: Jennifer, are you submitting those findings of facts for the record?

Jennifer Marks: I am.

Chairman Dixon: I should say that Jennifer has done a real good job for us in these long months that we've not been able to get together. I'm sure she'll continue to do so.

So, do we have any questions for her?

Would anyone like to speak in favor of this rezoning? I believe the applicant is with us.

Would you like to speak sir?

Very good, do we have any questions for the applicant? Do we have anyone else here who would like to speak in favor of this rezoning? Do we have anyone here who might have questions about this or would like to speak in opposition? Do we have any interest from the Facebook community?

Hearing no questions for any party, I'll entertain a motion in regard to Rezoning #1121 with a development plan.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY MAC ARNOLD THAT WE APPROVE THIS REZONING AS SUBMITTED BY JENNIFER MARKS. SUBJECT TO A CONSOLIDATION PLAT AND BONDING FOR EROSION CONTROL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,850.

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion to approve, do we have a second?

Tommy Joe Fridy: Is your motion based on the proposed motion that was read into the record?

David Williams: Yes.

Chairman Dixon: The proposed motion is based on the record, the second is still in force. Are there any questions?

Bobbie Jarrett: Were there any subject to's? Consolidation Plat and bonding?

Jennifer Marks: Correct.

Bobbie Jarrett: Of \$3,850?

Jennifer Marks: Yes.

Chairman Dixon: Commissioners would you like to add that to the findings of facts?

Bobbie Jarrett: Yes.

Chairman Dixon: Is that appropriate?

Tommy Joe Fridy: It is if the person who made the motion and seconded agree to it.

The way they made the motion you wouldn't have to because it asks for it anyway.

Chairman Dixon: Ok, I think we've got an idea of what we're voting on, we're voting on the same thing.

Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, the motion passes.

I appreciate everybody coming out to help us with this.

That concludes the public hearing items on the agenda, I need a motion to go out of public hearing.

MOTION WAS MADE BY MAC ARNOLD, SECONDED BY GARY GIBSON TO GO OUT OF PUBLIC HEARING.

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion and second, all in favor say aye.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, we are out of public hearing.

The rest of the agenda; we have no bond report, is that correct?

Brian Bishop: That's correct.

Chairman Dixon: No action needed on the bonds.

The next item is the **Ollie Wash Site Plan**, Mr. Bishop?

Brian Bishop: The Ollie Wash Site Plan is submitted by Ollie Wash Henderson, LLC for the property located in the City of Henderson at 2700 Hwy 41 N (PID #55B-131). The applicants are requesting site plan approval for a car wash.

Many of us have been around the block a few times and many of us will remember there was a previous car wash there. This is Highway 41 North, this is Watson Lane, this is Sureway and then these are two (2) recently constructed shopping center; so that way we can kind of get our bearings.

This will be the site plan that we will be reviewing for tonight. The applicants are proposing a car wash. They have accounted for the future Watson Lane right of way as you'll notice here if you can see the arrow. The right of way of Watson Lane, once it's constructed, is already accounted for so it will not effect this property. Access will not be allowed on Highway 41 and the current access points will be removed with the construction of this. All access will be via Brinson Avenue which you'll notice here to the east. They will have two access points; entry this way, exit this way.

They are requesting a forty-foot (40') variance for corner clearance requirement with this site plan and that is this dimension here. If you'll notice this is forty-feet (40') and the access standards manual requires it to be fifty-feet (50') but our City Engineer Doug Boom has recommended approving this variance request. Staff would also request that the site plan be approved subject to bonding. Bonding for screening, which is shown here on the site plan for \$2,200. Road improvements for Brinson Avenue to bring it into compliance to handle the increased traffic is for \$53,000. Erosion control for making sure that there is no water leaving this site during construction is \$10,100. The grand total for bonding is \$65,300.

With that, I will do my best to answer any questions that you may have.

Chairman Dixon: Is this site plan...is this an L-shaped lot?

Brian Bishop: Not currently. It will be consolidated. Currently the lot exists in this manner. The applicant is in the process, correct me if I'm wrong, in the process of purchasing this, and then that will be consolidated later.

Chairman Dixon: The additional property might include this part further to the north making the L?

Brian Bishop: Correct. It will eventually but legally now those are two, separate tracts.

Tommy Joe Fridy: So it's subject-to consolidation?

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Dickie Johnson: Where they tore the old trailer park down?

Brian Bishop: Correct.

Chairman Dixon: Would anyone like to hear the subject-to's again? Everybody got it?

Brian Bishop: Subject-to consolidating and bonding in total of \$65,300 which includes screening, road improvements and erosion control. I can give exact amounts if you like.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, do we have any questions for staff?

Dickie Johnson: Do we actually know what exactly the Highway Department is going to take for the widening of Watson Lane?

Brian Bishop: Yes. They were provided the right of way drawings, the proposed construction drawings to incorporate into this. The engineer representing the project is here, he could probably answer that with greater detail than I can.

Dickie Johnson: That's a mess there and it needs to be corrected for sure.

Brian Bishop: We worked with KYTC on this and they were involved heavily. So, that has all been accounted for.

Dickie Johnson: Ok, that covers me.

Chairman Dixon: Does the commission want to hear from the representative? Any questions of that nature?

Did I understand that this is going to remove access points on Highway 41 North?

Brian Bishop: That is correct.

Chairman Dixon: Very good, I'll entertain a motion in regard to the Ollie Wash Site Plan.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DICKIE JOHNSON, SECONDED BY MAC ARNOLD TO APPROVE THE OLLIE WASH SITE PLAN SUBMITTED BY OLLIE WASH HENDERSON LLC FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE CITY OF HENDERSON AT 2700 HWY 41 NORTH (PID#55B-131). SUBJECT TO BONDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$65,300 AND A CONSOLIDATION PLAT.

Chairman Dixon: We have a motion and a second, any further discussion?

Madame Secretary, please call the roll.

AYE: ALL

NAY: NONE

Chairman Dixon: Very good, the site plan is approved as presented.

We also have some administrative business to deal with, I think Ms. Marks is going to discuss that.

Jennifer Marks: Thank you. I think many of you have received your packets, they were sent out last Thursday but this is in regard to the Executive Director's evaluation that we do yearly. In the packet you will find an envelope so you can just sent those back.

If you read the letter this is repetitive so I apologize but if you could get those back to us by Wednesday, July 21 so that way the next week the Executive Committee can sit down and review them before the next meeting in August. At that point we will determine the merit increase for the Executive Director. Nothing has changed on the form so it should be pretty simple. If you have any questions, you can just call me.

Chairman Dixon: Ok, any questions in regard to this process? I think it's what we've done annually.

Dickie Johnson: I received mine today.

Chairman Dixon: Everyone just sharpen their pencils, and take on that task.

Any other business from staff?

Brian Bishop: No sir.

Chairman Dixon: Does the Commission have any other business to bring before us? Does anyone in the public like to address the commission on other matters? How about Facebook?

Chris Raymer: I'm showing nothing.

Chairman Dixon: I need a motion to adjourn.

MOTION AS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DICKIE JOHNSON TO ADJOURN.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:44 PM

I, HEATHER LAUDERDALE, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the Henderson City-County Planning Commission Meeting of, July 6, 2021 to the best of my ability.

Heather Lauderdale, HCCPC Clerk

X
