



to do of course. So, to clarify, I'm not sure how the minutes can clarify that situation. Perhaps, I've notice that if the President/the Chair specifically says, you know, I received a motion from one member and a second from another member, that clarifies it in the record.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Smith: It seems to be kind of a unique problem for this setup.

Mr. Slavens: Sure, it's a great recommendation and I'll make sure that I take that into consideration as we move forward, especially while we remain virtual.

Mr. Smith: Good, thanks. I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. Klinger: I do maintain a voting record that identifies who made the motion and the second, so we should be able to reconcile that with the minutes to properly reflect who made the second on that one.

Mr. Smith: I just don't want to be making a motion and seconding my own motion.

Mr. Slavens: I understand, thanks Bruce. With that, do we have a motion for the approval of minutes?

(brief pause)

Mr. McPhail: I would move that the minutes be approved as corrected.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kent.

Mr. Bahr: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Kent and a second from Steve; all in favor say aye.

(All ayes)

Mr. Slavens: Any opposed?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: None, thank you.

## **GUIDELINES OF PUBLIC HEARING VIA TELECONFERENCE**

Mr. Slavens: Tonight, we do have three dockets up for public hearing. If you are online, please provide your comments in the LIVE stream and Kim will be monitoring that throughout the evening. If you are online and present to the video conference, we will call you if you have any questions. And then if you had any comments or questions to staff prior to, we'll make sure we

get those addressed throughout the evening as well, per docket, for any sort of pre-public hearing or pre-comments.

### **OATH OF TESTIMONY**

Mr. Slavens: With that said, Mel, if you could do Oath of Testimony for us, please?

Mr. Daniel: All those expecting to provide evidence at the Plan Commission meeting, please raise your right hand.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Mel.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Slavens: It looks like the first item up is Kevin, RZ-21-003 – JWB Properties.

Mr. Whaley: Yes, thank you. This petition is for a map amendment, or a rezone, to rezone approximately 0.18 acres from R-4: Medium Density Residential to R-U: Urban Residential at 319 South Center Street in Plainfield. The property is highlighted in the aerial photo on the map. This is located on the east side of Center Street, just south of the church there you can see in the photo. There is an alley to the east of the property and an alley to the north of the property as well; there is also a detached garage on the east side. This view is looking to the south and as you can see, there are parking spaces behind the residence and just to the north of the garage. I think the applicant estimated there's about seven parking spaces available in that location. There are also three spaces within the detached garage. The applicant purchased the property; in its current configuration it was a tri-plex with three one-bedroom apartments, but then there was also an additional studio apartment. The applicant wants to get permission to basically convert the property to have three living units within the existing structure. I believe the narrative indicated that there's a door that was closed off, and he'll speak to that later.

There are five different criteria that the Plan Commission need to review per statute when it comes to considering a map amendment. The first is the comprehensive plan. Second is current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district. Third is the most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted. Fourth is the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction, and fifth is responsible development and growth. We did recommend a condition, if the Plan Commission decides to give a favorable recommendation on this application, to limit the use of the property to three units only. The applicant again, has

requested R-U, which allows for multi-family, which could include a number of units, so we recommended that to the Commission. At this time, I will turn it over to the applicant.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kevin. Is the applicant online?

Mr. Barnhart: I am

Mr. Slavens: Hi – Mr. Barnhart?

Mr. Barnhart: Yes

Mr. Slavens: Is there anything that you would like to add additional to what Kevin presented?

Mr. Barnhart: That's pretty much what I'm wanting to do. Right now, the people have pretty much taken all of the good out of the house, the way it is.

Mrs. Barnhart: Well, and originally, we have one waterline – what started this whole process is that we want to add two additional meters.

Mr. Barnhart: Right, that's all this is for. They have one water meter serving the three units and I want to put two more in, so they have individual water meters. They each have their own electric service; they each have their own gas meter, but one water meter.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. I guess before we turn it over to public hearing, do any of the Commission members have any questions for Mr. Barnhardt?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Hearing none, thank you Mr. Barnhart. This is listed as a public hearing and so – I guess maybe Kevin, starting with you, anyone at Headquarters there, to speak for or against the petition?

Mr. Whaley: We do have one person here to speak for a petition later on in the agenda, but not for this particular case. We did receive one letter of remonstrance, which was uploaded to the website, from a Mr. Robert Crews, and that's available for the Commission's viewing.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Whaley: I believe we also received a couple of telephone calls in support of the request.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. And then Kim, is there any kind of feedback or comments online?

Ms. Robinson: We have not received anything via the LIVE stream.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. I'm trying to just pull up the remonstrance letter here, so I apologize. Okay, thank you. So, we'll close the public hearing and turn it back over to the Commission for any further discussion/motion. Either way it looks like you got telephone calls

supporting it, and then from Mr. Crews, an opposition for this. But we'll turn it over to the Commission for any discussion.

Mr. McPhail: Scott, this is Kent. I'd like to ask Mr. Barnhart if he could be a little more specific in his remodeling plan – in his letter to the Department of Development Services he indicated that he's going to replace windows and do some things like that. You know, this property is on one of our main streets and it appears that it's been neglected for some time, by just driving by and looking at it. And I would just like to know if he can give us a little better explanation on what he plans to do.

Mr. Slavens: Sure – Mr. Barnhart, do you care to address Mr. McPhail's concerns?

Mr. Barnhart: Yeah, this isn't my first rental; I have several here in Plainfield and I would live in any of them. It is an investment; I like to keep my properties up. And at this moment, I have already purchased windows to be put in there, new windows. I'm having it insulated because there is no insulation. And then I'm going to either have it painted or sided; I haven't decided yet, but just try and fix up the outside because it's not a very good looking house, no, as it is.

Mr. McPhail: And then I also noticed that the garage needs a little tender loving care also.

Mr. Barnhart: Yes, Yes, it needs a new roof. It's going to need a major roof replacement because it's wetter inside than it is outside.

Mrs. Barnhart: But we plan to remodel it, and we have lived in Plainfield for 27 years; our son graduated from Plainfield High School. We realize that this property sits on a pretty major street in Plainfield, and we want to improve the community too. So, you know, as Jeff was saying, we do own several units here in Plainfield and we do keep our properties nice. You can go to the Hendricks County website and look any any of our properties, JWB properties, and they are presentable. We do not have problems with tenants and police runs and that sort of thing. Our desire is to improve that home to; we realize that it has been neglected at least for the last 20 years. And as long as I've lived here, I don't think I've seen much improvement to it. So, our goal is to improve the property and yes, we do plan to improve the garage as well; it's just kind of in phases, that we plan to move forward on this.

Mr. McPhail: Well, I for one, appreciate the fact that you're investing in rebuilding some of our older infrastructure because you know, we have a great town and it only takes one bad apple sometimes to make the whole bushel look bad. So, I do appreciate what you're doing to the property.

Mr. Barnhart: Yes, it will look 100% better and totally different from what it is now, it's just going to take time here.

Mrs. Barnhart: We do also use an application process when we rent our properties. I know that since we have purchased this, we have had neighbors who have said that this property was

probably frequented by people who were drug users, so I can't honestly say that no one that I rent to has ever used drugs, but we don't have a history of having police calls to our properties, or neighbors complaining about our tenants. So, we do try to be selective and respectful of our neighbors who we know are not renting, that do own their homes, so that the people that we have in there are quality people and that they uphold the property value for our neighbors.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. Any other comment or questions from the Commission?

(brief pause)

Mr. Smith: Yeah, I do have one. I wonder if Kevin or someone can kind of clarify for me, the ruling status for me here. I guess I'm a little leery of creating an area where we strongly encourage a lot of multi-family, unless our goal is to increase density, then that's fine. But have a lot of houses around there been cut up in multi-family for a long time without the proper zoning? So what – can somebody clarify the history for me here? I'm just fuzzy about it.

Mr. Whaley: Well Bruce, I'll try to answer that as best I can. We don't know the exact number of units or houses at this point in time, that have been converted throughout history, but I can tell you that it is fairly typical in older parts of towns and cities, like we're talking about today, for these types of conversions to take place. The structure is currently considered non-conforming. Whether it's legal non-conforming or illegal non-conforming, that's difficult to determine because of when these conversions take place, it's difficult to get information on when exactly that happened. But what this would do, is it would basically formalize the existence of the tri-plex and establish that as a permitted use. But to your question about density, we want to make sure that we provide additional housing opportunities, particularly in the downtown area when possible. That's something that as we go through the ordinance recodification, we'll be taking a look at that area strongly to see what provincial regulations we can put in place to encourage that in situations where it makes sense and provide a level of review to make sure that happens.

Mr. Smith: Well, as you look close there, you can see that there's a number of houses that from the outside look as if they probably have been modified to be multi-family. I think there's one almost across the street that has an outside stairway and landing going up to the second floor, which certainly look like it's probably been divided into apartments. So, I just want to be clear, you know, the path we're on here is towards an area of multi-family. We approved a similar thing, as I recall, a couple of months ago, not far away on Center Street.

Mr. Brandgard: Kevin, this is Robin. I'd like to add one piece to that. You know, Plainfield has only had zoning in place, for regulations, in place since the early 70's, so a lot of this in the old part of town happened before we had zoning and residential control. I think we've got to look at what's there and how do we make it work as a whole. As you said, we need to look at the whole area and adjust the zoning for what's there.

Mr. Smith: Well, I can agree with that, and I just want to be sure that we all are on the same page because you have one or two of these, and we'll probably have more. In fact, it might be actually a good thing because it gives an opportunity to encourage improvements in the properties, as in this case. So, it can be a good thing.

Mr. Slavens: Yep, I agree, and I think that – Kevin, I think the staff report mentions that it's not considered to be spot zoning if we were to approve this. Is that correct?

Mr. Whaley: That's how we're viewing it from a staff perspective. Since you're going from residential to residential, it's more of an intensification of use, as opposed to doing spot zoning, which might be a commercial use within residential, or industrial in residential.

Mr. Slavens: Gotcha, thank you. So, I guess – Mel, do you have anything?

Mr. Daniel: I don't really have anything; in fact, I think the clarification by the staff about intensification of use there, is the proper way to deal with this. It's already multi-family, like Robin has indicated, we run into a lot of this especially in the older part of town where prior to zoning, a lot of things were done over a period of time, that the town will just have to work through. But this is not spot zoning; I agree with that.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thanks Mel.

Mr. McPhail: Well, you know, and it protects the property owner, that they've got a legal conforming use, you know, if we approve this, and I certainly support approving it. But I do think we need to make sure we restrict it to three units.

Mr. Slavens: Yep, I agree.

Mr. Kirchoff: Scott, are you prepared for a motion?

Mr. Slavens: Yes sir.

Mr. Kirchoff: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Plan Commission certify the zone map amendment RZ-21-003 requesting rezoning of 0.18 acres at 319 S. Center St. from R-4: Medium Density Residential to R-U: Urban Residential with a favorable recommendation.

And, that such approval shall be subject to the following commitments that may be added by the Commission or Applicant:

1. The structure shall not include more than three (3) total dwelling units.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Bill.

Mr. Phillip: Second



southwest corner. One of the conditions of approval is that we did request that the applicant provide a landscape plan to show that the buffering has been provided at the south end of the detention pond shown on the screen. As you can see, there are additional sites for future development; this is an incremental plat, so the applicant will have to submit an application for secondary plat approval. As noted in the Director of Transportation's comments, the cul-de-sac that you see just to the south of the building, that will be a private street and that cul-de-sac length is over 800 feet, which is the limitation established by the subdivision control ordinance, so that will require a waiver, which means that the plat will have to come through the Plan Commission as opposed to being handled administratively by staff.

This is a closer view of the proposed site plan. You can see that there is trailer parking on the north end of the property as well as the south end. And then the east and west sides will be automobile parking. The docks are facing County Road 100 South, so this did require a development incentive, which requires additional landscaping to be provided along the south side of County Road 100 South. The applicant also did request another development incentive for the reduction of the yard to provide for the parking, as you see on the east side of the property, to be within that minimum setback.

One thing that I did want to note about this particular building configuration, is this is something that we haven't really seen here in Plainfield, at least I'm not aware of; this building includes two bump outs on the south end of the building, which basically encloses the east and west sides of the dock area. And as you can see, looking at this screen, those areas are highlighted in yellow. Again, this is sort of something new for Plainfield; we think this will be a beneficial design feature for this particular building, in terms of helping screen some of the visual impact of that dock area, as well as the sound that can be generated by the activity taking place within that area. We do recommend that as the developer considers additional buildings on this site, that that same design feature be considered for other buildings, especially as you move farther to the west to the Lexington Woods subdivision. This provides renderings of the proposed building; the bump out that we just took a look at on the previous screen, is shown on the upper left-hand corner, and you can see that could be potentially used for office space within the building. This is just an example of an existing building that is located out near Portland, Oregon, on the left side, and the same one on the right; you can see it's a cross-dock operation but has bump outs on both sides of the building. So, you can see what the potential impact that is from a building standpoint, how it helps isolate some of those dock areas. This is a street view showing that on the left-hand side, you can see there's a dock area kind of in behind that utility pole that's blocking some of the view, but that bump out helps screen some of that visual aid from the street as you're looking at it more from the perpendicular perspective.

At this point, I believe that the applicant is here to speak on behalf of the request, and then as I said we do have a couple of individuals who might want to speak as well, so we will refer to them when the time comes.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kevin, and yeah, I like the idea and I like the design of bump out or bump in, whatever you want to call it, of the dock, so great design. Speaking of that, the applicant, if you are online – do you have anything that you would like to add to Kevin’s comments?

Mr. Hebert: Thank you, yeah, we had a...

Mr. Slavens: Sorry, I meant to – if you could state your name and address, we would greatly appreciate it; I forgot to do that with the previous applicant.

Mr. Hebert: Okay, sure. Terry Hebert with Browning Investments, we’re at 6100 West 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 150, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Hebert: Welcome. So yeah, I just wanted to mention that we had worked with the planning staff and town staff throughout all of this, so thanks to Kevin and all of his very, very valuable feedback. We also have incorporated some of the comments we received from the DRC group. You probably notice we had a couple of the bump outs, kind of in the building because there was some longer looks to it, and we added a little bit of extra concrete to give it more of that look. And then these bump outs that we have in the building corners, we like them just as much as you guys do and we hope to, and we think we’re going to, be doing those as we move forward with the rest of our buildings. It really kind of gives us a nice look; it kind of gives a little more of an office look to it and it kind of works well. We received certain comments about trying to beautify that northeast corner that kind of goes right to the roundabout, and we’ve done that with these also. Like I say, they were all very good comments, very helpful, and we were glad to work with all of them, so thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Terry. Before we turn it over to public hearing – Commission members, do you have any questions for Terry before we turn it over to public hearing?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Okay; hearing none, this is listed as a public hearing. Before we go to those at the Headquarters – Kim, do we have anybody online with comments for or against the petition?

Ms. Robinson: I have not received any comments, no.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kim. And then Kevin, did staff receive any comments prior to tonight’s meeting?

Mr. Whaley: I did not receive any written comments in addition to the people who could potentially comment here at Plainfield Fire Territory.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, so then we'll turn it over to those that are at the Fire Territory then, to speak for or against this. If you do speak, if you could please give your name and address, it would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Meyer: Good evening. My name is Joe Meyer, I'm in the Lexington Woods subdivision, I live at 1266 Turfway Drive. My neighbor here, wasn't sure of the scope of this, in terms of what buildings were going up when. I do know that that field is to be developed, and so I do want to just comment. And likewise, I appreciate the consideration in terms of those bump outs and the noise factor. That's been one of the concerns that myself and some of the neighbors have had, that as we do bump up to that field, it's quite pleasing in the sense that there's not a lot of industrial noise/traffic noise. And certainly, there's two story homes that line that back tree line and I own one of those homes, and we're just concerned about the visual aspect as we move forward. So, I appreciate the consideration for the noise. Obviously, this particular building is further east; we'll be interested to see how things play out as we move further west and the development of that land. But that would have been my main concern here, is just questions in terms of consideration given to the property values and the visual aspect. You know, if you stand on your second floor looking out, that's about 20 feet line of sight, straight out into that field, and I'm not sure what the plans are in terms of putting reasonable accommodations in there to make that appealing. I appreciate that buildings are going there and it's going to be what it's going to be, but if there's something that can be done to minimize the impact, I think that was probably the area I was interested in most in hearing. Again, I appreciate that this particular building is further east and not butting up directly against the neighborhood, so maybe that question can be tabled for another time. But if the developer can comment on what their thoughts are in terms of the plans as they develop that land, I'd welcome that at this time, if possible.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, good, thank you. Thank you for your consideration; thank you for coming forward. I think that you have another gentleman there to speak for or against it as well, and so we'll get the – we'll accumulate everything and then we'll address them all at once.

Mr. : I don't have any questions; he kind of addressed a lot of the issues, so I think we're good.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, all right, thank you. Is there anybody else in the room Kevin?

Mr. Whaley: No, there's no one else here.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, I think that's everybody's opportunity for speaking for or against the petition. With that said, we'll close this for public hearing and turn back over to Terry, if you would consider the concern or the comments around the visual from second story windows – or Kevin.

Mr. Hebert: Yes, I'd be glad to. Also, Kevin, could you do me a favor and go back to that exhibit, the one that showed kind of our building up in the top right corner? It would help me kind of address it. Yeah, there you go. You know, we are well aware of all the residents to the west and

to the south of us, so what we've done to try and make things a little bit better is that we are going to keep that existing tree line in place going all the way around the western edge of the property, and the same things with the southern edge of the property. You'll also see that we did kind of a little bump out south of the pond so we can keep a berm in place. And we're also planning on building a, you know, as much as 15' to maybe 16' tall berm, all the way along the edge of the property, to try to offer a little bit of buffering. We're even going to try to undulate it to try and make it look a little bit better. And then our hopes are that we're going to eventually put some extra landscaping on top there. And if everything works out well, because we're going to have to move a lot of dirt, we're hoping to maybe either get that berm in there now, so it has a chance to kind of establish, so that as we develop the rest of the buildings and we get closer to the residential, we'll have maybe a little bit more of an established berm with some pretty good landscaping on it. And then that will help you know, kind of maybe offset some of the sights and the sounds that are coming from our development. So, we hope to satisfy you know, maybe some of those concerns.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Terry.

Mr. Hebert: You're welcome.

Mr. Slavens: And I'm sorry, I forgot your name, that addressed it – and I know that the town does, and the Design Review Committee does take is serious around the landscape plans and the visual impact to our neighbors, so you'll definitely be taken into consideration as we move forward. Thank you, Terry, again, for addressing...

Mr. Hebert: You're welcome.

Mr. Slavens: Any other questions/comments from the Commission members?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Again, I think this is up for three – I've got to go back to it – three motions.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I didn't have any other questions or comments. It seems like this and our questions have been addressed, so if anybody else has any questions or comments, let us know. Otherwise, does anybody have a motion?

Mr. Phillip: Mr. President, I'm ready to make a motion.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Phillip: 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. Smith: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Mr. Phillip and a second from Bruce, for motion 1, for development incentive. Andrew, if you 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 motion for development incentive regarding the loading spaces is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Phillip: So, Mr. President, motion 2: 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.



2. Prior to construction the petitioner shall submit a landscape plan for the Common Area demonstrating compliance with the requirements of Article 4.7 – Landscape Provisions.
3. A Secondary Plat in conformance with the Subdivision Control Ordinance shall be submitted within 60 days from the Development Plan approval date.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Smith: Second

Mr. Slavens: We've got a motion from Mr. Phillip and a second from Mr. Smith for the development plan for DP-21-010. Andrew, if you 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

DP-21-010 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you; thank you Terry, and team.

Mr. Hebert: Thank you guys very much for all your help, we appreciate it.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, have a good rest of your evening.

Mr. Hebert: Thanks.

Mr. Slavens: The last petition up for public hearing is DP-21-014, from Hendricks Therapy Plainfield LLC. Eric?

Mr. Berg: As you mentioned, it's DP-21-014, renovation of the existing Chateau Thomas Winery into an integrated center that involves a clinic and a restaurant. So, you look at the site here to the south, or to the lower part of the screen, there will be I-70; Quaker Boulevard there to your west, or the left on screen. Across the cul-de-sac, you may remember, is Lifestyle Powersports that was approved in 2018, August of 2018; that should be constructing soon. And just to the

right or east of that is the Holiday Inn Express that you guys saw an addition to come through, I think that was probably October or September of last year. The ordinance does not give the applicant much guidance in the means of bringing the building closer into compliance with the Gateway Standards; it just does not, it doesn't say you have to hit certain things. So, on one hand, it does allow the Commission to have kind of an organic give and take, but then on the other, it can add some uncertainty and costs to the project which can be tougher on smaller, less capitalized groups. As we talked about in the staff report, the waiver is really what's bringing us to you tonight. The ordinance group will be looking at adding some guidance for applicants, as well as a way to create solutions instead of a need for waivers, but at the same time, maintain the review and purview process that you have right now. You can see here in the illustrations that it's going to be quite a bit different of a building there. The waiver is for replacing the non-architectural metal as you see on the lower left, with more of an architectural metal and other materials, there on the upper left and on the inset pictures there. You can see that they're adding more glazing, including sky lighting, and again, more different architectural features. – If we can move on to the next one here – the site plan is going to remain largely similar; they are removing a loading dock there on the east side of the building. They're adding an entrance and augmenting the current ones. They have provided information on the trash enclosure, which we did receive after the reports were sent out.

These are currently two lots, but they are going to be platted into one lot. The members who are also members of the Board of Zoning Appeals will remember that last month we did have a variance request on the parking lot. The existing conditions were such that there was not a sufficient setback, but the odd thing is that it was approved that way, so it was felt that instead of continuing a legal non-conformance, that it would be best just to clean that up because we see all sorts of times when we have to do zoning confirmation letters, that these types of things do tend to trip up financing all of it. So, we were glad that we could help clean that up. Just a note on the motion, apparently, I need to make sure that I'm using the regulation size keyboard on my surface instead of just my surface keyboard, because I did typo; the docket number on the motion there, that should be "14". So, from now on, if Kevin sees me not using the regulation size keyboard, he is going to dock me on my review. That is all that I have on this, I'll be happy to answer any questions. The applicant, I did see them, is here, but if there's nothing from me, I shall hit mute and wait for any questions.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Eric. Applicant, if you could please state your name and address, it would be greatly appreciated, if you have anything you would like to add besides what Eric has already covered.

Mr. White: Good evening, it's Nathan White, Benchmark Consulting, office at 69 Augusta Drive, Brownsburg, Indiana, and I am here for Hendricks Therapy. Eric did a pretty good job explaining what we're trying to do. This will be, we feel, an improvement to this location. We're obviously going to make substantial renovations to the building. Just so you know, this will be a mental

health facility with different types of therapies, I guess you would say, treating people's mental health; that is the main use. Eric did mention a restaurant; that is a goal, to have a small restaurant of some sort that has a healthy food option for people. So, that is the main use of the building. Of course, he went over, we're not making any major site changes, doing any substantial changes to the material of the building. So, we're asking for a waiver to use a combination of metal products and not a whole lot of masonry products. We feel that the look that we're providing is substantial improvement and trying to do masonry on an existing building that never had masonry is problematic for us. So, that's all I really wanted to add; I'd be happy to answer any questions. We do have the architect, the builder, and the owner of the practice available to answer any questions.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. White: So, we're here to do what we can.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Nathan. So, the restaurant that you plan on having in there, is that – it's not going to be a public restaurant, its more towards the clients and/or doctors in there?

Mr. White: If it happens, it will be open to the public, yes. It's a coffee shop sized restaurant is what is envisioned at this point, but it would be open to anybody to walk into.

Mr. Slavens: All right. Commission members, any questions for Nathan before we turn it over for public hearing?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Okay – hearing none, this is listed as a public hearing, so I'll go to Kim first. Are there any comments online to speak for or against the petition?

Ms. Robinson: I have not received any.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – Eric did you receive any comments prior to tonight's meeting?

Mr. Berg: We have received no comments, either yay or nay.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – and then Kevin, anybody in the Headquarters to speak for or against the petition?

Mr. Whaley: No one at Fire Headquarters.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Hearing no input, we'll close this for public hearing and turn it back over to the Commission for any further discussion and/or a motion.

Ms. Robinson: Hey Scott, really quick – it looks like Tammie Borders raised her hand. I don't know if she – I believe she's the owner – I don't know if she wanted to make a comment or not.

Mr. Slavens: Oh sorry, I did not see that. Tammie, are you on the phone?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Tammie, can you hear us?

(brief pause)

Ms. Robinson: She said, "Unable to get on."

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Ms. Robinson: Let's see if I can maybe give her the phone number to be able to call.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – while we wait for Tammie to get on, any Commission members, do you have anything you'd like to ask or discuss further? Like was said, I think Tammie is the owner of the facility.

Mr. Smith: Scott, I have one clarification, I guess. Is it our intention to go ahead and consider this and potentially take action on it? As I recall, this really did not get through the DRC. It came too late, and Design Review hasn't really had a chance to look at the metal and the design here. I'm not sure if this is to be continued or referred back to the DRC; whatever the preference is.

Mr. Slavens: Um, I'd look to Eric; your feedback... it didn't go through DRC, I think typically – it looks like there are some comments made in the staff comments that they addressed some with DRC, but are there some that haven't been addressed yet?

Mr. Berg: Yeah, this has not been through the DRC and I'm going to kind of lean on Robin and Mel a little bit here, but I believe in the past you have had cases where you have voted "aye" or "nay" and then referred it back to the Design Review Committee. Help me out, I'm going off old minutes; this was before my time, so I'm kind of leaning back on the two of you to provide some institutional memory.

Mr. Daniel: Do you remember Robin?

Mr. Brandgard: I know we have in the past, approved without DRC. I don't recall approving something and then sending it to the DRC.

Ms. Borders: Hello, hi, this is Tammie. I'm so sorry, I had technical difficulties. Can you hear me okay? There seems to be an echo.

Mr. Slavens: We can hear you, yes, but there is an echo.

Mr. Klinger: You're on now.

Mr. McPhail: That's great.

Mr. Klinger: There we go.

Ms. Borders: Okay, wonderful. Yes, I apologize; I was definitely having some technical difficulties. My computer kind of freaked out and closed out of the program. I just wanted to give a little more detail on the property and what our hopes and goals are for this project.

Mr. Slavens: Before you start, can you state your name and your address?

Ms. Borders: Yes, it's Tammie Borders, B-O-R-D-E-R-S. The project address or my home address?

Mr. Slavens: Your home address.

Ms. Borders: 304 North East Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Did you have anything else you wanted to add to what Nathan has covered, and staff covered?

Ms. Borders: Yes, unfortunately I was offline when he was talking so I'm not sure if he was able to cover some of thinking behind why we are adding a restaurant. We are hoping to attract a restaurant that has a very healthy menu, one where ideally the chef will work with our dietitian in holding community classes teaching better food choices, better food preparation, because we feel like mental health is not only affected by other variables in their environment, but also is affected greatly by what they eat. We are also looking to add another medical group on the first floor. We're looking for someone that has more alternative approaches; looking perhaps toward more functional medicine which is kind of premised on allowing our body to heal itself; nothing voodoo, nothing where you've got shockers or anything like that, but it's a new form of medicine that many prescribers and physicians are going back for additional training for. Currently, functional providers are only available on the north side, or the majority are on the north side or in Carmel. So, we feel like there's definitely a gap in the west side, especially in Plainfield and we're hoping to meet that need. Also, the conference room that we have, that will certainly be used by us for our meetings or group meetings for our patients, but also for potential exercise classes. We also want to make it an additional reserve space for anyone wanting to utilize the restaurant and have that space for meetings in the community, if they want to do so. So, the whole building in itself is not about Hendricks Therapy so much as it's about every aspect of a person's life and how it relates to their mental health.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Ms. Borders: And that's it.

Mr. Slavens: Great, thank you.

Ms. Borders: You're welcome.

Mr. Slavens: So, we'll go back to the Commission members; definitely pulled off the public hearing. Bruce, you bring up a great comment around that it has not been through DRC, especially when asking for waivers for a building material. Can we really approve this, or continue it – what do we need to do with this? Looking for recommendations from Mel, on what the correct actions should be.

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Mel, can we do anything with this if it hasn't been through DRC?

Mr. Daniel: Sorry, my computer messed up there for a minute. The Plan Commission can go forward – this has been advertised as a hearing – and act on it as they choose. Or they can send it back to the DRC; it's up to the Plan Commission to make that decision one way or another, but there's nothing to prevent them from going ahead and acting on this, if that's what they decide to do.

Mr. Kirchoff: Could the motion be contingent on the DRC review and resolution?

Mr. Daniel: The only problem with that Bill, is you don't know what they're going to –But I think if you make it contingent on their approval one way or another, I frankly think it's too general.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Daniel: I think it would have to be tied to a specific concern of theirs, one way or another.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Smith: I might add that I think the reason the DRC kind of went this way, there was just a conversation briefly among DRC members about this and – the DRC knows that sometimes a metal siding gets approved by the Plan Commission and then sometimes it doesn't. And so, here we're looking at another all metal building, pretty much, and I think it was mostly looking to kind of take the temperature, if you will, of the Plan Commission, about metal siding before the DRC spent a lot of time trying to go through the detail. That's kind of what the DRC was looking for, whether metal was going to be acceptable or not.

Mr. Brandgard: This is Robin, I'm going to jump in. I think when you look at the current building, it's your typical metal siding building which is something we would not approve today. But on the other hand, this is a remodel and they're trying to fix it up as best they could and who wants to keep an open mind when we're looking at materials because when we legislate what kind of materials can be used, we keep new types out which is not good as time moves on. Personally, I think what they did with the new metal siding and that building is a quantum leap in the way it looked. Second to that, go back to our staff; why did it come to us before it went to DRC if it needed to go to DRC? This is not good for the petitioner.

Mr. Whaley: I'll just second Bruce's comment. We viewed this as an opportunity for the Commission to provide some direction in terms of the use of the metal on the building. What we wanted to avoid was sending this to the DRC and not having them have a lot of guidance from the Commission and focusing on a variety of different materials or methods of making the metal look more compliant with the ordinance because as Eric had indicated, the ordinance says to bring it closer to the Gateway Corridor Standards, but it doesn't say how far it has to go. And so, we didn't want to waste time having the applicant go back and forth with the DRC, trying to satisfy their particular recommendations and then find out that once it got to the Commission, you might have felt completely different about the original design. So, at this point we're looking for some guidance. Obviously, this is a bit unusual; it's not your typical everyday new construction development plan where we can go to the DRC first and they can look at the standards that are applicable to the project. So, as I said, we're just looking for some guidance from the Plan Commission here.

Mr. Slavens: So, then you're not looking for a motion to approve or deny; you're looking for guidance?

Mr. McPhail: Scott, this is Kent. I think the petitioner has done a really good job of trying to convert, basically a structure that was made more for manufacturing products and trying to convert it to an office building. You know, there's limitations on what they can do with that superstructure of that building. You know, obviously they could put masonry on it, but I think that would be cost prohibitive and they probably wouldn't do anything. I know we've discussed metal way too many times and there's metal panels we've approved, but to reconstruct a building like they've got there today, I'm sure we would never approve that. But certainly, I think they've made enough improvements that's reasonable within the ordinance, that we should move forward and approve this petition.

Mr. Kirchoff: Kent, I concur with your thought process. Kevin, are you really just saying are we comfortable with this and we can move forward? Is that what you're asking us?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, you can certainly take that position. If the Commission likes the overall design and how it's presented, you could approve the waiver and the development plan both tonight. If it was a situation where you looked at this and said, you know we kind of like the use of the metal but maybe it's just a little too much and we'd like the DRC to give us some feedback on how they could incorporate some different materials, that would be an option as well. So really, it's at your discretion.

Mr. Slavens: So, I guess it would be to the Commission members if you feel comfortable with what we know and moving forward with a motion, or do we need to send this back to DRC with a recommendation of – I think we are all aligned with the metal as being okay, or the metal siding is okay enough in the details to approve it. I look for the Commission to discuss that or make a motion.

(brief pause)

Mr. Phillip: So, I agree with what Robin, Kent and Bill have said, that they're doing a good job with the kind of difficult and not particularly beautiful building that's already there, and trying to take it up a level from there. They can do masonry for that building but I know that kind of construction would be outside the norm, too expensive. So, I'm supportive of that. From a process standpoint, do we just kick this back to the DRC; I need more guidance from you guys.

Mr. Kirchoff: I think we've got motions here we can approve tonight. Don't we?

Mr. Phillip: We do

Mr. Slavens: We do if we believe that we are confident with what's presented in materials and that it doesn't need any further review, yes.

Mr. Brandgard: (microphone not on)

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, I support we move forward.

Mr. Phillip: Robin you're muted.

Mr. Smith: Scott, before we do that, could I maybe toss in a couple of questions about the building and see if this clarifies a couple of things that I think the DRC might have asked about. We've already talked about perhaps the prohibitive structural idea, but personally, the only part of the building that bothers me are what I would describe as the vertical sections. The horizontal metal and all that, I think can be very attractive. In a black and white drawing, the vertical lines kind of jump out of the paper and it looks so busy that it's kind of hard to look at. Now it may be that that's just all white and the seams kind of meld together; maybe that doesn't give the visual impression that I see on a black and white page. I assume it's not feasible to substitute EIFS or some other product, in the white portions of the building. I don't know if the developer can clarify that.

Mr. Slavens: It looks like Kevin has put back on the screen the more colored rendition of the drawing of the building.

Mr. Smith: Yes, well, those particular pictures kind of illustrate another thing, is that as I see two or three different pictures of a proposed building, the colors kind of change on me. In some of them, portions of it look more white than in other portions. You've got the blue bands; that's pretty much the same and then sometimes that looks brownish and sometimes it looks very white.

Mr. Slavens: So, typically – let me ask, since this is not a warehouse and it's really a doctor's building, office building, whatever you want to call it...

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Slavens: Does the DRC usually get into that particular breaking up of the building structurally?

Mr. Smith: Oh yeah. The overall look, and the look of the building for sure. These are definitely things that DRC is concerned about. I kind of add another question along the same lines; a couple of members of the DRC were concerned about the visual appearance of the skylights. Normally we'd treat those almost as HVAC units that have to be shielded or hidden behind a parapet. They're not in this case, and I'm not too sure how tall those are, if those are going to be very visually noticeable from the ground or not. If not, no big deal.

Mr. Slavens: Okay – Nathan, could you address especially the skylight question from Bruce?

Mr. White: I'll have to have Gordon, the Architect talk on those, because I am not familiar with the specs of the skylight at all. I think he's still on here – Gordon, are you still on?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: It looks like there's a Gordon Clark online.

Mr. White: Yeah, that's the Architect. Gordon, could you describe the skylights and how tall from the roof they're going to be?

(brief pause)

Mr. White: All right – how about Dave, can you answer that question?

(brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Did we lose everybody?

Ms. Borders: This is Tammie, can you hear me?

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Mr. Smith: Yes

Mr. White: Yes

Ms. Borders: They are only about – I understand they are only about 3 feet high, but I'm sure Gordon and Dave can attest to that. When we were on the ground and discussing them, it was their hope that they would not be visible from the ground, that they would not be seen. Regarding the coloring of the building, I know we've got some different shades here on these renderings, but the goal is to have the steel metal look, like a silvery blue, with the windows tinted another complimentary shade of blue. So, it will be essentially, blue throughout; no white.

Mr. Smith: Okay – is there another addition to the building to come in the future, or are we seeing the whole thing?

Ms. Borders: No, there's no addition; that is the entire thing. The only thing that has been modified other than the top is exterior, the awning there. That's going to be modified right now, it's kind of a "V" shape with the circular logo signage that's on that, and that will be removed, and we'll just have a more parallel awning there for the entrance of the restaurant. We're hoping to utilize that patio there for outdoor seating for the restaurant as well.

Mr. Smith: I take it you're going to have to eliminate the parking spaces on the east side of the building, between your building and the hotels. Do you have to remove those parking spaces?

Ms. Borders: No, we do not.

Mr. White: No

Ms. Borders: In fact, we have added some, especially with the removing of the loading dock which we will no longer need. They will still be utilized, and will be utilized especially for handicap because it will be more easily accessible on that side.

Mr. Smith: Okay – I just wondered about that because it looked like, on at least one of the site plans, that it indicated that those stripes would be removed, so I thought maybe you were losing that parking.

Mr. White: The parking will remain; it will need to be re-striped to adjust the parking stalls for a more efficient use.

Mr. Smith: Okay

Mr. White: We relocated some handicapped spaces on that side, so we're going to add some more handicapped parking aisles, or striped areas. So, the parking stripes immediately adjacent to the east side of the building will need to be reallocated to fit.

Mr. Smith: Right, what about the little restaurant, that little circular building out in the middle there; is that going to remain or is that going to come down to make way for a parking lot?

Mr. White: The Ritter's Custard Stand?

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. White: It's gone.

Mr. Smith: Oh, it's already gone.

Mr. White: It's been gone, yes, it's just a concrete pad now and part of that is utilized for parking.

Mr. Smith: Okay – are any of the clients or patients here, is there any overnight stay?

Mr. White: No, there is not. That's a whole different building requirement and we will have no overnight inpatient services at all.

Ms. Borders: Outpatient

Mr. White: Yeah, this is all outpatient, there's no...

Mr. Smith: No inpatient. You do consider it a medical facility though?

Ms. Borders: I consider it a mixed use building. Yes, medical will probably be three fourths of the building...

Mr. Smith: Okay

Ms. Borders: But with the restaurant addition, there will be a small retail store, and then the community spaces, those will not be medical.

Mr. Smith: Okay, two short last questions. Will you have some sort of security on this building?

Ms. Borders: Absolutely, that's a must.

Mr. Smith: Right, I'm not necessarily asking what it is, but I want to be sure that safety and security around a medical facility is assured.

Ms. Borders: Yes, absolutely, especially in mental health; we go above and beyond some of the other specialties. So, we definitely take precautions on that regard.

Mr. Smith: And lastly, the DRC would have carefully checked the lighting coming off the building or off your parking lot, and they would probably tell you, or encourage you, that any pole lights or any wall packs that you have on the building, that none of those things are going to shine towards your neighbors. Particularly since you've got two hotels right next door within a few hundred feet, we don't want lights spilling in their direction. So, there are particular light fixtures – and staff, if necessary, can help you to be sure we're all on the same page about lighting and that we're not shining the wrong way.

Mr. White: We are aware of that; all of our lights are downward facing dark sky compliant lighting, and if we need to pick a different fixture, we'd be happy to do that. I did have my lighting guy take into account the town requirements when he put the plan together.

Mr. Smith: Good, good. I would add that when it comes to the skylights, since we don't have a firm answer on that, if they are really 3 feet tall up above the roof, that's fairly high; that's as high as a heating and air conditioning unit perhaps; normally we would expect some kind of screening on those so they're not terribly visible. So, here's another case where I guess I would look to the staff for when it comes time for that detail, to help advise you on what we might be able to do. The typical possibility is to have kind of a parapet along the edge of the building which then hides the view of anything behind it. You have some portions of the building that are covered by a parapet there, a blue line it looks like. And perhaps an idea might be to extend that line further across the front of the building. So, these are the kinds of things the DRC would have asked you.

I want to say that I'm in favor of the project; I was a great lover of Chateau Thomas wine and I'm glad to see the building getting a good new purpose.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Bruce, for all questions and clarifications, appreciate it.

Mr. Berg: Mr. President?

Mr. Slavens: Yes?

Mr. Daniel: Scott? Oh, go ahead; I'm sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Berg: When I look at Article 5.5 C.4.d, Mechanical Equipment, when I look at that I'm not seeing anything even close to skylights that are listed there. It lists HVAC, pedestals for electric, phone, cable, above ground meters, those type of things. So, and that's just my interpretation.

Mr. Slavens: That's fair, it is a different categorization for sure, for what's on the roof. Thank you for that clarifications. Mel, did you have something?

Mr. Daniel: I was just going to comment that I wasn't sure that skylights fell within the same category as HVAC and that equipment, so Eric's clarified that.

Mr. Slavens: You're on the same path, okay good; glad we're on the same page.

Mr. Berg: I should have let Mel say it so that it would have sounded better.

Mr. Kirchoff: Are you ready for a motion?

Mr. Slavens: I'm ready for a motion.

Mr. Kirchoff: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested waivers finding that:

1. The requested waiver represents an 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. Slavens: Okay, we have a motion from Mr. Kirchoff, do we have a second?

Mr. Smith: Second





Mr. Slavens: Good, thank you. Good information. Anything else Kevin, Eric, anybody from staff?

Mr. Whaley: I have nothing further.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Slavens: Awesome; great evening, great topics, appreciate everything. We need a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Phillip: I move we adjourn.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion and a second. All right, thank everybody, appreciate it. Have a great evening.