

Henderson City-County  
Planning Commission  
March 7, 2017

The Henderson City-County Planning Commission held their regular meeting March 7, 2017 at 6:00 p.m., at the Henderson Municipal Center, 222 First Street, 3rd floor assembly room. Members present: Chairman Herb McKee, Vice-Chair David Williams, Dickie Johnson, David Dixon, Mac Arnold, Rodney Thomas, Kevin Herron, Herb Pritchett, Gray Hodge, and Attorney Tommy Joe Fridy. Gary Gibson and Kevin Richard were absent.

Staff present: Director Brian Bishop, Assistant Director Claudia Wayne, Theresa Curtis, Heather Lauderdale, and Chris Raymer.

*(The following minutes were transcribed from an audio tape recording of the meeting on March 7, 2017. The audio tape recording is on file at the Planning Commission office and will be retained for 30 days after the minutes are approved)*

**MEETING BEGAN AT 6:00PM**

Chairman McKee: Let's call this March meeting to order of the Henderson City-County Planning Commission; Madame Clerk will you please call the roll?

The Chair will entertain a motion to go into **Public Hearing**.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY MAC ARNOLD, SECONDED BY RODNEY THOMAS TO GO INTO PUBLIC HEARING.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: So mote it be. Have you had an opportunity to review the **February 7, 2017 minutes**? Are there any additions, are there any corrections?

***MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DAVID DIXON TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 7, 2017 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: Next on the agenda **Tracts 1&2 of the Donald Newman Estate Agricultural Division.** Mrs. Wayne, are you going to lead that conversation?

Claudia Wayne: Yes sir.

Chairman McKee: Please proceed.

Claudia Wayne: This is submitted by Farrah Corbett, Executrix of Estate for the property located in Henderson County on KY Hwy 416 (Parcel ID #115-19). Applicant is requesting approval of an agriculture division of the property.

This is Tracts 1 & 2. Tract 1 contains 17.635 acres, and Tract 2 contains 50.718 acres. This plat meets all the requirements of the KRS Chapter 100 and is exempt from the subject-to of the Subdivision Regulations, so its **and** Ag Division.

Chairman McKee: Questions for staff?

David Dixon: The aerial and the map, do they match up?

Claudia Wayne: Yes, it's a cell tower. The out lot, the Lot #1 that you see, that's a cell tower, it's an existing lot.

David Dixon: Are you talking about the triangular shape on that?

Claudia Wayne: Yes, the aerial's not right. That's how it looks now, but this plat that is in front of you, that's how it will look.

David Dixon: Thank you.

Claudia Wayne: Ok? They are re-doing the property lines. Denny is here I think if you have any questions.

Chairman McKee: Any other questions?

Claudia Wayne: Staff does recommend approval.

Chairman McKee: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak for or against this application, any comments from the commissioners? Hearing none, the chair will entertain a motion.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BOBBIE JARRETT TO APPROVE TRACT 1 & 2 DONALD NEWMAN ESTATE AGRICULTURAL DIVISION, SUBMITTED BY FARAH CORBETT, EXECUTRIX OF ESTATE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED IN HENDERSON COUNTY ON HWY 416 (PARCEL #115-19).***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: So mote it be. Next on the agenda is **TSW Design Group Presentation on Development Process Analysis Survey**. Mr. Bishop did you have comments you would like to make before we hear from Mrs. Williams?

Brian Bishop: No sir, the process has gone pretty well from what I can gather. I believe Mrs. Williams has done a good job, and I would like to turn the floor over to her.

Chairman McKee: Mrs. Williams would you please take the podium? If you don't mind would you please state your name and affiliation for the record?

Amy Williams: Of course, and I will have Haley do the same.

Chairman McKee: Please do.

Amy Williams: I'm Amy Williams with Taylor, Siefker, Williams Design Group. I am a principal with our firm and have been helping the community over the couple of years with lots of planning activities here.

Haley James: My name is Haley James and I am also with Taylor, Siefker, Williams Design Group, and I'm a community planner with the firm.

Chairman McKee: Thank you both, please proceed.

Amy Williams: Thank you for having us this evening, and I want to be a bit respectful of your agenda tonight and not completely monopolize it so we are going to go through the draft report or draft assessment probably in about fifteen (15) or twenty (20) minutes. By all means, if you all want to delve into any more details, we can go through any section or any recommendation much more detailed as we start to go through things. I at least want to give you all an overview here tonight.

You should have received, and Brian has sent out the first draft of the Development Process Analysis and Community Perception Survey. For those who may not be as familiar, I think everybody probably is, but we were hired to kind of come in and assess the development process here,

how development friendly it is, and then also how business friendly the community is from the planning perspective as well. So as we've gone through those we've had a lot of public input that I will touch on just here in a bit, whether it be focus groups or key person interviews or the online survey as well.

We literally have the document up here so we're looking at the same thing you have as well; we wanted to make sure it didn't get confusing.

What we'll go through tonight is the actual draft assessment. We start with a baseline analysis that we will go through here in a minute, we also have section two (2) which looks at the perceptions and the procedures; so everything from codes to public improvements to small business development. The third section is really kind of the meat of it, and that is the recommendations. That's where we are going to spend most of our time actually talking through with you all tonight since that's, again, some of the meat of this report. We also have three (3) appendices in there, the survey results are actually identified question by question and have all the responses listed in there. Those ones that were open in new questions, it's literally their response in there as well so those weren't filtered or changed in any way. We also did twenty-five (25) key person interviews, those summaries are in Appendix B, and then Appendix C is we had two (2) different focus group meetings. One (1) with KYNDLE and then one (1) with Homebuilders.

Yes sir?

David Williams: Mrs. Williams, just one question right off the top; do you think the sampling number, population was sufficient?

Amy Williams: We did get thirty-six (36) responses on the survey. I know Brian and I kind of off-line discussed we were shooting for fifty (50) but I know it is much less than say we got for the Vision Plan but

that was a much broader audience that we were sampling from; that was anybody in the community. So I think when you start to look at it's a much narrower focus when you're looking at people who have gone through your development process or have had some sort of interaction with your development process, your planning procedures; that narrows your base down a lot. So I know that it was definitely well marketed, Brian you can definitely chime in here; I know that you emailed it out to, actually emailed it out to everyone who has been through development review process in some fashion in the last...

Brian Bishop: We reached out to many homebuilder civic groups like Rotary, Lions; we did public outreach through WSON, the gleaner was kind enough to write an article, we personally invited people through email, phone calls so we tried.

Amy Williams: I think it was well publicized and the reason again you have thirty-six (36) as your sample there is just that the average person isn't going to have interaction with the process.

David Williams: The question is do you think it was sufficient?

Amy Williams: I think, paired with your twenty-five (25) key person interviews and the focus groups, I think that was sufficient then, yes. If it was just that, I think we would be lacking a bit. But the amount of information and the input we got, especially from those key person interviews I think was pretty crucial.

David Dixon: So what was the total number of individuals who have had input on this either through on-line, focus groups, business organizations, etc.

Amy Williams: It was thirty-six (36) plus twenty-five (25) key person interviews and then between the two focus groups, I believe we had nine (9) folks between those two (2), there's four (4) and then five (5)...

Brian Bishop: Sixty-one (61) plus nine (9), so seventy (70) roughly.

David Dixon: So when we have focus groups involving KYNDLE and the Audubon Area Homebuilders, which totals nine (9) people?

Amy Williams: Yes, I believe off the top of my head, I believe four (4) attended (inaudible).

David Dixon: All were invited though?

Amy Williams: Yes, the whole board was invited. Again, Brian sent those requests out.

Brian Bishop: We did, for example with KYNDLE; we emailed KYNDLE representatives and they even put it in their newsletter, I actually think they did that twice. With the Homebuilders, I contacted their director and he put that in their email and we spoke about it at the Homebuilders meeting, we personally invited them there.

Amy Williams: With the Homebuilders we did a little bit of, some of those folks who are doing a lot of your plats or those types of things; I think there was one (1) individual that didn't come because they were part of a key person interview as well. One of those key person interviews actually were husband and wife.

Chairman McKee: Thank you.

Amy Williams: No, perfect, I think that is more of our purpose tonight is to get some of those questions that you guys might have out, that you can't just pick up a report and read it from.

What we want to do is, I'll briefly touch on Section 1 and 2, and really kind of tell you more of what we did at a very broad level, and then we were thinking we wanted to spend most of your time with the actual recommendations because they stuff we heard in Section 1 and 2 will be directly reflected in the recommendations, so to not help to repeat ourselves too many times and keep your agenda a little bit shorter tonight.

So we go through a little bit of just how the document is organized, and then again this Section 1 baseline we went through and we compared this community with Bowling Green, Evansville, Hopkinsville, Madisonville, Owensboro and Paducah. So we wanted to make sure that we grabbed all of our kind of peer communities that are in the round-about same size, plus Evansville because we can't not consider them in the development world as well. So as we go through all of these, we compared those six (6) communities and Henderson, Henderson County to see where you all fell within that range.

We went through and looked at process for rezoning or zoning map amendments, and made sure we looked at everything from the process and the application fee. You all have very reasonable fees compared to most; that process that they actually have to go through, what's required within that application or that submission; and what all is required from those other six (6) communities. We looked at, again, how much clarity there is in those documents to say if the average person picked this up could they understand it and figure out what they needed, and then also about the information availability in terms of is it online, is it easy to access and that sort of thing.

We also looked at timelines as well. So we wanted to compare about what the timeline on your process versus these other six (6) communities. Again, the output of this is all summarized but we really

want to get into that more in the recommendations here in a second, and at just tell you what we looked at so you have a mind-set of when we talk about recommendations.

We also looked at major and minor subdivisions. So we looked at the same types of things we just went through for a rezone or map amendment. We looked at the application fees, the actual requirements for that application. We went through and looked at major and minor subdivisions. We looked at, again, how clear those requirements are listed; if it's clearly spelled out or not. And then also looked at where the information is available and your general timelines for those processes.

We did the same thing for site plan review. So as those were submitted in different communities, that same process with the six (6) communities, and looking at again the application fees and the requirements; again how clear those things are, where that information is available or how easily accessible it is, and the time frame for those.

We also looked at your Vision Plan and your Comprehensive Plan. You just updated or created these documents recently, what things from that have or have not been pulled over into your actual ordinances so you can force, encourage or incentivize these things. We have a list of recommendations here we'll go through in a second that actually reflect things from your Vision Plan or the comp plan update you went through. We just have a summary of some of what those big goals were in this section though, much more background information.

In Section 2 we started to look at perceptions and procedures. So we did again those same six (6) communities, and we looked at your construction permitting and your code compliance. We went through and looked at again, what are some of requirements for those various

steps through the process. We looked at the time frames for turn arounds for say building permit approvals, that sort of thing to make sure that we are comparing ourselves to some of the surrounding peer communities.

We looked at Public Improvement Guidelines so everything from streets, roadways, sidewalks, curb and gutter all of those types of things and what all those other peer communities are requiring versus Henderson City and County are requiring.

Then the final step of this before we get into the actual recommendations, we looked at the business friendly side of things. So I know that was one of the kind of genesis of a lot of this as well and looked at how the application fees or legal registrations fair within the other communities that are peers around here; they are very well by the way, they are much lower than it seems like most of them. We looked at utility cost, you guys have low utility cost and I think you guys know that; water and sewer, and then we looked also support for small business startups. So it's a little bit more of the intangible type stuff. I want to start a business and I know my business well but I don't know how to start a business; what kind of resources are available? There are a lot of statewide resources that are available that we will kind of look at here in a minute in terms of recommendations on publicizing or making more readily available as well.

Then looking at what local incentives are provided for local businesses in other communities and that helped to form these recommendations that I will have Haley go through here in just a second. As we go through these recommendations, they are divided into those same categories. So again, that is why I didn't want to spend too much time going through kind of the existing conditions and what we heard necessarily from doing an actual review of all the documents, we will

share those here in a second. I do want to point out that through the amount of engagement we got through whether it was a survey, the stakeholder interviews or those focus groups we heard a lot of good things. I think that is very positive to start with. Probably one of the most common comments we actually got was about your planning staff. There is an attitude now that they are really helpful and it's not going to put up roadblocks that are saying we have rules but let's figure out how we can both come to a solution at the end of the day. So I would commend them and having that kind of business friendly and customer friendly attitude; that was definitely something we heard throughout the process. We also heard some things on how we can change things and that is going to be part of the recommendations that Haley is going to go through but I at least wanted to point that out since the good isn't always reflected in the recommendations for change. I think that one of the things that we are up against is that perception of maybe how things used to be done and how things are done now, it just takes some time to filter some of those. We heard a lot of good things about your pre-conference meetings now too and how that has been a game changer in terms in getting information out, getting everybody in the same room, that has dramatically helped as well but that is a newer process in the grand scheme of things as well. So having more folks go through that, especially as more subdivisions come online I think you will notice a bigger difference in that.

I'm going to let Haley go through and actually talk through some of the recommendations.

Chairman McKee: Thank you.

Haley James: So a lot of the recommendations include improving the clarity of the documents that are provided online, kind of creating this one stop shop for your average person, not necessarily for the developer

who is familiar with all of these terms and different processes. You know your small business owners who are starting their business and are not really familiar with this process. So a lot of our general recommendations, include referencing the same title for every document, making sure it's the same exact thing throughout every reference, also having contact information, formatting them the exact, same so that it is clear as well as providing explanations for some of the key terms that they may not be familiar with. Also explaining what governing body is going to review and approve these plans or these approvals.

Amy Williams: If you are following along on your books, we're starting on page forty-eight (48) as your recommendations so that's what we have on the screen.

David Williams: While you're stopped, the format that you're talking about, what exactly are you talking about?

Haley James: The same, exact font, the same colors, the same font size, the same spacing, all of those so the documents much like this document you can say all the pages go together. So if you have different pieces of your document on line and you click on this document, it looks like it belongs to the same family of documents if that kind of clears up...

Amy Williams: Something pretty simple that you can probably do in a couple of hours on a down day. I think if you're a developer or someone who is doing your surveys and do this every day; they aren't even going to pull them offline, they already know what they're doing. You know what I mean, they go through it every day but the average person that doesn't go through this frequently, it just helps to recognize, oh I understand all of these documents are kind of from the same place at least.

Haley James: And we have in the recommendations, I don't want to sit here, read through and say change this title to this title just because it's very repetitive and I apologize if I sound like a broken record as I go through these recommendations. We divided also the recommendations so we have general recommendations website recommendations, and then specific recommendations for site plan review, rezoning, subdivision and they are all based from our existing conditions analysis, what we heard from our interviews, the focus group...

Chairman McKee: Mr. Bishop did you have something you wanted to add?

Brian Bishop: Well I guess I was just going to add there that I think a way to summarize what they were saying is to make them more user friendly. So that way it's uniform and it makes sense to the...

David Dixon: Are we talking about standardizing documents?

Amy Williams: Yes.

David Dixon: From multiple agencies?

Amy Williams: No, just from your planning commission. Your applications have the same look and feel, and that sort of thing. Something minor, again it's nothing major by any means but it's just one of those I think, I know you all have really been working to be a one stop shop; I think it's some of those little, bitty things that we can start to tie in that makes the average person to at least grasp.

Herb Pritchett: It's sort of like reading a book, you expect the same fonts in everything from chapter one to chapter two to chapter three.

Amy Williams: Yes, that's a good analogy.

Herb Pritchett: So what you're saying is right now in chapter one we might have Bookman Old Style and in chapter four we might have Times Roman with different fonts.

Amy Williams: Yes, and you might one (1) same document something and in this you might call it something else in another one. Again, the folks that go through this every day understand that a map amendment and a rezoning are the same in the essence but the average person who will maybe only go through this process once, that gets a little more confusing for them.

David Dixon: Excuse me.

Amy Williams: Yes sir.

David Dixon: So unless it says specifically we're talking about a different agency, and these recommendations apply to the planning commission?

Amy Williams: Yes.

David Dixon: Ok, as we get to page forty-nine (49) we see the Henderson City website, County website.

Amy Williams: And that's why we called out the...

David Dixon: Everything else applies to the planning office?

Amy Williams: Yes.

David Dixon: Ok, thank you.

Amy Williams: I mean you always have the option if City and County wanted to join in on that, that's completely fine but we're mainly referencing all these documents that are on your planning website right now.

David Dixon: Well until we get to the next page and it very specifically...

Amy Williams: That we mention City website or County website, yes sir.

David Dixon: Thank you.

Haley James: So if you look under General Recommendations 1-6, are all of those general comments, formatting explanations, and contact information, all of those previous items that I just mentioned. On 7 & 10, those specifically reference the Zoning Ordinance including landscaping, plans, signage requirements, building materials, and the site plan review which was identified in the Comprehensive Plan that's why that recommendation is there. Also updating the building or zoning codes to accurately represent additional requirements made in the pre-conference meetings. So if there is a common additional requirement, for example one that we heard was the diameter of a cul-de-sac. If that's not already in the plan and that is something that is commonly adjusted, go ahead and put those recommendations in the zoning ordinance.

Also in reference to the pre-conference on 8 & 9; making sure that all the decisions in that meeting are documented so that there is some accountability to the review of those changes and then evaluating the time for those meetings insuring all the changes made at that meeting are able to be included in the review.

Amy Williams: In working on that what we heard was sometimes things do get documented but it might take a little bit of time. Obviously a lot of time they get comments in order to turn around for your next planning commission meeting, you know they just physically have enough time. Part of that is I know you hold those meeting weekly so it might just be that they need to get in earlier in the que, that was something we heard

multiple times and we at least wanted to say go ahead and evaluate. Maybe it's recommending, saying hey you know what you can come in on the week before, two weeks before planning commission but you're likely not going to hit until the following meetings just because of logistics.

Haley James: Moving on to the website recommendations, there are various recommendations. 1, 4, 6 and 11 that kind of ease towards that more user friendly aspect of providing a link to various different parts and pieces. For example on one, there is no current link on the City website or the County website to the actual Planning Commission website, so the average person may go to the City or the County first and they don't realize they have to go to that website and it's not on there. So, improving that just helps make it friendlier for them.

Others include providing an explanation of the process. Stuff like getting an electrical, plumbing or HVAC permit obviously the process on the website is not clearly outlines so it's hard to understand what's the process, what do I have to do? For some people it may be easy for them to pick up a phone but they have time to look at the internet and they can say I have to do this, this, this, check my list and I have that available.

Other links and/or explanations, that's mostly what's underneath the website recommendations; improving that user friendliness.

Amy Williams: Are there any questions on that? It may be easier to ask section by section.

Haley James: Moving on to the next page where the Rezoning/Map Amendment recommendations; 1-3 again, those kind of aim towards improving the clarity of those documents; changing the title, providing explanation, providing an explanation for the process and procedures. I

want to highlight number four (4) which talks about internally reviewing nearby historic structures and sites. If a development plan is required to analyze the new development zoning impact, this is something that was brought to attention in the Comprehensive Plan, preserving/protecting historic structures. So if there is a development within the historic structure nearby, making sure they are compatible and that those historic resources are being preserved. Any questions underneath that?

Under subdivision on that page; 1-3 again go towards changing names and clarity of the documents and references. I want to highlight 4,6,7 & 8, and these were all pulled from the Vision Plan and Comprehensive Plan or 6,7 & 8. Four (4) is construction plans should be required at the final, subdivision approval to reduce cost of the developer; construction plans should only be required for public improvements during the preliminary subdivision approval.

Brian Bishop: Can I jump in right there?

Haley James: Yes.

Brian Bishop: If you'll notice in the study, we are the only community that we compare ourselves to that require construction drawings at the preliminary plat stage and not the final plat stage.

Amy Williams: Those six (6) others, they only require that at final plat.

David Williams: Well I guess we had a reason for it, what was the reason Brian do you know?

Brian Bishop: That I'm not really sure. Claudia do you know?

Claudia Wayne: It was done a preliminary because that's what came to the planning commission to be approved, and then the final plat was approved in-house so they didn't have to come back to the planning

commission for the final plat to be approved by the planning commission and have to wait another month.

David Williams: So we're actually saving them some time by requiring the initial construction documents?

Claudia Wayne: In some cases.

Brian Bishop: In a sense, I think the theory behind the recommendation is that if someone submits a preliminary plat and the associated construction drawings, all the engineering work has gone into that work and if the planning commission chooses not to approve the preliminary plat, they are out the money for those services. Where as if it submitted with the final plat, they have already received approval for the preliminary plat and are not out the expense of the engineering services.

Haley James: Or if there are any changes they then have to go back and re-do everything.

Herb Pritchett: The question I've got, you know I always though the preliminary plat process was design approval, and that the final platting process is did you build what you said you were going to build and that was the only question to ask; did you do what you said you were going to do? So if you are going to catch design defects, you have to have the engineering on the preliminary side. Because what are you going to do if they come to you for final plat approval, it's happened in a prior planning commission I sat on, between the preliminary and final we caught mistakes and my feeling was as a former developer; I did what you told me to do, I put in what you told me to put in the way you told me to put it in. So, you should have caught in on the preliminary side and then if I've got to go back and do additional stuff, that's not quite right.

Brian Bishop: That is a valid point but I know a lot of times with the planning commission here, our planning commission, it's been quite a while because we've not had a subdivision; they would submit the preliminary final plats at the exact same meeting. Everything related at once which means all those expenses were up front.

Amy Williams: That was just based on a recommendation of kind of what most other communities are doing. If there is a good reason you're doing it a certain way, I think that is something that needs to be discussed and evaluated. But this is based on our experience with other communities and then evaluating those six (6) peer communities (inaudible- was not at microphone)

Brian Bishop: I'm sorry to interrupt but I just want to make a mental note that we should probably come back and discuss this at a later time.

David Williams: I was going to say I don't want to get too far into details, I just had questions.

Amy Williams: We'll put a big star on that one.

Haley James: So in six (6), placing a time limit on construction of public improvements until the final plat approval becomes invalid incentivize a timely built subdivision. Also reducing the number of final copies if feasible, and require a digital version to reduce the cost for the developer or business owner.

Amy Williams: That was one of the more frequent comments we heard in our stakeholder interviews too. Just the cost of submitting that many hard copies is pretty large, and if they have to make a change they have submit all of that again. Most of your peer communities are all on digital submission with maybe one (1), two (2) or three (3) hard copies.

Haley James: Then provide incentives for green infrastructure through the Zoning Ordinance. So if they provide green infrastructure improvements, for example; it could be a density bonus for their development so it incentivizes those sort infrastructure improvements. Green infrastructure was something that was in the Comprehensive Plan to be improved.

Are there any questions on subdivision recommendations?

Herb Pritchett: There was, in your table back on page nineteen (19), you have one where we did not score does one of these recommendations take that into account? I think question five (5), am I reading that right?

Haley James One that didn't score?

Herb Pritchett: Are all the required able to be retrieved in one place, and we scored a no on that.

Amy Williams: Ok, I see what you're saying about we didn't score.

Haley James: So meaning all of your required documents on the website, are they on the same website page? Do you have to go back and forth and figure out; oh I need this extra document to go with this?

Amy Williams: They all live on the Planning Commissions website but multiple tabs or pages or locations, not in a nice central, one-link that would take you to; you know what I mean.

Herb Pritchett: So if we put the link on the page then, ok, thank you.

Amy Williams: I think you're good. I think again, that's what I'm saying; I think there are a lot of these little things that revolve around just clarity on the website and that sort of thing. Again, your folks that are in the development industry, and do this day in and day out don't even go to the website, they already have the stuff and know it. It's that

person that is going to go through this once or twice, or it's that small business owner that says, oh no I need a variance because of my use or I need a sign, something like that, those are the folks we are trying catch with that.

Herb Pritchett: Got it.

Haley James: Then on page fifty-one (51) for site review recommendations; 1-4 again go towards that user friendly, improving those sorts of things; 5-8 all are recommendations pulled from the Vision or Comprehensive Plan. So again, consider the review of building materials, landscape plans, signage and Site Plan review; consider the review of historic preservation within the Site Plan review if it applies; and consider adding or review of historic sites/properties impact report within that; then provide incentives for green infrastructure through the Zoning Ordinance. In that last one, is improve the clarity of technical specifications for water and sewer. We heard through the interview process that was unclear and that needs to be improved.

Amy Williams: Sometimes it looks unclear to what standard they were doing on storm water to, and during that Site Plan or preconference meeting it might be one thing on one development and another standard on another development. Whether that is justified or not just clarify, you know what I mean; these are our standards on those things.

Herb Pritchett: Then it looks like you handled the no on questions one (1) and two (2) on page twenty-five (25) in relation to this.

Amy Williams: With that, yes. With all of these recommendations those areas that were maybe lacking a little bit, these recommendations are addressing that; or if there were (inaudible) area in that first two (2) sections that maybe weren't quite in the same place as your peers, we

wanted to make those recommendations. Although there were places that you were, in my opinion, up here and your peers aren't quite there, a lot of your development fees as an example, are very reasonable compared to your peers. So, obviously we didn't make recommendations in that aspect.

Haley James: Fifty-two (52) and fifty-three (53) are the last two (2) pages of the recommendations. Recommendations based on the planning documents two (2), three (3) and four (4) we've kind of already touched on. The Comprehensive Plan states that aesthetically pleasing commercial development with appropriate landscaping, signage and access should be encouraged, but in the site plan review process only requires screening and access requirements; so if that is something that is a strong desire including within that process to insure that it happens. The preservation and protection of historic façade, sites, and structures; and incorporation of green infrastructure is also encouraged. One other additional item that has not been mentioned on number one (1); the Vision Plan states that infrastructure should be invested in to retain and attract new retail and commercial uses but focuses this responsibility on the developer within the policies. So if it's a new retail/commercial use that is in an area that wants to be developed, Henderson could incentivize this development through some sort of support for infrastructure improvements.

Amy Williams: I think one example we talked through on that is your Second Street enhancements that are happening with sidewalks and that sort of thing, it's a City investment but obviously it's a priority area to develop and that was identified in the Vision Plan and Comprehensive Plan so it starts to incentivize some of your private development around there; that's the type of infrastructure we're (inaudible-away from microphone).

Haley James: Also with the green infrastructure to highlight; currently the public improvement specifications outlines how sidewalks, curbs, gutters, storm sewers, and those things, how they should be constructed. But there is nothing in there that references green infrastructure, there are no guidelines within your ordinances to support that.

So this last page, local construction and utility permitting procedures recommendations; Henderson County they are all underneath website recommendations; City of Henderson, those are the same formatting clarity of the documents explaining the process and those sort of comments. Then the public improvement guideline recommendations, a lot of these came from the interviews, focus groups and the survey.

I'll just read through these really quickly; Consider hiring an additional personnel to perform technical review and inspection just to keep that process going and minimize the time on that for developers; consider hiring an electrical inspector to increase turnaround time as well.

Amy Williams: Those two (2) things in particular we heard again, not just once or twice but multiple times. Most days it might function ok but if your electrical contractor right now is out of town, that's the only person that can do this so now I have to wait a week to get my electrical permit. So, that's where those came from.

Haley James: Continue to provide current GIS data that was mentioned as very helpful. Consider hiring a Level III building inspector which is Kentucky Certified Building Inspector. It just minimized the time for someone to have to go to the state.

Amy Williams: That one was brought up multiple times too, and referenced very frequently on that about the Level III. Why can they do it and we can't? Well it's because they don't have to send it off to the State to get reviewed because they have a Level III Building Inspector.

Haley James: Then providing a training session for building codes employees regarding customer service to enhance the perception of the development review process. So, increasing that can do attitude, and making that there's ways to do it and reasons why you can't.

Finally, small business environment examination recommendations. Basically increasing the awareness of the Kentucky Small Business Development Center, which was recognized as a very valuable resource but it was not very well marketed and not well known.

Amy Williams: We didn't even know about it but they can really help small businesses and it's a free resource.

Brian Bishop: That is located in the KYNDLE office, correct?

Amy Williams: Yes, by appointment only on a half day I believe it is. They are out of that (inaudible) in the Owensboro region, and they have a wealth of information. They will help you write business plans, they will help you get in contact with lenders, and they will really help you solidify if you know... We find a lot of small businesses say I know my business very well but I don't know how to do business as a small business. Having to jump through some of those hoops it's a great resource, and it's a free resource that is out there for your community.

Haley James: Also increasing marketing and positive success stories to enhance that perception. There is a positive perception out there, but it's not very well known, and there is less celebrating of the success stories.

Also if the applicant desires, have KYNDLE attend the pre-conference meeting just to help coordinate with some small business applicants.

Amy Williams: We heard that from a couple of the small business owners. You know, it would have been great if they could have sat at the table with me, but they didn't know to ask KYNDLE to come sit at

the table with them because, you know, I might be doing a variance or rezoning or something for my small business, and they would have been able to incorporate something along the way they felt.

Brian Bishop: The reason why we don't invite KYNDLE is not that we do not want KYNDLE involved in process, it's just those meetings belong to the applicant and we do not want to invite people that they may or may not want to be there. If the applicant chooses for that we have absolutely no problem with that, it's just we don't want to interject a...

Amy Williams: An extra if it doesn't need to be. I think it was more of, we kind of talked about this previously too, the idea of saying if it is a small business owner saying if you want, KYNDLE is more than happy to help out too, and that's pretty much your level of interaction there.

Brian Bishop: We just wanted to make sure we kept the preliminary conference confidential.

Kevin Herron: Do the applicants even know that's an option? Is that on a document, or is on the website saying, I mean, do they even know it's an option?

Brian Bishop: Not currently, and I think that is Amy's suggestion.

Amy Williams: That was kind of where we were trying to definitely trying to get. They, by all means don't have to but there were multiple folks who said it would have been helpful if I would have known, and I think I would have tapped into more resources then to get my business up and off the ground.

Haley James: That pretty much wraps up recommendations.

Amy Williams: Are there questions on those last ones we went over, now that you have sucked in all of those? Hopefully you've had time to review this prior to this meeting. Tonight we are just here to discuss and present so if you haven't had a chance to make it through that whole thing yet, you have time. By all means if you even have little tweaks here and there you can funnel them through Brian and we will get all of that incorporated. I wanted to have some time to talk to you all really tonight.

Brian Bishop: I want to make sure the public knows that for example, if the Judge, the Mayor or anyone has input it is welcome here as well.

Herb Pritchett: Amy, on your recommendations, is there a priority level, I mean 1,2,3,4,5, are they grouped just at priority level or just there?

Amy Williams: Right now they are just more grouped by topic. We can definitely do that if that is something that will help staff and the commission, by all means we can go through on the next round and do a low, medium, high priority if that would help.

Herb Pritchett: That would be helpful, at least to me. You all interviewed the people, we did not.

Amy Williams: I think it's a combination of that interviewing and what others are doing as well.

Herb Pritchett: Right, right.

Amy Williams: Like everything, of course, you hear from one (1) or two (2) that just don't want zoning.

Herb Pritchett: Sorry.

Amy Williams: There's reasons we have it, whatever side of the table you sit on with that is fine...

Chairman McKee: Mr. Hubiak would you like to...can you come up to the podium please. Please state your name and what you do.

William A. Hubiak: William A. Hubiak, Henderson County Engineer.

Chairman McKee: Thank you sir.

William A. Hubiak: I have a concern on page fifty (50) on the recommendations on the rezoning/map amendment recommendations. Number one (1), I've been here almost twenty (20) years and I believe under KRS we are set up under Planning and Zoning, and I think that everybody in the community has become accustomed to rezonings and what they mean in our community. All of our postings, all of our notices deal with the rezoning. When I'm talking map amendment, I'm talking flood plain; that's confusing to me. I think it would be more confusing the public by changing that to map amendment instead of rezoning or zoning because this is what we do as far as the planning and zoning.

Brian Bishop: Amy do you want to jump in?

Amy Williams: We even discussed that because right now it's rezoning/map amendment. Developers get map amendment, public get rezoning. We really only said map amendment because it's more frequently referenced; it doesn't matter, the idea is it needs a consistent...sometimes it's referenced as rezoning and sometimes it's referenced as a map amendment throughout documents; pick one (1) let's go with it.

Brian Bishop: So Bill you're saying we should use rezoning?

Amy Williams: Rezoning.

William A. Hubiak: I'm saying rezoning because when we go out and post them, we put them in the paper and it's always rezoning...

Amy Williams: And the public understands those.

William A. Hubiak: Like I said, we started getting into our flood plain and that's where we're talking map amendments. I think that the public would be more comfortable with the rezoning name than changing it over to map amendment.

Amy Williams: I think that is perfectly fine.

William A. Hubiak: One other question for you because I didn't get to see this. You're talking about the cul-de-sac diameters, can you be more specific? It's on page forty-eight (48), second to the last thing. Because this has been a concern of mine in the past because when we do the City and the County at first had different regulations, and this comes into a fact when we get into is it a cul-de-sac for commercial or residential? Well, cul-de-sac's were under designed in the county when I got here because you couldn't turn a school bus in a cul-de-sac. Well, you design it for a school bus but how do people move into their home?

Amy Williams: Right.

William A. Hubiak: It's a moving van, that's a semi. How do you get in there? We have children that have to walk down the street in some of the county subdivisions to meet the school bus because the school bus cannot turn around. So I understand what we're saying here but I think we need to get that into the regulations where it can be addressed that it needs to be a standardized cul-de-sac design. Because, especially in the Subdivision Regulations...

Amy Williams: That's exactly what it was. A standardized so you know if it's commercial or residential. That was the confusion we heard

is I come in and sometimes it's this diameter and sometimes it's this diameter, it's not clearly stated.

William A. Hubiak: Ninety (90) percent of the traffic is vehicular, ten (10) percent, five (5) percent...

Brian Bishop: But in the Subdivision Regulations that's the service (inaudible) too, so.

William A. Hubiak: So we need to look at that. Like I said when you have your service level and you have delivery vans coming in, and then semi's coming in and they are hopping the curb or part of the cul-de-sac, or running up in peoples yards, they get a little intense. I agree with that one, I think we need kind of look at that.

Amy Williams: Do you have some verbiage that we can tweak that with? That would be perfect, that was just one example that we heard from, I think, two (2) different interviewees that just somebody tell me what it is so it's clear to everyone, and I'm not all of a sudden thinking it's going to be this diameter and then it's smaller or larger and I've got to go change things.

William A. Hubiak: I do agree with number nine (9) on the website that if we can clearly get out to the public more of the drainage requirements, that's always been a number one (1) question. Thank you.

Chairman McKee: Thank you Mr. Hubiak. Mayor, do you have anything you would like to ask the group?

Mayor Austin: I appreciate the Planning Commission taking on this on and working through this. I think your recommendations, and you'll have other recommendations that will come out of this. I appreciate your work on this and congratulate you for the good job that you're doing and how we will proceed.

Chairman McKee: Judge, do you have anything you would like to ask?

Judge Schneider: I appreciate the commission and Brian pursuing this study and I think it goes back to my experience as former CEO of KYNDLE and the importance of teamwork and embracing local businesses and being consistent. I think the studies show that we are actually very competitive in ninety (90) of ways, and that is encouraging of many of the, if I'm not mistaken the reaction of doing this was based on very few comments in the Branding Survey that was done so even though we didn't have a tremendous number of respondents, we weren't basing this on a tremendous number of complainants to begin with and I think the study shows we are very business friendly in many ways but we can always continue to get better. The County has already made the corrections on its website that were suggested in the study. We're on board and we appreciate the Planning Commission taking the time to do this.

Chairman McKee: Mr. Stinnett do you have anything to ask this group, or comments you would like to make?

Chuck Stinnett: Would you like to address the microphone?

Chairman McKee: Please do. Please state your name and affiliation.

Chuck Stinnett: Chuck Stinnett, I'm Vice President for Chamber Services, and public relations for KYNDLE. Obviously we have had only a very short amount of time to see this, we appreciate staff for sharing the document and I've had a very cursory look at it. I guess the main thing I would want to say is that I don't see the Planning Commission as people who want to halt development in this community. I think we have seen a tremendous amount of change in the attitude in terms of local regulatory environment. In two (2) of our Taking Care of Business committee meetings, the last two (2) we have conducted we

have had local, professional development people who are both represented in this room, who have used words like night and day in terms of describing the environment for development in this community, we find that to be tremendously encouraging. I applaud Judge Schneider who had a lot of the initiative in terms of initiating the Taking Care of Business committee work, and to David McGan who is the longtime chairman. I am tremendously encouraged, I see a great attitude among staff. A number of the items that I saw in this document are, I don't want to belittle them, but they are technical. We're talking about fonts. Now I'm a former print person, and I get fonts, I get type size and I'm a Helvetica man myself but if you like Times New Roman then that's your business. But we're not talking about see change, we're talking about a fine change. I appreciate what the consultants have done, and in the great words of Art Carney I would like to say, "Hello microphone."

Chairman McKee: Thank you Mr. Stinnett. Is there anyone else that would like to address the consultants with questions or comments in the audience? We would welcome you to do it at this opportunity, and if not there will be another opportunity, and anytime between now and then if you have input or questions please direct them to the planning staff and they will make sure they get to the right place and get you an answer. Any other questions from the commissioners, or comments?

David Dixon: I would like to see page seventy-nine (79) displayed please. Can you comment on this?

Amy Williams: Yes, I think this goes back to the perception versus the old perception overcoming some of that. Even when we sit down and talk to some developers, you haven't had a new subdivision in a number of years in the community so they haven't even been through your new pre conference process yet. It's that same kind of relation I think, as Mr. Stinnett said it's like night and day, that is a comment we heard in a

variation frequently. In the last two (2) to three (3) years there have been major strides made, and I think again, celebrating those successes more than we do some of those bumps along the road really impacts this. Perception is a hard thing to overcome, it's not something you overcome overnight either. I think that the community, again, is making those strides, it's just making sure the general public and everybody else in the development industry reflects that, so I think that's where you're getting this. The largest number was yes, we think it is business friendly, I don't know if you would have gotten that answer five (5) years ago or not but it's changing that tide from where maybe the community was a number of years ago to where you're heading. I defiantly want to re-iterate the staff sitting at the table over here, we only heard great things. It was even, they brought us applications at our place of business because I was busy. It's that different attitude that maybe, I wasn't here a number of years so I can't say personally, but from hearing people talk about it it's been a 180. I mean the folks that have gone through it recently have experienced positive things for the most part, I think that's what that is.

Rodney Thomas: Now if you had re-worded that, and put just in the last three years, were we business friendly; what do you think that percentage of yes would be?

Amy Williams: I think it would go up a hair more but I don't honestly know if, in my opinion, would have changed too much. Again, I think it's the perception and perception is hard. It's the same perception in every community there is never enough parking downtown.

Rodney Thomas: I agree with that.

Amy Williams: Well, you know there's a hundred spots within so many feet that it's perception, it's hard to get downtown but for some reason

I'll park halfway out at Wal Mart and walk up. I walk further, but it's perception. Again, that's harder to overcome, you can't overcome that overnight. I don't know that it really would have changed much honestly.

David Williams: On page fifty-six (56) you said there were a handful of people that had extremely bad experiences. I'm kind of curious, when you spoke to them, was that an attitude that was changing, and in the process of changing that they were....or were they still as mad now as they were back when they...

Amy Williams: So, um, you said fifty-six (56) and that's the survey so we didn't get to actually speak to those people one on one since that was all online. But the twenty-five (25) people stakeholder interviews we did, yeah I think going...people who had been through the process or even hadn't been through it but had heard thru the grapevine that maybe they haven't done a subdivision recently or something, people know things are changing. Again, I think a lot of it comes from your staff, the changes come there in an attitude at the planning commission, and your pre conference. People had a lot of good things to say about it and you know, we asked the questions of you know it's one more meeting, are you ok with that? Some developers or folks want to just make sure they are ok with that, and their across the board response was, "Well yeah, because you know what? Right up front I know x, y and z, and it's clear and I can move on and it will save me time in the long run.

Brian Bishop: I know Denny is chomping at the bit.

Chairman McKee: Mr. Branson, would you like to make a....should we take a restroom break before you start? (laughter) Please state your name and affiliation.

Dennis Branson: My name is Dennis Branson, and I'm the Henderson County Surveyor.

Chairman McKee: Is that an elected position?

Dennis Branson: It is.

Chairman McKee: I thought so.

Dennis Branson: I was just curious as to why my office did not get a copy of this study.

Brian Bishop: Good question.

Dennis Branson: That was a joke. I didn't want my silence to be interpreted as not agreeing with everything that has been said here. As you guys know, I have been around here quite a long time and probably represented more projects by myself than everybody else all put together. I've seen some changes. I've seen it bad, and I've seen it as it is today, there's just no comparison. Brian and his staff have become proactive in helping anybody and everybody get done what needs to be done. These recommendations while they are valid, all of them are valid, are just really, really minor things which speaks well of not just Brian but the Planning Commission and the attitude of the community. You guys wouldn't have the attitude that you have today if it wasn't for the change in attitude of the community. The staff has done everything that they can to help support that too. So, I would just be cautious about changes that are being recommended that we not make changes just for the sake of saying we made changes and got value for our dollar. They did an outstanding job, the study is great, the responses; you're just not going to get that many responses from people who, there just aren't that many people who interact with the development process in total. I think everything went well, I loved the reports and am anxious to read through

the results, and dispute some of them of course. But I didn't want you guys to thinking me sitting back there with my mouth shut meant I didn't like everything that is going on, it's great. Things are really great here.

Chairman McKee: Once again, wisdom does not come from intelligence it comes from experience doesn't it Mr. Branson?

Dennis Branson: It does, yes.

Chairman McKee: And we thank you for yours.

Dennis Branson: Thank you.

David Williams: Denny before you leave, are there, what do you see missing?

Dennis Branson: From our process?

David Williams: Yes, from this report? What are you seeing did not get addressed in your opinion as a developer?

Chairman McKee: Have you seen it? Have you seen the report?

Dennis Branson: I have not seen it, I've talked to Brian off and on...

Brian Bishop: He has not seen it, and we did not openly want to give it to the public before the Planning Commission and the elected officials had a chance to.

David Williams: Ok, I'm sorry.

Dennis Branson: Elected officials. (laughter)

Brian Bishop: Well, decision making electing officials. (laughter)

Chairman McKee: As I recall Mr. Branson, you won that by a landslide didn't you.

Brian Bishop: Denny we will correct that mistake tomorrow.

Dennis Branson: Really, I can tell you, I've been on the Taking Care of Business committee for KYNDLE for a number of years, I have been on the Homebuilders board of the local Homebuilders Association for a number of years, and then constantly involved in hearing the complaints that people have had over the years. There is nothing to complain about, there is just nothing to complain about, not even the smallest thing. The staff is thick skinned, people get mad at them and they just keep right on with a positive attitude and keep going. It's a great place to be today and that evident by the fact we, right now, the Judge asked me not too long ago did I ever recall a time in our history when we've had this many commercial building projects going on in Henderson at one time. The fact is we haven't, and that means that we've got people investing in our community, we've got people who want to be here that have been through the process, that aren't leaving, aren't complaining, aren't calling the Judge and the Mayor like they used to years ago. That is strong evidence that it is a brand, new world in Henderson today.

Chairman McKee: Mr. Branson I can assure you that you will get a copy of the report and your input will be considered valuable.

Dennis Branson: Thank you Herb.

Chairman McKee: Thank you sir.

Brian Bishop: Can I inject something here real fast? Claudia and I appreciate all the kind words but I really think that Peggy, Kathy and Curt should get some compliments along the way. Because the preliminary conference was Peggy and Kathy. They really started this, and I think you can make the argument that Claudia and I have done a better job of broadcasting that but it was a new process at the time and we were still learning our way. Curt did a really good job with the new

zoning districts, he helped write the Gateway and the HIP District. So I just want to make sure those folks are given the credit they deserve too.

Chairman McKee: Are there any other comments or questions?

David Dixon: What are the next steps here?

Brian Bishop: This is the draft version. What we would like to do is take in the comments that we've received from tonight and of course we will give a copy of the survey to the County Surveyor, and then we will solicit some more input from folks. Then at the April meeting, Amy will come back with a final draft and that will be the formal presentation.

David Dixon: Ok, then that is when we will prioritize some of these recommendations?

Amy Williams: We will do that for the next draft, yes. We will coordinate with Brian here on dates. I know we like to get things to Planning Commissions about two (2) weeks in advance, which really only gives us about two (2) weeks to take in comments. You guys can set those deadlines and just tell us what they are and we will follow them. Let us coordinate a little bit on that, making sure you have enough time to get comments back and then give you all enough time to actually look at it all. But yes, any comments we get from you guys from staff, from any of your officials out there or the public; and then one of those comments was the prioritization, I think that is a good comment so we will go back and do that as well. That will all appear in your next, the final draft.

Brian Bishop: Commissioner Dixon is April too aggressive for final presentation?

David Dixon: That's completely up to you all. I would rather have it done well than done quick.

Amy Williams: We won't need much time to make edits. We can block those out on our production schedules so if we know we're going to get edits in two (2) weeks, we'll block those next couple of days out and be ready to go, that is not an issue on our end. I think it is just however long you want to allow folks to give you comments, that's all.

Brian Bishop: Is it ok if we ask Chuck and Denny because I think they will have a lot of input? How much time will you guys need? Mr. County Surveyor?

Dennis Branson: I can do anything.

Brian Bishop: Is a week enough time?

Dennis Branson: Oh yeah.

Brian Bishop: Is the commission comfortable with that, giving everyone a week to provide comments? Then we can have a few days to get those to Amy and that document can be prepared and to you guys two (2) weeks before the meeting?

Chairman McKee: Ask it a different way. Is anybody uncomfortable with that time frame, is that enough time; a week?

Brian Bishop: Keep in mind the April deadline is not set in stone. If you guys are not comfortable with that...

Amy Williams: We're flexible too.

David Dixon: How long have we been at this?

Brian Bishop: I believe we started in September.

Amy Williams: We did extend it, the staff wanted to leave the survey longer so we did extend that deadline. So we're about a month later than we anticipated because of that.

David Dixon: What's another couple of weeks when we've been doing it for this long?

Brian Bishop: Are you suggesting doing it in May?

David Dixon: I'm saying, let's be generous with making sure we get as much input from as many people as possible. That's all I'm saying.

Herb Pritchett: If I can piggy-back on what Mr. Dixon is saying, I took a picture of this off of a building, it says, "We do three (3) types of jobs; cheap, good, and quick you can have any two (2). A good, quick job won't be cheap. A good job cheap won't be quick. A cheap job quick, won't be good."

Brian Bishop: Amy if you're ok with it, and the board is ok what if we give a little longer and then we can do it at maybe a workshop or maybe the May meeting. That way we make sure we solicit input from the public. I'll take the blame for this, I didn't want this document getting out to everyone before you guys had seen it. Because the Planning Commission is the one that started this process and I think you guys should have seen it first. Is there an opinion amongst the members?

Chairman McKee: I would just like to ask a question. If there is additional input to be sought, how do you plan to get that input Commissioner Dixon? What is the mechanism that we're going to use to increase the amount of input that we currently have.

David Dixon: Ok, so every elected official in the county now has a copy of this?

Brian Bishop: They got that shortly after you did. We delivered those and emailed them but the Planning Commission was our first priority; I think they maybe got them a week after you did.

David Dixon: Ok, so they all got an invitation to respond directly to you?

Brian Bishop: Yes sir. Well, except for the County Surveyor.

David Dixon: Well, if that seems sufficient that's fine.

Chairman McKee: I am not questioning the sufficiency, I'm questioning how we're going to get it to them to get their comments. How are we going to reach out to additional people?

David Dixon: I'm sure this is going to be on our website isn't it?

Brian Bishop: It can be.

David Dixon: Make sure it's labeled correctly and matches all the other documents.

Herb McKee: How are people going to know it's on the website?

Rodney Thomas: Well, there's the gleaner right there.

David Dixon: Perhaps the media could assist.

Chairman McKee: Websites are handy if you know to go there, but if you don't know.

David Dixon: It could be on the City's website, it could be on the County's website.

Brian Bishop: We would ask Mrs. Stinnett to help us broadcast it. We can place it on our Facebook page.

David Dixon: I think the bigger question is, what are you going to do when you get the input? But we'll cross that bridge at another time.

Amy Williams: We will evaluate what we get. If we get input that we don't incorporate we'll have to let you guys know what that was.

Chairman McKee: I have a technical question for you before you get away. How did you retrieve the information from the other cities? From Evansville, Bowling Green, Paducah, how did you get all the information that you got?

Amy Williams: Ninety-nine (99) percent of it was on line, there may have been one (1) call we made to get some clarity on finding a document. But all of their documents are online.

Haley James: Some were easier to get to than others.

Amy Williams: Some took some digging.

Chairman McKee: That's very interesting.

Brian Bishop: Do we have a consensus on April or May?

David Dixon: If it can be done in time for the April meeting that's perfectly fine with me, whatever you think.

Chairman McKee: Well if you're going to push it out there in the air, you might want to allow a little bit longer. I was just curious as to how you were going to approach getting additional input, whatever we've already done has gotten this much input, and what's going to increase the input that is going to have to go out to a larger number of people; so how are you going to do that? Frankly I don't believe that putting it on a website is going to produce that much, but it's possible I guess.

Amy Williams: I think you're pretty right there, there might be a few folks that go and look at that, that are development minded but it's probably not going to generate a swell of interest just because the average person, they typically don't want to get into that level of detail unless they have to.

Chairman McKee: What is staff's recommendation of an additional push for additional input.

David Williams: How long have we had this survey out?

Claudia Wayne: It's been out for a while.

Brian Bishop: I think I would love more input but I don't know if we would receive it. So if we could ask for some assistance for one last push for maybe a week. Then that would give us a week to get those to Amy, and those edits can be changed and we will have them to you guys with two (2) weeks' time to review for the April meeting.

David Dixon: Sounds great.

Chairman McKee: Is that acceptable commissioner?

David Dixon: Sounds great.

Chairman McKee: Any other comments or reactions...Judge, would you like to suggest something?

Judge Schneider: Do you plan to survey current projects going through the process?

Brian Bishop: Mr. Branson actually had a good idea about that, is he still here? Would you mind, I'm sorry, Mr. County Surveyor?

Dennis Branson: Are you talking about the survey?

Brian Bishop: Yes, the ongoing survey.

Dennis Branson: I think it will be a great idea. What they have done is great, I don't know, you can ask for input all you want but they've gotten all the input they are going to get from all the interested people that were willing to do it. But what we really need from this point

forward is, and I'm glad you asked this Brian because this is very important.

We need a questionnaire constructed to give to people who have been through the process, immediately after they go through the process. When they go to site review committee, when they deal with HWU or HMPL; maybe ten (10) or fifteen (15) questions that are asked to evaluate how they were treated, were they confused, how could they have been clearer, how could it have been made easier or more cost effective for example. But immediately after they go through the process, continually all year, every year. We're going to get real input from a lot more people that is a lot more valuable that we can react to better than hoping that we don't just get a bunch of hot heads like me, bitching about the Planning Commission or whoever might be doing it. I think that would be very handy, to do it all the time and we just follow up on it all the time.

Chairman McKee: That is something we can do internally, correct?

Claudia Wayne: Yes.

Chairman McKee: Will you include that in your...

Amy Williams: Yes, I think that is a good one we can add under the general recommendations; I think that's a great idea.

Chairman McKee: Thank you Judge. Anybody else have additions, comments, reactions? Commissioners? Yes sir, Dave McGan please come up. Would you mind to please state your name and affiliation please sir?

David McGan: David McGan, Chairman of the Taking Care of Business committee with KYNDLE. Just something to consider; when I saw all of this commercial development going on here recently, one

afternoon I went out and drove around took pictures of it and put it on my Facebook page saying, you know someone in Henderson must be getting the word out that Henderson is business friendly. One thing, everybody can do that, be positive about it. Secondly, some of the comments made me wonder, well what do people mean when they say Henderson isn't business friendly? Because some of the comments on that were well, we're not business friendly because we don't have a Chick-fil-A. What do they mean when they say we're not business friendly? We've got to be sure we know that, maybe somebody needs to go get a Chick-fil-A. (laughter)

Rodney Thomas: Good luck with that.

Chairman McKee: What's another term for business friendly?

Amy Williams: Some people may say open for business is another slogan that they use, I know other communities say they are open for business.

Mac Arnold: Welcome business.

William A. Hubiak: The land of opportunity.

Chairman McKee: Milk and honey.

Brian Bishop: I'm going to give second hand, maybe even third hand information. Mrs. Stinnett and I had a conversation one time, she was at the YMCA and someone cornered her that just because we were trying to develop Second Street with the Gateway District, that the HPD should not be giving speeding tickets on Second Street because it wasn't business friendly. The term has been convoluted and over stated so many times it's hard to define.

Rodney Thomas: On anything negative, we're not business friendly no matter what it is.

David Dixon: I think that is one of the good things about this study is we're dealing with what does it cost, what kind of hoops you have to jump through; not just opinions but actual facts and making some kind of comparisons there. That's one thing I like about it.

Rodney Thomas: I recently talked to two (2) guys that have built a couple of projects in town, and I cornered them and asked them and they said it could not have been any easier working with us. That is two (2) people I didn't know, I was just talking to them. So we're making progress, whether the perception is there or not, we are making progress.

Chairman McKee: I think one (1) question that must be answered at some point during this process is; if perception is the problem, can we identify whether or not we can change that perception? Because it's occurred to me, and I've met a few of them, no matter what we do or say we are never going to change that perception. It might even not happen in the next generation in that family, it might the third generation. So that kind of analysis would be important I think for what we intend to do as a Planning Commission and what the City and the County, and KYNDLE may choose to do as a result of this activity. Does that make sense?

Amy Williams: Yes, I think that does, I think that does. You're never going to get everybody on board. Some think we're not business friendly because we have zoning, you know, there are some things like the cop issuing speeding tickets but we can help to define some of those barriers that you mentioned. We will do that in the next draft for you.

Chairman McKee: Any other comments or questions? Anybody in the audience think of something? Thank you all for your input and your participation this evening, we really appreciate it.

Amy Williams: We appreciate your time too. We will see you all in April.

Chairman McKee: We're not finished guys, we've got some more to do. It's time to go out of public hearing.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY RODNEY THOMAS TO GO OUT OF PUBLIC HEARING.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: Next on the agenda is the **PC Finance Report for February 2017**, Mrs. Curtis are you going to lead that conversation?

Theresa Curtis: Yes.

Chairman McKee: Please do. Thank you for coming everybody.

Theresa Curtis: We are at sixty-six (66) percent of budget, and we have four months left to go. We just need a recommendation for approval.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY BOBBIE JARRETT, SECONDED BY DAVID WILLIAMS TO APPROVE THE PC FINANCE REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2017.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: Next on the agenda is the **Bond Report**, Mrs. Wayne?

Claudia Wayne: We have two (2) items on there. Best One Tire on Garden Mile, to extend it one (1) year; the amount is the same they are not completely finished with that project yet. Fast Pace Medical on Hwy 41 N, we can release both the entrance and erosion control. It is finished and they are open for business.

Chairman McKee: Any questions?

***MOTION WAS MADE BY MAC ARNOLD, SECONDED BY DICKIE JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE BOND REPORT.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: So mote it be. Next on the agenda is **Administrative Business, RFP's discussion**, Mr. Bishop?

Brian Bishop: Yes sir. A little bit of history and background; the Planning Commission last saw a request for proposals for legal and auditing services in the spring of 2013. Those were written so they would expire at the end of this fiscal year, which is the end of June.

But Claudia, Theresa and I realized this when we were starting the budgeting process and we have a specific request that we too to the Executive Committee. What we would like to do is ask the current providers of those services which would be Mr. Fridy and MYRIAD Group; if we could extend the current proposals for one (1) year and then re-address the RFP's next year. The reason behind this is that we still have a couple of potential legal issues which I would be happy to discuss, just not in the public meeting. The long and short of that is Mr. Fridy's expertise is absolutely invaluable in these two (2) situations, and I find it very unlikely that someone would come in and provide a bid that would provide his level of service but I would really not want to risk

that at this time, which I think if we could extend the current proposal for one (1) year, that should get us clear of the potential legal issues we may have, and then we can start the process over just as we have done in the past. The precedent had been set that these two (2) had been done in conjunction with one another which is why we are asking for the RFP's to be done concurrently.

Chairman McKee: The Executive committee heard the discussion, and concurred with staff and recommend that we extend both engagements for one (1) year, the Chair will entertain a motion.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY RODNEY THOMAS, SECONDED BY DICKIE JOHNSON TO EXTEND THE CURRENT RFP'S FOR MYRIAD GROUP AND ATTORNEY TOMMY JOE FRIDY FOR ONE (1) YEAR.***

Chairman McKee: For this one, would you please call the roll Madame Clerk?

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

Chairman McKee: So mote it be. Is there anything else to come before this body?

Brian Bishop: No sir.

Chairman McKee: In that case we will see you in April, and the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

***MOTION WAS MADE BY BOBBIE JARRETT, SECONDED BY DAVID WILLIAMS TO ADJOURN.***

***ALL IN FAVOR: AYE***

***OPPOSED: NONE***

***MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:25P.M.***

**CERTIFICATE**

**I, HEATHER LAUDERDALE, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the Henderson City-County Planning Commission Meeting of, March 7, 2017, to the best of my ability.**

---

**Heather Lauderdale, HCCPC Clerk**

**X**

---

**Herb McKee, HCCPC Chairman**