

Mr. Smith: Second

Mr. Slavens: Second- I have a motion from Rich and a second from Bruce. All in favor, please say aye.

(All ayes)

Mr. Slavens: Any opposed, please say no.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

GUIDELINES OF PUBLIC HEARING VIA TELECONFERENCE

Mr. Slavens: There are several items tonight listed for public hearing. Given the times of being virtual, we are a little bit unique in the way we are handling this. We'll ask the staff if they had any comments prior to tonight's meeting. I know that staff is at the Plainfield Headquarters, as we expected to have one or two people there. So, for the public hearing we'll make sure we address those individuals as need be, as well as the LIVE stream comments, which Kim is monitoring. If you are attending and you have any questions or comments, please use the LIVE feed for comments, and if you're at Headquarters, please work with staff that's there as well.

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Slavens: Mel, if you could do the Oath of Testimony for those who plan to testify tonight.

Mr. Daniel: If you're expecting to testify, raise your right hand.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, sir.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Slavens: The first item up for public hearing tonight is PP-20-099 – Harper's Crossing Primary Plat, which was continued from the previous meeting. Terry?

Mr. Jones: Thank you Mr. President, members of the Plan Commission. As President stated, this is a Primary Plat review, as well as a secondary Plat, PP-21-002 as filed by Cripe Company for Harper's Crossing LP & Core Metropolis. It is a replat of a Lot 4 of Hendricks Plaza II, which was approved in the early 2000's, like 2001, 2002. It's approximately, it pushes about 21 acres in totality. You may know this as the Shops at Metropolis; or the Burlington, now Ross clothing store

is located in the shopping center. The first Lot, Lot 4a, will consist of about 17 acres and it is virtually the shopping center as you know it. From this viewpoint you can see the area outlined in yellow; that is what would actually be the newer lot, Lot 4b. It is about 4 acres and was approved, you may recall, Woda or Harper's Crossing, that was a Planned Unit Development approval, approved about a year and a half ago for a 60 units of 3-story workforce housing project. You then received a staff letter; in that, at the time of drafting the staff letter, there were some items that were still kind of outstanding, and to maybe kind of address that, all items have been satisfactorily addressed by the applicant. The first slide, next slide here, will show that – this is the Lot 4a, the northern piece of Lot 4a. The items that were of concern, identified on the staff report, is the area there, the westernmost access location out to Main Street – one of the things that was on the previous submitted plat, it did not show the entire area access, ingress/egress easement; they have since addressed that. They've taken it all the way to Main Street, as requested by staff, as well as taken it to the property lines of that particular stem. The other item that we were concerned about was an access point to the west, to that property to the west. Now the easement is shown going to the western property line. And then one of the more important things was a continuation of the ingress/egress easement across the entire piece of the property, which now you can see that that area between the two stems that goes out, the access points, the east and west access point, which goes out to Main Street, have been connected with the ingress/egress easement. What this does is provide – really, one of the benefits for having this accomplished, is it does allow for an actual definition of the ingress/egress easements across the property. The zoning ordinance requires that when commercial pieces have parking lots which adjoin other commercial pieces, that they have a cross-access easement. Many times, these don't really get identified, and so they just sort of become a blanket agreement that access can be made across the property. In this instance what it does is again, affords a direct definition for how that is to be accomplished across the property, and gives the owners of the property a little bit better of an idea of what they need to maintain in order to be able to allow that to function properly in the future. The second slide shows mostly the southern piece of 4a, and also the 4b. That is the Lot that is to be created of the Woda/Harper's Crossing workforce housing project. That area is actually zoned Planned Unit Development; just Lot 4b is zoned Planned Unit Development, Lot 4a is zoned General Commercial. It also addresses the concern listed in the staff report. As far as the utility easement and the tapering of the easement from the private street, that is to be known as Harper's Crossing. The last little detail that asks, which isn't shown here, but having talked with the applicant earlier today, they have no problem with identifying Harper's Crossing not only as an ingress/egress, but as a private street as well. So, that will be made on the final plat for signatures. One of the things you'll notice is it does have listed here as a Primary Plat and a Secondary Plat; due to the timing of what the applicant is desiring to do for the Harper's Crossing, they were interested in having as much of their civil engineering done prior to tonight's meeting as they could get accomplished; it has been reviewed and I'm happy to say that with the exception of some minor details, they should be in a position to have this recorded in a matter of days. And then finally, there's just a couple of other slides

that I've added that kind of give you some memory back to – this is the actual project, the Woda/Harper's Crossing. This is the elevation, that was from the Planned Unit Development; I just threw that in to sort of help jog your memory as to what you've already approved and what they will beginning to construct, I presume fairly soon. With that, I'm available for any questions that you may have. The applicant is here as well, so I will turn that back to you Mr. President.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, Terry, appreciate it. Applicant? Is the applicant online? If so, would you like to speak?

Mr. Zant: John Zant – Oh, will I need to be sworn in?

Mr. Slavens: Did you do the Oath of Testimony before?

Mr. Surak: I did

Mr. Slavens: Okay, if you could state your name and your address, it would be greatly appreciated as well.

Mr. Zant: Okay, my name is John Zant, I'm the Site Civil Engineer, I work for Cripe Engineering, I am at 3939 Priority Way South Drive in Indianapolis, and I am representing the Woda Cooper company in regard to the Primary Plat of this project. I believe I have Nick Surak and Ann Little possibly on the phone with the Woda Cooper company, to assist me with any questions you may have.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. Do you have anything you'd like to add to what Terry presented?

Mr. Zant: No, we have worked closely with Terry Jones and the staff at Plainfield; we're very greatly appreciative of his efforts in steering us through the process. We believe we have addressed all comments regarding the Primary Plat. As Terry mentioned, we are working through our civil engineering items which I'm going through with a fine-toothed comb, and we are hoping that you will grant approval of the Primary Plat tonight.

Mr. Slavens: All right, thank you sir. We'll go back to the Commission members – are there any questions for the applicant at this time?

Mr. Smith: Mr. President, I did wonder if - they're replating here does not include the pond across the road, does it not?

Mr. Zant: No, that is on a separate piece of property with an access easement being negotiated with the property owner. But the pond, when it was originally constructed, allowed for drainage from 4a and 4b, so that is where our stormwater will head to.

Mr. Smith: Okay, and I take it that you're satisfied that we've accomplished clarification on all of the easements that were referenced in the staff report? They had several – have we covered them all now?

Mr. Zant: I believe...

Mr. Jones: I can answer...

Mr. Zant: I'm sorry, go ahead Terry.

Mr. Jones: Yes Bruce, they have been adequately addressed. Thank you

Mr. Smith: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Any other questions from the Commission members before we turn it over for a public hearing?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Okay, hearing none, this is listed as a public hearing. I guess I'll return to staff, did you have anything speaking for or against this prior to tonight's meeting?

Mr. Jones: I have received nothing.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – then Kim, any comments or feedback online?

Ms. Robinson: Did not receive any.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, and then at Headquarters– I'm not sure who's there – at Headquarters, is there anybody there that would like to speak for or against this petition?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I'm not sure who's at Headquarters.

Ms. Robinson: No, not for this one.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Kim. With that said, we'll close it for public hearing and turn it back to the Commission for any sort of discussion and/or a motion.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Personally, I don't see anything – it seems like they've addressed all of staff's comments.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Are there any questions and/or comments from the Commission members, or a motion

Mr. Phillip: So, Mr. President, I'm ready to make a motion; I'm not hearing any other comments.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Phillip: I move that the Plan Commission approve PP-20-099 as filed by Cripe Company for Harpers Crossing LP & Core Metropolis LLC requesting approval of a Replat Hendricks Plaza II Lot 4 (approximately 21 acres) to create 2 commercial lots (Lot 4A and Lot 4B) finding that:

1. Adequate provisions have been made for regulation of minimum lot width, minimum lot depth and minimum lot area;
2. Adequate provisions have been made for the widths, grades, curves and coordination of subdivisions public ways with current and planned public ways; and
3. Adequate provisions have been made for the extension of water, sewer, and other municipal services,

And that such approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the Town Standards, including but not limited to: Plainfield Ordinance 1-96 regarding Floodplain Management; Plainfield Ordinance Nos. 12-2015 and 06-2017 regarding Sewage Works; Plainfield Ordinance No. 17-97 regarding Drainage; Plainfield Ordinance No. 19- 97 regarding Municipal Waterworks; and Plainfield Ordinance No. 18-97 regarding Access Permits.
2. Compliance with the standards and specifications of the Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance.
3. Without modification, adherence to all comments and conditions stated within the Staff Report dated February 1, 2021, and as presented to the Town of Plainfield Plan Commission.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, Rich. We have a motion; do we have a second?

Mr. McPhail: I would second

Mr. Slavens: Thank you; we have a motion from Rich and a second from, I think that was Kent. Andrew, could you take roll call?

Mr. Klinger: A motion from Rich Phillip and a second by Kent McPhail.

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

PP-20-099 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – thank you applicant, and good luck with the project.

Mr. Zant: Thank you very much. We look forward to working with you and establishing a presence in Plainfield.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, good luck.

Mr. Zant: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: Thank you guys. The next item up on the docket is DP-20-095 – Wade’s Carwash. This also was a continuance from the previous meeting. It looks like, Kevin?

Mr. Whaley: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a quick clarification: we did have an incorrect petition number on the agenda; it’s actually DP-20-096. When it comes time to make a motion, that is the correct number that’s in the staff report, so you should be okay in that respect, but I did just want to point that out really quick so that there's no confusion about what the number is.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Whaley: As I said, DP-20-096 is a petition for Wade’s Carwash, for Architectural and Site Design approval for a nearly 4,000 square foot automated carwash, to be located on East Main Street – 603 West Main Street, excuse me – just east of the existing McDonald’s near the corner of Vestal and Main Street. The property is bounded by Main on the north, and Vestal on the south. It is approximately 1.44 acres. As you’ll see on this next slide, there is a copy of the proposed site plan, superimposed over an aerial photograph. So, it gives you a description of what this development could potentially look like, if approved. The site includes access off of Vestal, with a single access point that includes two entry lanes and one exit lane. The entry lanes give the egress party the option to continue straight to go to the pay station for the carwash, or to turn left and go to an area that includes eight vacuum area stations for customers of this site. There was, at one point in time, an access point proposed for U.S. 40; INDOT did not approve that access, so this is just restricted to the single access off of Vestal. The applicant has included a sidewalk connection out to Main Street, as well as a sidewalk connection to Vestal, and sidewalks will be improved at the north and south edges of the lot. If you move to the next slide, you’ll see that the petitioner is requesting approval for a development incentive at this location to allow for the loading space, which would be the entry to the carwash. For the loading space to face Main Street, which is considered a Gateway Corridor, in order to have that type of a setup a development incentive would need to be approved, which the applicant has requested. With that development incentive, there is a requirement for some additional landscaping; they have to add,

I think it's a Level 4 on Main Street, and that has been provided to supply the additional screening from that loading area. They have also requested approval of a waiver for the building materials, which you'll see on the next slide. The applicant is proposing to use Nichiha materials, which resembles the brick which is required by the ordinance for building material composition in a Gateway Corridor. So, they're not supplying brick but it's a brick-like material, and the applicant can go into more details on that in a minute. Then on the next slide we do have some recommended conditions with this application. The first being substantial compliance with the development plan file dated February 1, 2021. The second is a condition that was supplied by the Transportation Director Scott Singleton, in cooperation with the Plan Commission's legal counsel, regarding future easement connection to the property to the east. Back on that second photo – the first slide, excuse me – that showed the aerial photo of the property, there was – you see that little connection on the east side down there, sort of a boot shape, or toe, and with that little extension you would want to see some sort of potential easement to provide access to future development, if possible, depending on the layout of the future development and any site constraints that might exist; we just want to make sure we preserve that potential connection in the future. And then the last condition that we have listed there is that the property still needs to be platted, so this would be a condition upon getting a primary and secondary approval for the property. And with that, I'll turn it over to the applicant.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – if the applicant is online and you'd like to speak, add anything additional to what Kevin has stated...?

Mr. Rench: Yes, my name is Tony Rench, I'm with Innovative Engineering. We're located at 3961 Perry Boulevard in Whitestown, Indiana. I guess Kevin actually covered the project very thoroughly, so I don't have a whole lot to add. I would just say that we've worked with the town and with INDOT quite a bit, to make sure this project works well for both Wade's and the town, and we respectfully request your approval. And we are happy to answer any questions you might have. I have Jake Wade here on the phone as well here.

Mr. Slavens: Sure, for my education – I'm sorry if the others know this – can you help explain the material that you're asking for a waiver for?

Mr. Rench: I will do my best, I'm not the Architect. But it's a, essentially a faux brick panel. It's going to look very similar to brick, but it will come in a 2' x 4' segment, something like that; and then piece together to look like a simulated brick. We've supplied samples to the town; staff seems to have been happy with it so far.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. It's more for my education as well, so thank you.

Mr. Rench: Sure, sure; we're in the same boat.

Mr. Slavens: Any other comments or questions from the Commission at his point, before we turn it over to public hearing?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Hearing none, this is listed for public hearing; I'll look to Kevin and staff – did you receive any comments prior to tonight's meeting, for or against this?

Mr. Whaley: I did not receive any comments.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – Kim, any comments online about this petition?

Ms. Robinson: I have not received any either.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. And then – Kim, are you at Headquarters as well?

Ms. Robinson: I am, yes, and nobody is here for that one.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Hearing nothing, we will close this for public hearing and turn it back to the Commission for any sort of further discussion and/or a motion.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, I guess I'd appreciate the comment from Scott Singleton. As I look at this project and it only having one point of access – Scott, have you given much consideration to the potential back up on Vestal and what that might mean? I know that the carwash on the other side of town on a busy day is a lot of traffic and a lot of backup, and I'm just curious as to if we've done any analysis, and looking at what this traffic backlog might look like on Vestal and all the way back on to U.S. 40?

Mr. Singleton: Well, I don't have much more to offer than what we put into the report, which is that certainly we did talk about and look at the queuing concerns that come with a carwash. Knowing exactly what you're referencing, one of their would-be competitors out on U.S. 40, they can really have a pretty substantial backup at certain times of the year and certain times of the day. And so, unfortunately, I don't have a great answer for you; it is a bit of a risk to take, to put a carwash in this location. Obviously with the entrance not getting approved out on U.S. 40, all of the vehicles will be coming in at Vestal Road and will be exiting. By our measure, and I put this in the report, you can see approximately 18 vehicles that can stack up prior to those vehicles starting to block the inbound lane. Now most cars won't be coming inbound anyway in order to get to the vacuums, but workers may do doing such. That's a fairly high number, honestly, over what our ordinance requires. And yet, it's probably not you know, what we've seen at other carwashes in town. And so, there certainly is a potential concern. Now, the applicant has made comments that they will staff someone at the entrance to redirect vehicles coming in, so that they can drive down the vacuum side and potentially turn around and get back in the queue so that they're not backing up on Vestal Road, but again, obviously that's not an ideal situation. So unfortunately, I just can't you know, give you a firm answer that yes, this will be a problem; no, this won't be a problem. What I can show you is what capacity is there, identify that it could pose a problem based on other successful carwashes in town, and that's the best I can offer you. I will point out, I guess, too, that there is a left turn lane out on Vestal Road, which – whatever consolation that offers – at least if we did get to that point, vehicles turning left in there would

not be blocking the through traffic on Vestal, but certainly that's never our intent to have a commercial business stacking up on the public right-of-way.

Mr. Kirchoff: You know, I'm thinking, we're hosting another regional little league tournament, and we have you know, lots of people coming down to a major tournament down there and it's the wrong time of day – I guess I just express my concerns about traffic flow.

Mr. Slavens: That's fair; there's a lot of fields that are back there that if you can time it right, maybe with the ending of games or ending of tournaments, that everybody wants to go get their cars cleaned out from the baseball diamond dust, or soccer fields, it could be backed up there, yeah.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, and we're getting ready to add – what is it four more diamonds down there for Peewee, so we're going to add even more traffic down there.

Mr. Slavens: Yeah

Mr. Bahr: Scott, it's Steve – how many cars can they stack in their waiting line on their property?

Mr. Singleton: They allow it to que around...

(brief pause)

Mr. Kirchoff: We lost you Scott.

Mr. Singleton: I'm sorry, I'm on the phone. Can you not hear me?

Mr. Bahr: You started to give an answer and then you went away.

Mr. Singleton: Are you talking about if they allow it to que around the building?

Mr. Bahr: Yes

Mr. Singleton: I did not do that calculation; it would be probably – I mean adding another 10 cars at least.

Mr. Bahr: And excuse me on this question because I haven't driven through there lately; I'm very familiar with it, but that section of Vestal Road is only two lanes, correct? There's not like a merging lane in that section?

Mr. Singleton: There is a dedicated left turn lane, shared left turn lane, that's terminating at that drive. And so, the engineer has checked to verify that we'll be able to stripe it in to make sure that left turn lane ends – like when you're heading towards the ballfields, that left turn would be able to kind of be defined and turned into the carwash.

Mr. Bahr: All right, thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Steve.

Mr. Smith: Scott? I wonder if I could ask Scott also if there's enough, if he considers there's enough distance between the driveway to McDonalds and the carwash driveway? It's not very far; is there a conflict here?

Mr. Singleton: By any kind of typical design standard, the drives would not be that close together – is the best answer I can give you. I mean, I'm not a traffic engineer myself, right, so I can tell you, you know, based on speed and design standards we're probably closer than we want to be, but I think that there's enough distance between there that we're not directly having, you know, with the everyday traffic, having a conflict there. It's more really about if the queuing backs up to a certain aspect, does it become a negative factor? I just can't answer that Bruce; I don't know.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Scott, for answering all the questions. Commission members, any other comments/questions?

Mr. Smith: I might mention Mr. President, that I would commend the developer. In their presentations to the Design Review Committee, the initial proposal wasn't real well received. However, they took all the comments to heart and came back with a much improved design on the building, and so I do want to commend them for that.

Mr. Slavens: Good, good, thank you.

Mr. Rench: Thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Good to hear that.

Mr. Smith: Having said that, I do have another question now. We all know how these carwashes kind of operate, and there's a tendency with the other one on the east side of Main Street, that cars, as they come out of the carwash, they're going to drag a lot of water out into the pavement and into the street, and there's not a very long distance there – I don't know if there's anything from a traffic standpoint or a maintenance standpoint that can be done so we don't see damage, or we wouldn't see like wintertime ice buildup on the road – or something of that sort. I don't have an answer, just sort of an observation.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – very true, we see that happen at the other end of town as well. I don't know if staff wants to respond to Bruce – thoughts?

Mr. Singleton: I'll reply that we have not discussed that issue, but we'll be happy to look at it as part, you know, if approval were to be granted, as part of any civil site review, to see if there's something that can be done about that. Admittedly we haven't discussed that or reviewed alternatives for addressing that situation.

Mr. Smith: Are there any steps taken with the other carwash, about what damage they might cause to the roadway? Or is that state highway?

Mr. Singleton: Well, it's a private street when they exit off of their property. I can't recall ultimately who's the underlying ownership of that street that approaches the stoplight. When they get down to U.S. 40, then that is in fact, obviously the state highway, yes.

Mr. Smith: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Okay – Kent, were you wanting to say something? I can't tell.

Mr. McPhail: Yes, I do have one question for the petitioner. You know, this is adjacent to a residence on the east – what kind of noise are they going to generate?

Mr. Rench: I don't have exact decibel counts; I can get you that information, but you kind of know what the typical traffic is going to be around a carwash. We are putting up screens to kind of buffer some of that and bring that down, but the adjoining property there is also zoned Commercial, so even though it's in current Residential use, we anticipate a Commercial coming in the future, which is why we discussed the access easement earlier. I guess my hope would be that it wouldn't be a burden on them at all, but even if it is, in the future it would not be a problem. Does that answer your question?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, I – my experience with the noise around a carwash is being in the car going through; I don't remember ever standing outside to see what noise is being generated outside the carwash itself.

Mr. Rench: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Good point.

Mr. Smith: Kent, I do recall with the other carwash on the east side of town that we've referenced, when that came through the Plan Commission, the people that lived just right behind that carwash insisted, and I think it was approved, that they got a stockade fence of some sort. But they don't see it, and it buffered the sound to them. I don't know if that's practical here but... This is going to sound kind of funny coming perhaps, but I'm thinking more that the exit on this carwash looks like barely a few hundred feet over to the McDonald's next door – right at the microphone ordering station, and I'm wondering if there might be some noise back and forth – somebody I guess can just turn up their microphone, but there could be a little noise back there.

Mr. Rench: If I can address that really quick – I believe that was brought up at the last DRC and it was requested that we put in some Norway Spruce, and we've done that on the landscape plan, just to kind of buffer some of that sound because we want to make sure people get their Happy Meals; we don't want the wrong orders going through.

Mr. Slavens: Yep, yep, good, thank you sir.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, thank you.

Mr. Rench: Sure

Mr. Bahr: I have another question. I have some concerns about the unknown traffic, but I would like comments regarding the material that's being used. It's not brick and there's a lot of different materials out there and I'm not up to speed on all the different types and such, but does staff have any experience with that material?

Mr. Whaley: I'd probably defer to either Eric or Terry; I do know that Nichiha has been used in the past, and we've seen examples of other buildings where there have been sort of manufactured brick panels. I believe that the Performing Arts Center is going to use some of that brick-type. And also, the new behavioral health center on S.R. 267, they used brick panels as well.

Mr. Berg: Yeah, the Nichiha is more of a cementitious board. I believe they used that at the GetGo; they were going to use that at the Tim Horton's, if that were to ever have been built. Those are the first two that pop into my head. I think one of the hotels was going to use it as well; I cannot remember which one. So, it is a material that's been before the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Bahr: I didn't realize that that's been used as much as it has, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Eric, I think you may be thinking of the Embassy Suites. Didn't they have some similar cementitious material?

Mr. Berg: Yeah, I was going to say that, but I wasn't entirely certain. It had the phenolic panels first and then they moved to something else, and I just didn't trust my memory enough to come out and say that one, but I think you're right.

Mr. Slavens: Good – any other questions or comments from the Commission members? Remember that this is a, the petition was put in place prior to the auto zoning, and so it's just kind of getting – they slid in the middle right behind there, so we know that this is more of an exception, or a predecessor to the auto zoning ordinance as well. If there are not further comments or questions, is there a motion to move forward/deny/amend the proposal?

(brief pause)

Mr. Smith: Mr. President, if you're ready I see that there are three proposed motions.

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Mr. Smith: Motion number one, concerning development incentive. - I move that the Plan Commission approve the Loading Space Orientation Development Incentive finding that:

1. The required front yard or required front bufferyard is effectively screened with a plant unit value which exceeds the standard for such yard by adding a plant unit value of 4.0 to the total plant unit value otherwise required by this ordinance or other development incentive;
2. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and

3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of this ordinance.

Mr. Slavens: Do we have a second?

Mr. Brandgard: Robin – second

Mr. Slavens: Okay Robin, thank you, appreciate it. We've got a motion from Bruce and a second from Robin; Mr. Secretary, if we could do roll call please.

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

The first motion for development incentives is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Andrew.

Mr. Smith: Mr. President, motion number two concerns building materials waiver. - I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Building Materials waiver finding that:

1. The requested waiver represents a(n) innovative use of building materials, lighting, Signs, site design features or landscaping which will enhance the use or value of area properties;
2. The requested waiver is consistent with and compatible with other development located along the Gateway Corridor or within six hundred (600) feet of a residential District; and
3. The requested waiver is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Phillip: Second

2. Petitioner agrees to allow the recording of a future ingress/egress easement for a drive connection to Vestal Road, at the request of the Town and at no cost to the Town.
3. The property shall be platted according to the provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – we’ve got a motion; do we have a second?

(brief pause)

Mr. Brandgard: I will second.

Mr. Slavens: We’ve got a motion from Bruce and a second from Robin, thank you.

Mr. Kirchoff: I thought – condition number two, Bruce didn’t read everything that was in the paragraph.

Mr. Smith: Oh? What did I miss?

Mr. Kirchoff: You stopped about halfway through the paragraph, from the one I’m looking at.

Mr. Singleton: Bruce, I apologize. He may have an earlier version; Mel provided some additional comments from his legal perspective, on that condition.

Mr. Smith: Oh, dear. Well, I don’t have that extra wording. Can somebody else supply that?

Mr. Phillip: Two should read: Petitioner agrees to allow the recording of a future ingress/egress easement for a drive connection to Vestal Road, at the request of the Town and at no cost to the Town. The commitment is intended to ensure that all parties will cooperate on a reasonable solution in the future, once there is more clarity on future proposed improvements. In the event the Town and owner cannot agree on the then new access the owner shall comply with the then recommendations of the Town.

Mr. Smith: Thank you Mr. Phillip. I would amend my motion with that additional wording.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Brandgard: And I will second the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – thank you Bruce, thank you Robin. Thank you, Rich, for jumping in. Andrew, roll call for approval or denial with the amendment?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – abstain

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – no

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

DP-20-096 is approved on a vote of 5 in favor, 1 no, and 1 abstention.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – thank you petitioner and good luck with the project.

Mr. Rench: (microphone not on)

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, have a good evening.

Mr. Rench: You too.

Mr. Slavens: Next item up on the agenda for public hearing is DP-20-151 – Plainfield Logistics Park II. Eric?

Mr. Berg: Thank you Mr. President. If I may, I'd like to do the staff presentation for both simultaneously – well, one after the other obviously.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Berg: Okay, DP-20-151 & 152 – Logistics Park, Building 2 & 3. This is Building 2, it's a single loaded building. As you can see there in the upper left, Camby Road there to the north; Quaker Boulevard to the east; Camby Road here. We finally have a name for this road, which has made me happy after all of this time – Delaware Drive is here; Sycamore Estates is over here to the left. And the building that was approved, that is currently occupied, is down here on the south of Camby Road. Again, Building 1, Building 2 – hopefully you can see my cursor, otherwise I'm not...

Mr. Slavens: Yes, yep.

Mr. Berg: Okay – Building 3, and then there's a future pad there, which was the site ready for a data center. Camby is cut off over here, so that there is a part of this development to prevent motorized traffic from coming through and accessing the – well, other than emergency vehicles – keep them from accessing the subdivision there to the west. It's about a 203,000 square foot building on 13 acres. You'll notice that there's an egress here that mirrors the ingress over here on Building 1; that's because of this median – shared entrance that would go up to Building 3. This would also provide access to this Commercial parcel there so that it would not have to come in off of Camby. Two accesses off of Delaware – and again, there's a truck turnaround here, which is to aid in case someone goes to the wrong building. Building 3, about twice the size and then

some. Development incentive over here for the depth of yard is required because this access drive does go into the setback, and they have complied with the requirements on that. Double loaded facing north and south, not facing towards the residential subdivision, which was a commitment that they made when this was rezoned. They did also put a parking commitment on this because what is required is very close to what they have provided, along with the additional there. We've seen in the past, with buildings that have gone more toward an e-commerce, that the parking need increases, and the trailer need does not go down, so that's been a concern of ours to ensure that we don't end up with people parking along the streets, particularly in the residential subdivision or in areas that are unsafe. These are the commitments that they have supplied regarding the parking and regarding the lighting. Staff had thought originally that the lighting was a little bit too high and was going to be a detriment to the subdivision to the west, and they have agreed to bring down the lighting. Some of the concerns that have been raised – I'm not going to go too much into this because we have a gentleman here who'd like to speak to it, but parking in the area where the road is cut off from Camby to 825, that is an emergency ingress/egress, so that's something obviously that our emergency services would like to avoid having happen as well. And there's also a – the sidewalk is required by the subdivision control ordinance – the residents in that area have some concerns over that. So, unless there are any questions for me, I'm going to do a bit of nifty turning my screen back off, and loading up the applicant's PowerPoint, and letting them take over.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Eric. Petitioner, I think Mr. Tuohy, anything you'd like to add to Eric's presentation for 151?

Mr. Tuohy: (microphone not on)

Mr. Slavens: I cannot hear you Mr. Tuohy.

Mr. Tuohy: Can you hear me now?

Mr. Slavens: Yes sir.

Mr. Tuohy: So, thank you Mr. President, members of the Commission. If I may, like Eric, with the Commission's permission, I would go through both of the buildings. And the petitions, I understand you have to vote on them separately, but they are tied together as one development. So, with your consent I will follow Eric's lead and present both petitions in order, if that's okay.

Mr. Slavens: Go ahead

Mr. Tuohy: Okay, thank you. Members of the Commission, good evening. My name is Brian Tuohy, my address is 50 South Meridian. I'm here representing actually two petitioners; Ambrose Plainfield Logistics Park II and Ambrose Plainfield Logistics Park III, LLCs. Here with me tonight are two representatives from Ambrose, Grant Goldman and Eric Seamands, and also two representatives from our engineers Kimley-Horn, Brian Sheward and Liam Sawyer. As always, thank you for your time in hearing this case, especially given the extraordinary circumstances we

all find ourselves in, so thank you. – Eric, could you please go to the next slide? – So, members of the Commission, you might remember that last year we did some zoning work on this site, and some modifications of commitments. As Eric said, we’re now focusing on approximately – it’s a total of a 63 acre site north of Camby Road, south of I-70, west of S.R. 267, and just east of Sycamore Estates. But for tonight’s concern we’re just dealing with two southern parcels in that site, which we’ll go to in the next slide. So, as I said, there’s about 63 acres total on the north side of Camby Road. You might recall last year we were before this Board on the south side, which has now been finished; that’s that 16 some odd acre site. This site is zoned I-2, so we’re not seeking any rezoning or variances, or anything like that tonight, just merely a development plan approval for these two proposed buildings. – Next slide please – So, this slide, members of the Commission, shows the two buildings which Eric outlined, and the two sites. The southern building, which is called Building 2, because the most southern building on the other side of Camby Road is Building 1. And so, as we go north, now we’re dealing with Building 2, and then further north is Building 3. So, we’re seeking tonight, development plan approval, or architectural and site design approval, for Buildings 2 and 3, which again, are located north of Camby Road, west of S.R. 267 and just east of the Sycamore Estates residential subdivision. I’ll get into the buffering and screening that we’re proposing in a minute, as we go through these slides. But as Eric said, the smaller building is about 200,000 square feet, and the bigger building is about 475,000 square feet. Neither of those buildings have any truck doors, or dock doors, or truck unloading facilities, on the west side of the property. All of our loading facilities are on the north side of Building 2, and on the north and south sides of Building 3. So, we’re not facing our residential neighbors with any loading facilities. In a minute I’ll elaborate more on the screening and the buffering we propose. – Next slide please – So, that shows kind of a close-up detail of Building 2. As you can see, there are no dock doors on the west side, that would be the left of that exhibit. All of our dock doors are on the north side of that building, and that’s the smaller of the two buildings. And again, that’s on the north side of Camby Road. – Next slide please – This is a rendering of what that building would look like, and that rendering is taken from the perspective – or maybe “made” is a better way to say it, made from the perspective of looking northwest from Camby Road. And in a minute, I’ll show you what that building will actually look like once it’s built, because we’ve built a twin, or a very close replica of that, on the south side of the street, and it’s already up and occupied. – Next slide please – So, now we’re up to Building 3. Again, we’re not at the far north end of the site; we’re just below a rather large easement area that if you recall, as you drove along S.R. 267, there’s some big high-tension wires through that area. And we’ll be back to see this, Plan Commission, at some point when we come up with the development north of here, but that’s Building 3. Again, you can see there are no dock doors on the west side or east side; they are all on the south and north side, away from our neighbors. In that slide, members of the Plan Commission, it shows the area where Eric spoke of our development incentive, where we’ve taken what is required of a Level 2 landscaping in order to get that incentive, and taken it to a Level 4, which allowed us to have that driveway around the east side of the property. And I’m sure you can recall that really our border there, the road we’re

dealing with that causes that is S.R. S.R. 267, and it's quite a ways distance from there and it's behind a significant stand of trees. – Next slide please – So, that's what Building 3 would look like. That perspective, rendering, is taken from Delaware Drive, the new street, looking northeast. And again, you can see there are no dock doors against our residential neighbors. – Next slide please – That is the building on the south side of Camby Road; it was finished – I think that we were before the Plan Commission in 2020, but that building is now finished and is occupied, and we anticipate building a very similar building in Building 2 and Building 3. – Next slide please – So, members of the Plan Commission, the key work on these sites has been to work on separating the buildings from our residential neighbors to the west. Early on, one of the things that occurred is Camby Road used to connect all the way from S.R. 267 to 825, and 825 is the road that leads into Sycamore Estates. So, in working with the neighbors and working with the town, we have eliminated that connection between Camby Road and 825. That's down in the bottom part where that green area is, where Camby Road used to connect – Thank you Eric, for that – That's where that is. It used to connect and now it does not; there's a gate, a landscaping area, so there won't be any truck traffic commuting from Camby Road, into that street 825, which could then get into the residential neighborhood. In addition, members of the Plan Commission, what we've shown here is there is a significant buffered area and distance between our buildings and the residential buildings of Sycamore Estates. And some of those measurements are that the Building 2, which is the lower building, is approximately 244 feet from the property line of Sycamore Estates lots, to the west edge of the building. But even more distant than that, from the west edge of the building to the actual homes that are in Sycamore Estates that are on our western border, that distance is between 310 feet and 350 feet, depending on which home you measure it from and where you measure in the building. The significance of that is, there's more than a football field between a home and the western edge of our building, which again, doesn't have any dock doors on it. And in that space, that 310-350 feet, you not only have the houses rear yard, but then there is a 50 foot wide pretty thick stand of trees, which you can see just to the left of that green border, and that's going to remain intact; that's part of our commitment and part of our development plan. But then in addition to that 50 foot wide existing tree line, what we propose to fill in, in that green area is another 60-70 foot wide berm, which will be 9 feet tall, along that north to south border. So, my point about all that is, not to be labored to the Commission, but it's very important to the neighbors next door and I think it's important to match these two uses, is that there's not going to be any loading docks, or truck unloading, or trailer parking on the west sides of our buildings, so that knocks down the objectional use. And then between our buildings and our neighbors will be that landscape, or that green area and then this 9 foot tall berm that's 60-70 feet wide, and then Delaware Drive is in there too, and then there's landscaping along our western buildings. So, there's been a lot of meetings and a lot of communication between the petitioners and our neighbors, Sycamore Estates to the west, and it has resulted in what I think is a pretty significant buffer area between these two uses. – Next slide please – So, this slide just zeros in on it to show that the height of that berm is 9 feet tall; it shows the distance of that tree wooded area, and then the width of the berm and Delaware Drive, and then the west edge of

our buildings. And that measurement is taken at the south end of the site. – Next slide please – And then that same measurement, it's actually a little further on Building 3, between the homes and the nearest edge of Building 3, which is the north building, it ranges between approximately 310 feet and 380 feet. So, even slightly further as you go north up Delaware Drive. And again, 9 feet and those same commitments related to screening; 9 feet is the height of the berm. – Next slide please – The DRC brought up a concern, and that is the sight lines to our mechanical equipment. I'm advised that the petitioner plans to use mechanical equipment that will not be on the roofs of the building but will drop down into the building. And this sight line does show the mechanical equipment – even if it was on the roofs, it would meet the town standards. – Next slide please – Again, showing sight lines because the DRC asked us to do that, and also asked us to confirm that the dumpster enclosures in Building 2 and Building 3 would be built with material compatible, similar to the building material on the exterior of these buildings, and the types of doors that we would screen the dumpster enclosures with; we've agreed to the types of doors that the DRC asked; either the cedar or the composite door, and we've agreed to that. – Next slide please – The DRC was concerned about lighting and parking, and so they asked us for two commitments, which Eric mentioned. One is that we won't exceed – we won't require more parking than the number of current spaces shown on the development plans, and that any lighting installed on the west elevations of the proposed Buildings 2 and 3, and lighting installed along Delaware Drive, that's the road running north from Camby, and lighting within those automobile parking areas west of Buildings 2 and 3, or other lighting installed within close proximity to Delaware Drive would not be higher than 20 feet above the surface grade of the location of that lighting, and we have agreed to that commitment. – Next slide please – Those show where those lights would be, and those light will be not higher than that 20 foot height that the DRC requested that we agree to. That's on Building 2, I think the next slide should show the lighting on Building 3, again, not higher than 20 above the surface. – Next slide please – So, members of the Plan Commission, in summary, this is an I-2 site; the zoning allows for the type of use that Ambrose proposes. I believe the use and the site plans comply with the development standards of the zoning ordinance except where we've asked for that development incentive up on the northeast corner of Building 3. I believe that the design and improvements comply with the design standards. And the DRC asked the petitioner for certain commitments regarding lighting and parking, which we have done. They followed and have complied with the commitments made in the earlier zonings and earlier Plan Commission meetings, where no dock doors would face east or west, they would face north and south. And that the development plan includes a berm that I've elaborated about, and a preservation of a fairly substantial 50 foot wide or so tree line right next to the west of our berm. And so, I think those items provide a substantial buffer between our site and our western neighbors. And because of the elimination of truck traffic on Camby Road, we don't believe that would be a negative factor to our neighbors in Sycamore Estates. And so, with that, we'll certainly try to answer any questions you might have and thank you again for your time this evening.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Mr. Tuohy. I have a question, but I'll turn it over to the Commission first. Any questions before we go over to the public?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Hearing none, my only question is – I thought maybe you could refresh my mind of, is this to be multi-shift – do you know yet – multi-shift buildings, if so, traffic patterns and so forth and so on.

Mr. Tuohy: Mr. President, I don't think we know that yet because we don't have a user of either of these buildings. It's certainly possible, but we don't know at this time.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Any further comments/questions from the Commission for Mr. Tuohy before we turn it over for public hearing?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Hearing none, this is listed for a public hearing – first of all I'll start with Eric – any comments prior to tonight's meeting, did the staff receive any?

Mr. Berg: We have received comments from Mr. Jim Jones; I believe he is on site and he does have a presentation, which I will switch to momentarily if he comes up; I can't see him at the I can't tell if he's at the training room.

Mr. Slavens: Yeah, there's somebody at the training room.

Mr. Berg: I'll switch over to him.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thanks. And then Kim, any comments, before we turn it over to Mr. Jones, any comments/questions online?

Ms. Robinson: No, I did not receive any.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – Mr. Jones, you provided a presentation to the staff prior to; if you could state your name and address before you get started, really appreciate it.

Mr. Jim Jones: Sure, thank you. My name is Jim Jones. I live at 6844 Cottonwood Drive, Plainfield Indiana 46168. Is the audio okay on your end?

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Mr. Jim Jones: Okay, first of all, good evening. Thank you, Mr. President, and other Commissioners for the opportunity to discuss Sycamore Estate's position on dockets DP-20-151, as well as 152. I will be going through both at the same time; I would have been in a little bit of an awkward position if Mr. Berg and Mr. Tuohy didn't, because my presentation is made that way. I would like to thank Mr. Whaley and Mr. Berg, and also Mr. Singleton for their help throughout the process; the neighborhood really appreciates that, thanks. I will speak to three areas tonight, the west and south berm and access to the neighborhood. – Next – the west berm

runs north to south along the west side of Delaware Drive. We want to reiterate the height need and inform the Commission of discussions about the tree preservation treatment being extended beyond the 50 foot area. – Next – the south berm is technically not in dockets 151 and 152 – my words – but this detail was not part of the Plan Commission’s review of Building 1, likely due to the phasing plan for Camby Road – my thoughts again. The west portion of Camby Road is not completed yet but will be completed with dockets 151 and 152. – Next – the third area of the agenda is concerns with access to the neighborhood. As a reminder, this was a main concern by the neighborhood when we started the process, this being the increased non-neighborhood traffic, using the neighborhood as a thoroughfare while not being familiar with our speed limits, pedestrian patterns, as examples. We will not offer critique of development today, since our previous Plan Commission communications record this. Just to be clear, if we had our wishes so to speak, we would not have a development adjacent to our neighborhood. Having said that, these three elements to be reviewed tonight are the remaining sticking points that we are aware of. Side note, you’ll notice the blue font at the bottom of a particular drawing, or an excerpt of a particular drawing; that’s just to reference where we took that excerpt from. Occasionally we might reference a drawing that is, the theme of the drawing, the title might be landscaping, but we’re showing a position, so that’s the purpose of that. – Next – on the height location of the west berm, the neighborhood agrees with the description. We do appreciate Ambrose working with us back and forth to get to what we believe is an effective height, which is 9 foot minimum, as measured from Delaware Drive. The north and south toe of the west berm, which are pictured, are cutouts of the referenced drawing. So, the real key for us was 9 foot, as measured from Delaware Drive. And then the drawing on the left shows the north toe of the berm, and the drawing on the right shows the south toe of the berm. – Next – Let me start with establishing the western border of the development, and the 50 foot tree preservation line. – Eric if you could, that bottom horizontal line, the south portion of the berm, if you could highlight that with the cursor; the bottom of that, right above the footnote, kind of a dash line. Not that one; just below that – that right there is the western property boundary for the development. The next line up is the 50 foot tree preservation line; so that area there, everything will be left. In discussions with Ambrose, and specifically Eric Siemens, we’ve come up with an agreement on how to treat the area between the 50 foot line and the berm itself. If we go to the top north portion of the berm, to the far left, you’ll see the dots; that’s really a landscaping diagram. It’s showing where they’d plant grass. What we’re asking is that – the areas of the berm that don’t need the entire 60 foot that Mr. Tuohy referenced, which it is 60 foot, the area of the 60 foot that don’t need the entire 60 foot to get the 9 foot height above Delaware Drive, we’re asking that we treat that area shown in dots here, as we would the 50 foot preservation area. In other words, we don’t take down any more trees than we have to. So, we’re in agreement on that. Also, we would like, we wanted to – anything on the line itself, the 50 foot line, kind of, let’s have a discussion before a tree is taken down. We had a few issues with Building 1; we believe that trees could have been left untouched and saved, but we were not consulted. Our point is, regardless of the soundness or durability of our argument, if we talk after the tree has been taken down, we’re not going to be able to return

the tree. The mechanism we're going to use to accomplish this is that the Construction Superintendent will talk to one of the core team members of the neighborhood before they start construction on the berm, on the west berm, and also if there happens to be a tree right on the 50 foot line. – Next – for the south berm we agree in principle with the referenced drawing. The actual berm described on the right side of that drawing, triangle; we agree with that, the way it's described. There're no issues with that, but what the principle really refers to is the trees and bushes shown in the bottom right hand corner, they're really not defined in a document that we have right now. So, we just wanted to be able to, as we go forward – although Ambrose and the neighborhood agree, again, on the principle of what's supposed to be there, but there's not something that we have on paper yet. So, that's the reason that it's principle; I don't see a problem, but it's not defined yet. Additionally, the drawing shows a sidewalk allowing access to the neighborhood, which is a good segue into the next section. – Next – Let me orient, at least myself and everybody. What we have here is an overlay of a Google Earth excerpt or picture, over a print or drawing. You can kind of see, if you look to the right you can see, what will be Camby Road, the west end of Camby Road, and then it goes north to Delaware Drive. You can kind of see the curving there. You'll also see, the red lines sort of show where the west berm is. So then, the darker green area kind of helps me define the road. Disregard what looks like a dash line, those are actually concrete barriers picked up on a Google picture during the construction phase. – Next – next, we're going back the other way, next – okay, what's going on now is we see parking; it's easier to access the development on the west side. Building 1 is completed and it's been easier to access areas on the west side of the development through 825, which comes from the bottom to the top. From the left, or west, is Cottonwood Drive; to the right is the emergency lane, which is created when Camby Road is disconnected from 825. The blue area is really where people are parking today, to access the development. And what they'll do is park and then walk back and forth until they complete their business. We request signage that prohibits stopping, standing and parking by vehicles along the pictured road areas of the intersection. And so, this is both a nuisance issue in general, and a potential safety concern if a vehicle stops or parks in the emergency lane. – Next – talking about the sidewalk concern; first of all, to describe what we have here, the bottom right is the berm, and then you can see the top right showing the west berm. And you can see Cottonwood Road coming from the left, or the west, and you can see 825 coming from the bottom, or headed north. And then you can see what's left of Camby Road, and then all the way to the right you'll see that gray line, which is the gate, that's the gate right there. – Next slide – I tried to highlight the sidewalk; I missed it a little bit on the top left but that is the sidewalk coming from the east to connect the neighborhood, if you will, to allow access. – Next please; and then next – We think the same thing will happen. We believe that a sidewalk would at least validate and likely encourage development vehicle traffic and pedestrian traffic from the development to our neighborhood. Their argument would be, why would the sidewalk be there if we're not allowed to access the neighborhood. And an argument may be why would someone park there, when the car can enter in a vehicle off S.R. 267. We believe that's a good argument, valid argument for Building 3, probably even Building 2, but not for the west side of Building 1.

Delivery vehicles, food, mail, packages, etc., and even potential landscape needs, mowing seeding, things like that, and you will have lost drivers, convenience will be their reason. – Next – and we would request that this sidewalk not be constructed. – Next – In summary, we request road signage and no sidewalk be constructed connecting the development to the neighborhood. We do agree with the west berm and the south berm descriptions, and the principle to the landscaping of the south berm area. – Next – Questions, concerns, suggestions?

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Mr. Jones, very thorough presentation, thank you.

Mr. Jim Jones: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Any questions for Mr. Jones?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: No? Very good, thank you. Anyone else in the Headquarters to speak for or against the petition?

Ms. Robinson: We've got one more.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, we've got one more, if you could please state your name and address.

Mr. Jarvis: My name is Charles Jarvis, my address is 10636 East County Road 800 South, Camby. My concern with this development is the traffic that's going to be, the increased traffic flow there on S.R. 267. And I may be missing the boat here, this could have been addressed at one of the other meetings that I was not aware of, but that's already a congested area, particularly in the evening, and I would think that any vehicles would have to exit there to the west, coming out of your development. It would be almost impossible for truck traffic to get out during that rush hour. So, are there any plans for improvement in that area? If there are, what are they? Thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you sir. Anybody else, Kim?

Ms. Robinson: No, that's it.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, great. Any comments or feedback online now; we'll loop back to that.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Kim, is there any feedback online?

Ms., Robinson: No – I'm sorry, I didn't hear you – there is not.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, great, thank you. All right, we'll close this for public hearing, and I will turn back to the Commission. I think Mr. Tuohy, there were a couple of comments in there, or maybe staff, about the traffic improvements, or traffic studies there. So, I guess maybe staff, maybe we can do the easy one first, the easier one – staff, if you could maybe look to address the question about traffic improvements or studies.

Mr. Singleton: This is Scott Singleton again; I'm happy to chime in to advise. The regional traffic study that was performed, and this went into industrial zoning, did indicate improvements needed at the intersection of Camby Road and S.R. 267. Building 2, either one of these next two buildings does trigger the need for those improvements, which includes a new signal intersection at that location. And so, the town is currently under contract doing the design for that intersection improvement, and we do expect those improvements to get underway this year, with really a final completion of next year. But do expect the signal to become operational this year to accommodate the additional traffic that's expected to use that intersection. I would add a comment to support Mr. Jones' comments about the signage at the end of County Road 825; staff certainly agrees with that. I think we'd like to see some, you know, not only some no parking to clarify that that is an emergency access drive, and possibly some towing violation signs to go up there. So, we'll work with the designer of the project to get those on their civil site plans and work to address that. Honestly, with regard to the sidewalk, staff feels that the sidewalk should get constructed in order to improve some improved connectivity for pedestrians and trying to be fair to those who rely on the sidewalk to get around. Not everyone will be able to walk through the grass and navigate the potentially muddy area at times, so having a sidewalk there gets everybody accommodated if they want to use that network that's nearby. And we do think that over time, we certainly hope – you know, the incentive to park close to the building, I don't know if it's as much as people get confused because we haven't been able to get the GPS systems to recognize that those roads are no longer connected, and so we're still having vehicles route up to 825 thinking they're going to be able to get to their destination, and they find out they can't. So, I think time will help cure that. And so, I don't think that's a good enough reason that we would want to forgo putting in that sidewalk, to service all that might use it.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Scott, appreciate the feedback and comments. Thank you very much. Commission members, anybody that would like to address comments made, before we turn it back over to Mr. Tuohy?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah Scott, I'd like to add to what Scott Singleton said there. It seems to me that we're going to have to have some cooperation from Hendricks County because where they're talking about parking and whatnot, on 825, that's not in the town, it's still in the County, and any enforcement of parking violations there seems to be in the jurisdiction of Hendricks County. I hope I'm not misreading that. But you know, we've had discussion about that some of the signage that they need to try to keep traffic from entering in there and from trying to get in there, again, is outside of our jurisdiction in terms of the roadways connecting to there. If I'm wrong there, somebody correct me. And as far as the sidewalk is concerned, I think it's a public safety issue, and I guarantee you we'll have people from the neighborhood walking that way, using the sidewalk, and it's important that we do the best job we can in terms of public safety there. I think that sidewalk needs to be there, and I think the folks in that neighborhood will be using it.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kent, appreciate it.

Mr. Singleton: I'm going to chime in, just for clarity, the parcel shape up there in the corner does indicate that we would have annexed that portion of the road with the annexation. And so, that edge right as you tie into – I can't remember the neighborhood street that goes off to the west there – but we do kind of have that stub, and that section of County Road 825 at that intersection, because that parcel shape kind of wraps that corner. So, those signs will be ours to, our jurisdiction, but you are right, we work closely with the County. And the developer/petitioner has been very helpful in getting some of the requested signs up, down at the signalized intersection or S.R. 267, so it's been a good collaborative effort and I'm sure we'll get this accomplished as well.

Mr. McPhail: Good, thanks.

Mr. Slavens: Yep, thank you sir. Any other comments or questions before we ask Mr. Tuohy if he would like to address anything?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Nothing else? Mr. Tuohy are there any comments or feedback from the Commission members, anything you would like to address or anything?

Mr. Tuohy: (microphone not on)

Mr. Slavens: You're on mute sir.

Mr. Tuohy: Can you hear me now?

Mr. Slavens: Yes sir.

Mr. Tuohy: Oh good, thank you. One of these days I'll figure out how that button really works. Thank you for Scott's response on the traffic issue. I'll kind of go from the end or Mr. Jones' comments, which by the way, I think you can tell we've worked pretty closely, and I think we're mostly in agreement. As to the – and going again, backwards, the signage proposed, that prohibits stopping and standing and parking at sort of the juncture of the west of Camby Road and 825, we're absolutely fine if that's part of the development plan approval; we're fine putting that signage in. We don't want people parking over there anymore than Mr. Jones does, and I think we've actually taken some steps, as Scott's mentioned, to let traffic know, truck traffic know, that they shouldn't be there. And the other thing is that that situation is going to rectify itself a bit because the road grading equipment, and the equipment that's been installing Camby Road, it will be gone and the truck traffic that will come in there, and the people that work there, they're going to figure out that the right way to come in there is off of S.R. 267 and just go west on Camby Road, and there's no connection through there. But make sure that I'm clear, we're fine on putting in the signage. I think we'd like to be directed by Mr. Singleton as to what signage should go in and where it should go in that area, we're fine with that. The sidewalk issue, frankly members of the Plan Commission, we are ambivalent about that. It's not that we don't care, we understand that sidewalks are a part of development. One of the Plan Commission members, I

think it was Mr. McPhail, made a comment that sidewalks get used, and that is our experience. So, if the Plan Commission is of the opinion and direction that that sidewalk should go in, that's fine with us, we'll put it there. If the Plan Commission suggests that connection is a detriment, or that perhaps we want to defer that connection until the buildings are up and occupied, and we see how the development is going and how pedestrian traffic moves, we're fine with that. So, I'm not throwing it back in your lap, I'm just letting you know that from the petitioner's standpoint, we're fine either way; either installing the sidewalk as we had planned to do and shown on our plans, or not installing it, or deferring it and waiting for the planning staff to say, okay now's the time to put that in, and here's when you make the connection, we're okay with that. And then as to the tree preservation, maybe I would ask Eric to go back to our PowerPoint. If I could just take one minute and show you my thoughts about that on behalf of our client.

Mr. Berg: Give me a few moments Brian.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you Eric.

Mr. Slavens: Test your PowerPoint skills Eric, how fast can you get it up?

Mr. Tuohy: I can describe it without it, but it helps to have that visual aid.

Mr. Slavens: All right, very good.

Mr. Tuohy: Oh, terrific.

Mr. Berg: All right, where from here, Brian?

Mr. Tuohy: Advance one slide, I think. And maybe one more. That's it. Perfect, thank you very much. So, members of the Plan Commission, what that slide shows you is, that's a photograph taken from the end of Camby Road, the western end looking northwest. That tree line there, which you can see is pretty dense even in the wintertime without leaves on it, there's homes behind that, that's the tree line that's going to stay in place. And what I would propose to suggest to Mr. Jones's concern about that area that's sort of at the foot of where that berm will start, and where the tree line ends – not to put words in his mouth, but the way I heard it was he's worried about preserving those trees that might be in that in between space, to the best that we can. And so, rather than having a tree by tree meeting, which doesn't seem too practical, what I'd respectfully suggest is that we would stake that area where the foot of the berm will start, and we know where the 50 foot tree line is, and then meet with a representative of the neighborhood one time and go through that area and say, look here's the trees that we can save in that pebbled area Mr. Jones showed on his diagram, and here's the trees we can't because they're either diseased, or we need to have a little more foot of the berm extend into that area. But I think as part of our petition, we'd be willing to meet with our neighbors and stake that area along the 50 foot wide, where the 50 foot wide buffer area and the foot of the berm meet each other; we'll stake that area and come to some kind of agreement on which trees get saved. I think that should

hopefully address his concerns, and it will give them a picture of what that's going to look like along that area. I think those were the notes that I wrote down.

Mr. Slavens: I think it was those three items, yes.

Mr. Tuohy: Okay, thank you sir.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, appreciate it, thank you for your feedback. Turn back to the Commission members for any sort of further discussion, questions for Mr. Tuohy, motion.

Mr. Smith: Mr. President, I would ask Mr. Tuohy – going into the future, after the construction, is the developer responsible to maintain that tree line, keep the trees healthy and so forth? Or how does that happen?

Mr. Tuohy: In the – well, we're certainly responsible for maintaining the berm and that 50 foot tree area will be on our property, so Mr. Smith, our plan is just to leave it alone. It's going to be undisturbed, we're not going to plow up any of those trees in that area, so I wouldn't want to be in a position where if a 40 foot tree got sick and died, we'd have to replace it with a 40 foot tree; we're just going to leave it in its natural state.

Mr. Smith: No, I understand, I wouldn't expect that replacement. But we know, you know, trees die over time and if you lose enough of them, they become unsightly and they don't do the job anymore, is what I'm thinking, years from now perhaps.

Mr. Slavens: Yep, thank you Bruce. Anymore comments, questions from the Commission members?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I don't have any questions, I guess I wanted to address Mr. Tuohy and the applicant, and your generosity in working with the neighbors; greatly appreciate it. And Mr. Jones, thank you very much for taking your time for voicing your concerns and also working with the developer; it shows great community, helps both parties of how to get things done. So, I very much appreciate it, on my behalf, so thank you.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you sir.

Mr. Slavens: I'll turn back again to the Commission, any sort of additional comments, feedback, concerns, and/or a motion?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I guess we'd be looking for a motion for probably DP-20-151 first, given that there are two different motions for this.

(brief pause)

Mr. Phillip: So, Mr. President I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-20-151 requesting Architectural Site Design approval for an Architectural and site design review for a proposed 203,000+/- square foot speculative single loaded industrial warehouse on a 12.57 acre parcel zoned I2: Office/Warehouse Distribution within a Gateway Corridor finding that:

1. The Development Plan complies with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans and document approved by the Commission.
2. A secondary plat will be required within sixty (60) days of the Primary Plan approval.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Rich.

Mr. Smith: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Rich and a second from Bruce for DP-20-151. Andrew, can you do a roll call?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

DP-20-151 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Andrew. Next would be, DP-20-152.

Mr. Phillip: So, Mr. President I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Depth of Yard Development Incentive, finding that:

1. The Plant Unit Value to be provided in the required Yard or required Bufferyard exceeds the normal standard for such Yard by a multiple of 2.0 or more;
2. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and,
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Rich.

Mr. Phillip: We have to do this in two pieces, right?

Mr. Slavens: Yeah, so there's two motions, yeah. This is for the development incentive.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Rich; do we have a second?

Mr. Bahr: Second

Mr. Brandgard: This is Robin, I would second.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, I think we had two seconds there, Robin and Steve, take your pick.

Mr. Klinger: I got Steve first. So, I've got Mr. Bahr on the second, motion by Mr. Phillip. I'll start the roll.

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion to approve Development Incentive for DP-20-152 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Phillip: So, Mr. President I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-20-152 requesting Architectural Site Design approval for a proposed 474,858 +/- square foot speculative cross-docked industrial warehouse on a 26.22 acre parcel zoned I2: Office/Warehouse Distribution within a Gateway Corridor finding that:

1. The Development Plan complies with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans and document approved by the Commission.
2. A secondary plat will be required within sixty (60) days.

Mr. Slavens: Do we need to add anything to the motion about signage?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: That's a question more than...

(brief pause)

Mr. Phillip: Give me some words and I'll add it, if I need to.

Mr. Slavens: I guess it was more of a question if we need to; I don't know if we need to or not. Kevin, do you know?

Mr. Tuohy: Mr. President, we're certainly – I've already committed it to the Board; we're certainly agreeable to installing the signage discussed during the hearing, at the direction of Mr. Singleton, in the areas west of Camby Road, in between 825 South.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Mr. Tuohy. We have a motion from Rich, do we have a second?

Mr. McPhail: I'll second.

Mr. Slavens: A second from Kent/ Andrew, can you roll call please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip – yes
Mr. McPhail – yes
Mr. Brandgard – yes
Mr. Smith – yes
Mr. Kirchoff – yes
Mr. Bahr – yes
Mr. Slavens – yes

DP-20-152 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you all very much for your time this evening.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Mr. Tuohy. Thank you and good luck with the projects.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: And thank you to those who attended at Headquarters. Thank you for coming out in the cold night and presenting, thank you very much.

Mr. Tuohy: Have a good evening, bye.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. The last item for public hearing is TA-21-009 – Omnibus 2021. Kevin?

Mr. Whaley: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. While Eric is loading the presentation, I just wanted to comment really quickly to say that you might have noticed that the format was a little different tonight; we did have some people attend the Fire Territory Headquarters to speak on behalf of these petitions and we are expecting that within the next month or so we could have one or two different items that could generate quite a bit of public input and feedback. So, we wanted to do a bit of a test this evening to see how the system worked, to take comments here at the Headquarters. So, that's why you saw a bit of a change tonight. We'll be doing this more in the future to give people the option to come in person, but obviously we are still going to encourage the virtual participation as much as possible, but this does just provide one other option for the people to utilize.

The next item on the agenda, TA-21-009 is the Omnibus text amendments that we discussed at the last couple of Plan Commission meetings. This is some general cleanup that we're wanting to accomplish within the current ordinance. As we mentioned at the last Plan Commission meeting, staff is going to be working on recodification of the subdivision and zoning ordinances, just to

streamline the document, make it more user friendly. But these changes are needed to get through while we're working on that document. – Next slide please – the first is one that we've already discussed several times, so I won't belabor this point too much. It's just an amendment to the administration section of the ordinance to change "Hardship" to "Practical Difficulties" in the findings for Development Standards Variances, which is specified in the Indiana Code, so it's a simple language change. – Next – we're also looking to change some of the definitions. We've talked about it a bit in the past, about "Lot Coverage", that's going to simplify that definition, isolate it to being applicable to primary and accessory buildings, as opposed to buildings and a variety of different structures. That's going to, I think, ease some people's limitations that they have on their properties currently, in some of the neighborhoods that we have in town. The other would be to add a definition for a "Patio Cover". We currently have a definition for a porch in the ordinance. The porch is sort of all encompassing, and we've seen over the years that a lot of people have wanted to install patio covers and pergolas, and retractable awnings, and all different manner of improvements over patios, and the only definition we really have to classify that was porch, so "Patio Cover" is a little bit more specific. And we'll get to why we added that as a definition here in a second. – Next slide – the Accessory Uses, we're looking to apply the Accessory Building Development Standards to all Accessory Uses as sort of a default application. And then we do have a couple of areas where, you know, there were a couple of different Development Standards that were applied, but we're trying to simplify that as much as possible because the current ordinance is sort of a mismatch of when those Accessory Buildings Standards could apply and when they don't. So, we're trying to simplify that a little bit. Also, in Accessory Uses, we are looking to have a provision in there which would require that, it's going to allow that the porches and the patio covers to extend into that rear yard setback for the home. But if it's a situation where someone's looking to enclose that space to make it more of a functional living space, and it's going to be a situation where there's more mass to the building and adds to the building, then it's more like a room addition so it should meet the setbacks of the primary structure, so we have some provisions in there for that. Those are sort of the main categories of changes that we're looking to make. One thing I would add is that we did have a section that we've been working with legal counsel to revise – and Eric, if you want to stop sharing the presentation, I'm going to pull up my screen here really quick. And as I'm doing this, are there any questions at this point?

Mr. Slavens: No questions from me

Mr. Brandgard: None

Mr. Whaley: Okay, so in the second page of the document that was provided to the Commission and the public through the town's website for the proposed amendments: item number four, the first sentence is just a one statement sentence, "Accessory Uses and Structures shall comply with all development standards required for Accessory Buildings unless otherwise specified". We met with legal counsel last week to go over the proposed changes just to make sure that everything was looking good from Mel's standpoint, and we did have a discussion about, you know,

situations involving some of the older Planned Unit Developments that we have in town. I don't know if you've ever had a chance to take a look at those ordinances or not, but there are some ordinances that don't specify and Accessory Buildings setbacks. I'm not sure if that was unintentionally or intentionally left out of some of those ordinances; it might have just been something that was overlooked, but in situations where we have people who want to put in Accessory Structures within their rear yard, we tried to come up with some language to offer to basically try to do a comparison between the PUD and the closest conventional zoning district in terms of intensity, and you know, the closest standards that are applied. You know, if some area of a subdivision is similar to an R-2 or an R-3, we want to try to apply those Accessory Building Standards to that Planned Unit Development. I had forwarded this to Mel, but just hadn't had chance to touch base to see if this was something that he thought was okay in terms of how it was worded, so I just wanted to bring this up.

Mr. Daniel: Kevin, I saw your email this afternoon and I had looked at that and then had another meeting at 4:00 p.m., so I didn't get back to you, but I think that satisfies the concern that you had had and ties that together without going through the entire ordinance and trying to find every piece in there that needs to be added. I think this is very helpful.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Whaley: All right, thank you. I think aside from that possible amendment, if the Commission is agreeable to it, that it gets submitted to the Town Council, that's all that I have.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Hey Kevin, this is listed as a public hearing, so did you hear anything Kevin, for or against this public hearing?

Mr. Whaley: I have not received any comments on the petition.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you – Kim, anybody online or at the Headquarters to address this petition?

Ms. Robinson: Not seeing anything, no, and nobody is here.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Hearing that, we'll close this for public hearing and turn it back to the Commission for any further discussion and/or a motion for approval.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Great work again, by staff; getting thing clarified and bringing it up to the changing times. So again, another great piece of work by the staff, thank you.

Mr. McPhail: Scott, you need a motion?

Mr. Slavens: Yes sir.

Mr. McPhail: I move that the Plan Commission certify the text amendment request TA-21-009 with a favorable recommendation to the Town Council.

Mr. Brandgard: So moved.

Mr. Smith: Second

Mr. Slavens: I didn't catch the second there; I think it was Bruce.

Mr. Smith: Yep

Mr. Slavens: All right, we've got a...

Mr. Kirchoff: Kent, did your motion include – did Kent's motion include the additional paragraph that Kevin just shared with us?

Mr. McPhail: Yes

Mr. Slavens: Uh, no, it does not; at least the memorandum does not include what was just shown by Kevin.

Mr. Brandgard: Just as a thought, the motion ought to say, "certify the amended text amendments", since we just amended it.

Mr. Slavens: Gotcha, thank you.

Mr. McPhail: I would make that change in my motion.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, we have a motion from Kent and a second from Bruce.

Mr. Smith: Yes

Mr. Slavens: Andrew, can you take roll call?

Mr. Klinger: Yeah okay, here we go. We've got a motion from Mr. McPhail, a second by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Phillip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

TA-21-009 is approved as amended.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you sir.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Slavens: Kevin, there's nothing listed for old business/new business; anything further?

Mr. Whaley: I do have a couple of updates to give you really quick, I know it's getting late, so I'll try to keep my comments short. I just wanted to let you know that we are continuing to work on the code recodification, and we've put together a Gantt chart and a flow chart for our process. We'll be meeting with the committee here in the next week or so and getting that process rolling; we'll be providing Director's updates in the report to you all next month. Also, we did have a stakeholder meeting for the Perry Crossing District Masterplan last Friday with Woolpert and some of the affected property owners out around the mall. We showed them three different concepts that Woolpert has been working on for that area, and we got quite a bit of good feedback from the stakeholders. Woolpert's going to take that feedback and continue to refine their concepts, and once they come up with something that we think is really viable and a good option for that area, we're going to bring that to the Commission to have you take a look at it and weigh in on it as well.

Mr. Slavens: Great. Great news; great progress.

Mr. Whaley: And with that, that's all I have unless you have questions for me.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, I don't think so. I'm assuming...

Mr. Kirchoff: Scott?

Mr. Slavens: Go ahead.

Mr. Kirchoff: I'm just curious as to what the status of our property out on East Main Street that we've been trying to get into compliance. Does Terry have any update on that?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Is he still there?

Mr. Jones: Bill, which property are you speaking of?

Mr. Kirchoff: The one on the north side of U.S. 40, out pretty close to Klondike Road. He has the semis and all the junk and everything.

Mr. Jones: Right, he's no longer, as far as I'm aware, he's no longer parking any vehicles there. I'm still waiting to hear from sources that are in contact with IDEM, as to the millings. That was brought to my attention by DPW, that there was a potential IDEM violation with those millings, but I haven't been able to get a response on that particular subject. But as far as the vehicles, he has ceased in parking those there; I haven't seen those in quite some time.

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Jones: I'll see if I can't have a better, a little more up to date information, by the next meeting.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Terry. Any more questions? I'm assuming in person meetings are still to be determined.

(brief pause)

Mr. Kirchoff: To answer your question, we're going to stay virtual.

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Mr. Whaley: Yes, we're continuing virtual, but I would look to Andrew to see if he would like to offer any additional comments.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah no, I think we will continue virtual certainly through February and probably into your next meeting in March. You know, it's a fluid situation, and so we will certainly be evaluating the advice that we get from CDC and Board of Health and others and be monitoring what comes out of the legislature as well in terms of, you know, the Governor and his authority to continue the emergency conditions and all of that. So, a lot that goes into play, but for the near future, yeah, we intend to continue to be virtual. And as Kevin kind of indicated, it's almost a sort of modified virtual because we may actually have some people in house at Fire Headquarters. I think that worked pretty well tonight actually. But yeah, we'll continue with this format going into the near future here.

Mr. Slavens: Cool, thanks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Slavens: Anything else from the Commission members? If not, I need a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Phillip: I move we adjourn.

Mr. Brandgard: I would so move.

Mr. Slavens: There we have a motion and a second from Rich and Robin to end the meeting. Thank you, guys, appreciate your endurance for tonight's meeting, thank you.