

January 12, 2010

A regular meeting of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, January 12, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in Meeting Rooms 4 & 5 of the Hendricks County Government Center, 355 South Washington Street, Danville, Indiana 46122. Members present were: Mr. C. Richard Whicker, President; Mrs. Jo Ann Groves, Vice-President; Mr. Brad Whicker; Mr. Eric Wathen; Dr. Russell Hodgkin; Mr. Jon Cain and Mrs. Sonnie Johnston. Staff members present were: Mr. Don F. Reitz, AICP, Secretary and Director of Planning; Mr. Tyler Starkey, Acting County Attorney; Mr. John Ayers, County Engineer; Mr. Brett Pickett, Deputy County Surveyor; Mrs. Lesa Ternet, Planner; Mr. Eric Fazzini, Plan Technician; and Mrs. Joanne Garcia, Recording Secretary.

There was a quorum present with seven (7) voting members. Mr. Whicker then opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Whicker stated that the first order of business was approval of the minutes for the December 8, 2009 meeting.

There being no corrections or additions, Mrs. Groves made a motion to grant approval for the December 8, 2009 minutes.

Mr. Brad Whicker seconded the motion with Mrs. Johnston abstaining.

FOR – 6 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 1 –

Mr. Whicker then called for election of the Plan Commission Officers for 2010.

Mr. Cain made a motion to nominate and approve the same officers as had served in 2009, those being:

C. Richard Whicker, President  
Jo Ann Groves, Vice-President  
Don F. Reitz, Secretary  
Greg Steuerwald, Counsel

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

FOR – 7 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mrs. Groves then made a motion to nominate Sonnie Johnston to serve as the Plan Commission's Plat Committee member.

Mr. Brad Whicker seconded the motion.

FOR – 7 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Whicker then stated that two items on the agenda had requested continuances and would be continued for thirty (30) days to the February meeting.

**ZA 400/09:      RICHARD L. & LISA A. NEIER**  
**MIP 1044/09:    CLAYTON ASSEMBLY OF GOD**

Mr. Whicker then called for the first item on the agenda as follows:

**ZA 399/09:      KS HENDRICKS PARTNERS LLC;** a zoning amendment change from PB/Planned Business District to GB/General Business District, 23.4 acres, Liberty Township, S25-T14N-R1W, located on the west side of State Road 39 and north of Interstate 70. (Comer Law Office)

January 12, 2010

Mr. Ben Comer of the Comer Law Office appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that at their last meeting before the Plan Commission, they asked to rezone 23.4 acres from GB to PB to accommodate their first user. He stated at the time they had made a commitment that the 23.4 acres would be replaced by changing some of the PB zoning and zoning it back to the GB zoning district to maintain the ratio. He stated that was the purpose of the current request to honor their commitment as stated above. He stated that they were submitting two different segments for rezoning, those being a 19.4 acre parcel located due west of the existing GB zoned property and a 4 acre tract zoned GB where they intended to also honor some commitments about providing a location for a public service as well as some utility areas along County Road 900 South.

Mrs. Groves asked for clarification on Mr. Comer's statements.

Mr. Comer again explained how the commitment would be satisfied with the current rezoning request.

Mrs. Groves then asked if the access road on County Road 1000 South would remain open.

Mr. Comer stated he believed it would be rerouted and he asked Mr. Ayers for clarification.

Mr. Ayers stated that the intent was to not have the connection from County Road 1000 South to State Road 39 and instead to reroute up through the site, although the final plans had not yet been submitted. He stated the concern was that if that access remained open, there would be a lot of truck traffic that might go into the development rather than use the road being built for truck traffic.

Mr. Whicker asked if there was any minimum acreage committed to regarding the property to be reserved for public service use.

Mr. Fazzini stated that one acre was committed to but that the applicant was proposing four acres.

Mr. Reitz asked for clarification from Mr. Comer that the commitments attached to the rest of the development would attach to the current requested rezoned areas.

Mr. Comer stated yes.

There being no further questions or comments, Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to be heard, Mr. Whicker closed the public hearing and asked for further questions or comments. There being none, Mr. Whicker called for a motion.

Mrs. Groves then made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Hendricks County Board of Commissioners and adopt the positive Findings of Fact/Law for **ZA 399/09: KS Hendricks Partners LLC** subject to the following conditions:

1. Recommendations in staff's letter dated January 5, 2010;
2. The Gateway Logistics Center Development Standards; and
3. To provide one acre of the overall development for public safety purposes.

Mr. Brad Whicker seconded the motion.

FOR – 7 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

This matter would be heard by the Hendricks County Board of Commissioners on Tuesday, January 26, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. or thereafter.

The staff recommendations and positive Findings of Fact/Law were as follows:

Staff Comments: The applicant is proposing to rezone property that is currently zoned PB/Planned Business District to GB/General Business. The reason for this request is to satisfy a commitment that was made during the previous rezoning within the Kite project (ZA 398). In order to meet the commitment, approximately 23.4 acres of PB is to be rezoned to GB to replace GB zoning that was lost as part of ZA 398. The 23.4 acres of GB is being made up in two areas: 19.4 acres fronting County Road 1000 South, and 4 acres fronting County Road 900 South. This proposal can be considered a minor internal change of zoning districts to the overall Kite project.

Compatibility with current uses. The area is a mix of rural residential and agricultural uses including a few commercial uses. The property that surrounds the 19.4 acre area is currently zoned GB, PB, HB and AGR. The property that surrounds the 4 acre area is currently zoned PB and AGR. This proposal does not alter the compatibility of any previous Kite rezonings.

Compatibility with future uses. Exit 59 has received a lot of attention because of the location's economic development potential. The Comprehensive Plan pays special attention to the area by designating it as Planned Business on the Land Use Plan which includes a mix of office, light industrial and flex-tenant type businesses located in campus type settings. This proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and does not affect the compatibility of any previous Kite rezonings.

Other considerations. The previous rezoning included a commitment to meeting certain development standards shown in the document Gateway Logistics Center Development Standards. The same commitments will apply to this proposal. Additionally, a commitment made previously provided for land for public safety purposes (a Sheriff's substation or fire house).

Staff Recommendation: Based on the information provided at the time of application, staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend: **APPROVAL** in the event the petitioner commits to:

1. The Gateway Logistics Center Development Standards;
2. To provide one acre of the overall development for public safety purposes; and

**Hendricks County Area Plan Commission**

Findings of Fact/Law

ZA 399/09: KS Hendricks Partners, LLC

An application for the above noted zoning map amendment was filed in the office of the Hendricks County Department of Planning and Building (DPB). That application sought to rezone property from PB/Planned Business to GB/ General Business. Acting in its role as staff to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission, the DPB staff subsequently created a file containing all documentation of the request and made that file available for public inspection in the department's office at the Hendricks County Government Center.

In accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 5-3-1, the DPB staff published a legal notice in the Hendricks County Flyer and the Danville Republican. This notice advertised the public hearing scheduled in conformity with the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Rules of Procedure Section 3.07(D)(1). The public hearing included the above zoning map amendment on its agenda.

In accordance with Section 3.07(D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission, the applicant also sent courtesy notices to certain surrounding property owners of record and other interested persons. A copy of this courtesy notice and a list of those receiving them were made a part of the file for this rezoning petition.

The Commission conducted the hearing as advertised and heard evidence and testimony on the above noted rezoning. Meeting in open session, the Commission subsequently considered the above noted request and its

relationship to the requirements of IC 36-7-4 and the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance. A tape recording of this proceeding has been on file and available to the public in the DPB office since the date of the hearing.

In its deliberations, the Commission weighed the evidence associated with the following requirements and made the following findings.

**IC 36-7-4-603: Zoning ordinance; preparation and consideration of proposals. In preparing and considering proposals under the 600 series, the plan commission and the legislative body shall pay reasonable regard to:**

**(1) The comprehensive plan;**

The Commission finds that the proposal does substantially comply with the recommendations of the Hendricks County Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Planned Business. In anticipating distribution and warehousing, the proposed zoning will allow for complimentary uses to serve the entire park, and is consistent with this designation.

**(2) Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;**

The Commission finds that the proposal is consistent and compatible with the character of current structures and uses in the zoning district. The establishment of commercial uses is appropriate at this developing interchange area. Further, zoning standards applied to the development will ensure its compatibility with surrounding uses.

**(3) The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted;**

The Commission finds that the proposal does represent the most desirable use for which the land is adapted. The site under consideration is located within a specially designated interchange area. The proposed land uses anticipated by this rezoning are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan's expectations about how the interchange should develop.

**(4) The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction;**

The Commission finds that the proposal does conserve property values in the jurisdiction. The proposed zoning is an appropriate and desirable classification for this interchange area. Further, the proposed use is consistent with the long-established land use recommendation for the area.

**(5) Responsible development and growth.**

The Commission finds that the proposal does represent responsible development and growth. Warehouse and distribution center uses, and especially mixed uses are consistent with the county's economic development policy for this area, and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Also subject to the following:

1. The Gateway Logistics Center Development Standards; and
2. To provide one acre of the overall development for public safety purposes.

**DPR 422/09 (PRIMARY): CLAYTON ASSEMBLY OF GOD;** a development plan review to construct a new church building, 5.05 acres, Liberty Township, S11-T14N-R1w, located on the west side of State Road 39, approximately 0.8 miles south of U.S. Highway 40. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Peter Arnold of Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Arnold reviewed the location of the property. He discussed the existing waterline for which an easement would be created on the plat. He discussed the location of the two entrances called for by the INDOT plans, although they were only requesting one entrance for the site. He stated that a driveway permit had been submitted to the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT). He stated that an existing sewer line was available and owned by the Town of Plainfield and they had submitted plans to the Town. He stated, therefore, they would need two permits from INDOT, one for the force main sewer and one for the driveway as well as the permit for the sewer connection from the Town of Plainfield. He then reviewed the proposed site plans including the landscaping and parking. He stated that since State Road 39 was a

January 12, 2010

major arterial, there was a large setback line and he indicated the location of the bufferyard which included a number of trees that would remain. He showed the location of the planned pond and stated there would be a commercial well which would be permitted through the state. He stated that there would be an outlet pipe that went across the property and up to a swale to the north and they were in negotiations with John Hall, the adjoining landowner, to put an easement in place. He then reviewed the elevations for the new church structure. He stated that all of the building was being done by volunteers and the architectural plans were hand drawn. He also stated that they planned on having temporary RV parking for up to four RV's or travel trailers in the middle of the proposed parking lot for the people doing the construction work. He explained how they would extend the sewer line into the parking lot to accommodate those RV's during the construction period. He stated they had been working with Mr. Tim Belcher of the Town of Plainfield and had submitted a letter setting out the town's agreement with the proposed sewer plans. He stated it had been agreed to locate the landscaping back in the bufferyard. He reviewed the recommendations in the staff's letter dated January 5, 2010 and how they would comply with same as set out below:

- Evergreen shrubs in parking area
- Grading on site
- New plantings proposed and existing trees included with possible credit for said trees
- Bike rack included
- Sign located outside of right-of-way
- Marked walking path
- Modification requested for architectural standards for reduction in masonry to approximately 25% along the rear and south sides of the façade
- Note added that vinyl be of heavy duty grade
- Shade trees and grass in the parking lot islands
- Relief requested for screening of the electric panel to be installed on south side of building for the sewer grinder pump
- Addition of wheel stops in handicapped spaces not needed because intention for those spaces to be drive through
- Wheel stops along parking on north side not needed as there would be a curb and sidewalk
- Existing pipe lying at entrance was left by INDOT as ditches were not completed.

Mr. Whicker then asked for questions or comments.

Mrs. Groves asked about the staff's recommendation for additional plantings to be proposed to meet the bufferyard requirement independent of the parking lot screening.

Mr. Arnold stated that they needed to add evergreen bushes for the parking lot screening which they had done. He stated they would be four foot in height spaced three foot on center. He stated that was in addition to the required bufferyard.

Mrs. Groves stated that she thought the ordinance required screening of the bufferyard and the parking lot.

Mr. Arnold explained how they had complied by just moving the plantings in the bufferyard but not reducing them.

Mr. Fazzini and Mr. Arnold discussed how they had addressed and solved the concern of Mrs. Groves.

Mrs. Groves then asked about the parking lot next to the building where staff had requested wheel stops and whether eliminating them was a problem.

Mr. Reitz stated that could be dealt with administratively as long as the Plan Commission was comfortable with doing that.

January 12, 2010

Mrs. Groves asked if there were any future plans to add onto the proposed structure.

Mr. Arnold pointed out where an addition might be proposed in the future.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked how heavy gauge vinyl siding was defined.

Mr. Arnold stated they were specifying .44 mil. on the plan.

Mrs. Ternet stated that was what had been acceptable in the past.

Dr. Hodgkin asked what the capacity of the sanctuary was at any given time.

Mr. Arnold stated that they were expecting around 40 to 50 persons on any given Sunday and the maximum capacity of the sanctuary was 131.

Mr. Wathen asked if there was sufficient parking.

Mr. Arnold stated that the parking was controlled by the ordinance in allowing certain numbers of parking spaces per number of seats. He stated he believed it was one space per four seats for a church and that could be expanded by ten percent. He stated they were showing the maximum or 35 spaces.

Mr. Whicker asked for further questions.

Mr. Reitz reminded the members that there was Mr. Arnold's request for modification of the design standards for the façade treatments. He stated specifically not to require façade treatments on the south and west sides.

Mr. Arnold stated that was correct as well as a modification for a reduction on the north side.

Mrs. Groves asked how high the stone masonry would be.

Mr. Arnold stated approximately three feet.

Mr. Whicker then opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to be heard, Mr. Whicker closed the public hearing and called for further comments. There being none, Mr. Whicker called for a motion.

Mr. Wathen made a motion to grant primary approval for **DPR 422/09: Clayton Assembly of God (Primary)** subject to the following conditions:

1. Recommendations and conditions in staff's letter dated January 5, 2010;
2. Granting a modification of the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance not to require full façade masonry treatments on the west side of the building and a modification for a reduction in the amount of masonry required along the north façade;
3. Modification of landscaping requirement to allow parking lot landscaping to be incorporated into the bufferyard landscaping; and
4. Remanding secondary approval to the Administrative & Plat Committee.

Dr. Hodgkin seconded the motion.

FOR – 7 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff recommendations and conditions were as follows:

**DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

1. Subject to Drainage Board approval and the conditions of the County Surveyor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project engineer must provide an estimate of construction cost and post a performance guarantee prior to the issuance of an Improvement Location Permit.
2. The applicant has proposed to place the required six street trees along the entrance drive, rather than along the thoroughfare plan right-of-way or within the bufferyard. Staff has no objection to this request. Acceptance of this is a modification the commission has the authority to make (HCZO 7.5(M)).
3. The evergreen shrubs proposed as parking lot screening must be a minimum of four feet in height every three feet to comply with the screening requirement for parking lots adjacent to residential uses or zoning districts (HCZO 7.5(F)(2)).
4. The applicant has proposed to count the required parking lot screening towards the required bufferyard. Staff does not support this and recommends additional plantings be proposed in order to meet the bufferyard requirement independent of the parking lot screening.
5. The applicant has requested a modification from the Non-Residential Design Standards which would require only the façade treatment and masonry building material along the front, facing S.R. 39, and on the north side of the building. Acceptance of this is a modification the commission has the authority to make (HCZO 8.3(P)).
  - a. The applicant has stated that less than the required 50% masonry will be used on the north side of the building. Staff has no objection to this request as a reduced amount of masonry would more closely match what has been proposed for the front of the building. Revised architectural drawings are needed showing this.
  - b. The façade treatment and masonry building material has not been proposed for the west side of the building. As this area is being used for agriculture, Staff has no objection to this request.
  - c. The proposed vinyl siding must be heavy gauge; revised architectural drawings are also needed showing this.
6. The shoulder and roadside ditch must be shown on the plans and must comply with the Subdivision Control Ordinance or the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) road improvement plans, whichever provides a greater spacing for the ditch.
7. Flowline grades for the ditch must be shown to verify that there is positive drainage.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to secondary approval with all appropriate fees paid prior to the start of any construction.
2. This project is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit covering storm water quality. Procedures there under are governed locally by the Hendricks County Stormwater Management Ordinance and corresponding Technical Standards Manual. An application, fees, construction plans, specifications and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be presented for approval to the Hendricks County Drainage Board separately from the application to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval for a plat, PUD or development plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Secondary Approval (or Approval in the case of minor plats) by the Plan Commission or its Administrative and Plat Committee. In addition, an Erosion Control Permit issued by the Hendricks County Surveyor is required for individual building lots prior to obtaining a Building Permit from the Planning and Building Department.

January 12, 2010

3. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
4. The applicant will have two (2) years from the date of approval to obtain an Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit. Should this two (2) year period elapse without the applicant having obtained the appropriate permit, the development plan approval will become null and void.
5. Development plan approval does not constitute approval of signage unless such approval is expressly granted by the Plan Commission as part of this development plan. Signage review and approval is typically carried out as a permitting process separate from development plan approval.
6. No Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit shall be issued until any plat associated with Secondary Development Plan Review has been recorded.
7. A State Plan Release is also required for multifamily, residential and non-residential (commercial and industrial) projects. In no way will a Development Plan Review be construed as a substitute or a waiver for these other required permits.

**TSA 01/10: AMENDMENT TO THE 2004 HENDRICKS COUNTY SUBDIVISION CONTROL ORDINANCE**, a proposal to amend Section 4.03 Expiration of Primary Approval and Section 5.02 Expiration of Approval, changes that pertain to subdivision regulations in the area under the jurisdiction of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission.

**TSA 02/10: AMENDMENT TO THE 2004 HENDRICKS COUNTY SUBDIVISION CONTROL ORDINANCE**, a proposal to amend Section 3.15 2(a.) Provisions for Completion of Improvements, changes that pertain to subdivision regulations in the area under the jurisdiction of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission.

Mrs. Ternet presented two amendments to the Hendricks County Subdivision Control Ordinance which she explained were basically minor housekeeping proposals.

Mr. Whicker asked for questions or comments. There being none, Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to be heard, Mr. Whicker closed the public hearing. He stated that these matters must be approved by the Board of County Commissioners. He then called for two motions.

Mr. Cain made a motion to send a favorable recommendation for **TSA 01/10** and **TSA02/10** to the Hendricks County Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

FOR – 7 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

These matters would be heard by the Hendricks County Board of Commissioners on Tuesday, January 26, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. or thereafter.

The ordinances were as follows:

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE HENDRICKS COUNTY INDIANA SUBDIVISION CONTROL ORDINANCE BY AMENDING SECTION 4.03 EXPIRATION OF PRIMARY APPROVAL AND 5.02 EXPIRATION OF APPROVAL**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners of Hendricks County, Indiana, adopted the Hendricks County Subdivision Control Ordinance on December 21, 2004;

January 12, 2010

**WHEREAS**, the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission has recommended that the Subdivision Control Ordinance be amended by changing Section 4.03 Expiration of Primary Approval and 5.02 Expiration of Approval;

**WHEREAS**, the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission has conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendment (TSA 01/10) and voted to forward a favorable recommendation to the County Commissioners; and

**WHEREAS**, the County Commissioners have received and reviewed the Area Plan Commission's report, have considered the Area Plan Commission's recommendations, and find that the adoption of the recommended amendment would promote the health, safety and convenience of the people of Hendricks County.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:**

Bold – Text change

**AMENDING SECTION 4.03 TO READ AS FOLLOWS:**

**EXPIRATION OF PRIMARY APPROVAL** -- Primary approval for a major subdivision shall be valid for **two** years from the date of approval, unless the Plan Commission grants an extension. If secondary approval is not granted before the expiration of two years, the primary approval shall be null and void.

**AMENDING SECTION 5.02 TO READ AS FOLLOWS**

**EXPIRATION OF APPROVAL** -- Approval for a minor subdivision shall be valid for **two** years from the date of approval, unless an extension is granted by the Plat Review Committee or the Plan Commission. If not granted before the expiration of **two** years, the approval shall be null and void.

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE HENDRICKS COUNTY INDIANA SUBDIVISION CONTROL ORDINANCE BY AMENDING SECTION 3.15 2 (a.) PROVISIONS FOR COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners of Hendricks County, Indiana, adopted the Hendricks County Subdivision Control Ordinance on December 21, 2004;

**WHEREAS**, the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission has recommended that the Subdivision Control Ordinance be amended by changing Section 3.15 2 (a.) Provisions for Completion of Improvements;

**WHEREAS**, the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission has conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendment (TSA 02/10) and voted to forward a favorable recommendation to the County Commissioners; and

**WHEREAS**, the County Commissioners have received and reviewed the Area Plan Commission's report, have considered the Area Plan Commission's recommendations, and find that the adoption of the recommended amendment would promote the health, safety and convenience of the people of Hendricks County.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF HENDRICKS COUNTY, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:**

Bold – Text change

**AMENDING SECTION 3.15 2 (A.) TO READ AS FOLLOWS:**

a. **Due to Weather** - - Delays which may be considered because of weather conditions, such as consistent temperatures of freezing or below include, but are not limited to placement of the asphalt surface course, boundary improvements, **centerline monumentation**, certain erosion control measures, sidewalks, landscaping and/or street lights (if required).

Mr. Whicker then called for Mr. Reitz to present his item for discussion as follows:

**QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY**

Mr. Reitz then stated that he had distributed copies of the draft Request for Proposal. He stated that the Quality of Life Survey steering committee had met earlier in the month to discuss moving forward with doing a Quality of Life Survey. He stated that the Commission had heard about it for the past two or three months. He stated the big question was as far as feasibility goes, could the county actually afford to go forward with this plan. He stated that the way to determine that was to distribute a proposal and receive responses. He stated the form involved the Quality of Life Survey and Report similar to the Jacksonville, Florida survey and report. He stated that they wanted to determine the cost for this survey.

Dr. Hodgkin asked what the deadline of 2 April 2010 was.

Mr. Reitz stated that indicated when the proposals had to be submitted to Mr. Reitz. He stated that the planning staff was one of several agencies involved.

Mrs. Groves asked about the ongoing funding and in-kind services.

Mr. Reitz explained how the City of Jacksonville sustained their program and how to acquire steady sources of income for the project.

Mr. Wathen asked what was done with the completed surveys.

Mr. Reitz explained that what should be obtained was a document that was looked on as an important source of community information by decision makers, by councils, by town councils, lending agencies, economic development agencies, grant writing institutions, etc. He stated it was important for establishing local government priorities, funding and policy making.

Mr. Wathen expressed his concern that if the study was done and it was determined there were deficiencies found, then it might be stated that there were issues that had to be fixed. He stated he was concerned with the consequences of this study.

Mr. Reitz stated that the notion was to establish a set of indicators that were proxies for what they considered a quality of life. He stated these indicators may go up or down and may or may not improve. He stated that the notion was that there would be concrete indicators on an annual basis being looked at reliably in order to judge whether the community was doing good or bad. He stated there might be unintended consequences that he could not answer to.

Mr. Whicker stated he had gone to the Jacksonville, Florida website and by looking at their approximately twenty year history, it showed how they had tracked and what entities were contributing in various ways and how the information was being used. He stated also that during the updating of the Hendricks County Comprehensive Plan, early on the committee felt that the comp plan should be far more comprehensive. Mr. Whicker stated it might be the time to determine what the quality of life was for Hendricks County. He stated that because of the economic situation in the country, the Plan Commission and planning department would not see the type of workload as had been seen in the past and he felt the proposal would allow the planners to do planning that was more encompassing than simple land use.

January 12, 2010

Mr. Wathen stated that the county had turned down federal money because they did not want to say things that were not true about the county which would cause unintended consequences.

Mr. Whicker asked the members to give a lot of thought about the Quality of Life Survey proposal. He asked them to go to the website for the city of Jacksonville, Florida to look at how they had utilized the program.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that it was his understanding that at this point in time, the Commission was deciding whether to instruct Mr. Reitz to move forward with obtaining Request for Proposals.

Mr. Whicker stated that was correct but if the Commission was not serious about this proposal, he didn't want to waste the time of others obtaining the RFP's.

Mr. Reitz stated that the steering committee made up of a group of independent agencies was participating because they believed it to be a good idea. He stated if that group decided they wanted to send out an RFP, they could do so but he stated he would not want to be a part of it and not have the Plan Commission's support.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if those other agencies would also be involved in funding the proposal.

Mr. Reitz stated he believed the anticipation was that the agencies that participated would contribute either money or in-kind services or both.

Mr. Whicker stated that they would not move forward with the program without some consensus on how to fund it.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated he understood but was interested in what costs would be involved and he asked if there was a line item for the project in the department's budget.

Mr. Reitz stated that they had a line item for consulting services.

Mrs. Groves asked if the Chambers of Commerce had any interest in the proposal.

Mr. Reitz stated that this was just the very basic beginning of the process and that it was just an idea that he and others thought was a good idea. He stated whether it was something that was feasible or not was still not determined. He said right now it was a group of interested agencies who would like to see if such a program was possible. He stated if the program was determined to be worthwhile pursuing, then there would be other agencies, banks, industrial representatives, etc., participating.

Mr. Cain stated he felt the proposal had merit. He stated that one of the reasons for citizens and businesses to move into a community was "quality of life." He stated that the program would provide information that would be helpful to those wishing to relocate to our area.

Mr. Reitz stated that this was part of a larger issue to be discussed that had been brought about by the change in the economy. He stated that the last fifteen years or more were spent in central Indiana with unprecedented growth and development. He stated that this had constrained planning to land use or physical development. He stated that planning did entail more things than just deciding on rezoning, subdivision platting or commercial development. He discussed what planning entailed other than administering plan commission agendas. He stated that currently, the planning staff would be participating in the capital improvements plan for the county as well as having closer ties with economic development. He stated that the role of the Plan Commission was changing as well.

Mr. Whicker then suggested the members determine by consensus how they wished for Mr. Reitz to proceed.

Mr. Brad Whicker gave a favorable consensus to proceed with the RFP.

January 12, 2010

Dr. Hodgkin gave his favorable consensus.

Mr. Cain gave his favorable consensus.

Mrs. Groves gave her favorable consensus.

Mrs. Johnston gave her favorable consensus.

Mr. Whicker gave his favorable consensus.

Mr. Wathen asked if the consensus could be contingent upon favorable funding.

Mr. Reitz stated he felt that was understood.

Mr. Whicker then stated that Mr. Reitz had a consensus to move forward with obtaining the RFP's for the Quality of Life Survey proposal which was contingent upon obtaining funding.

Mr. Whicker asked Mr. Reitz to send all the members a web link to the Jacksonville site.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Whicker adjourned the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

---

Don F. Reitz, AICP, Secretary