

July 9, 2019

A meeting of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, July 9, 2019 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. Brad Whicker, President; Mr. Walt O'Riley; Mr. Tim Whicker; Mr. Jeff Pell; Mr. Bob Gentry; and Mr. Ron Kneeland. Members absent were Mr. Damon Palmer. Staff members present were Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Secretary and Director of Planning; Mr. Greg Steuerwald, County Attorney; Mr. John Ayers, County Engineer; Mrs. Suzanne Baker, Senior Planner; and Mrs. Brandy Swinford, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. There were six (6) members present.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated the first order of business was approval of the minutes from the May 14, 2019 meeting as well as the June 11, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Pell motioned for approval for minutes from the May 14, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Tim Whicker seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 1 –

Mr. Kneeland abstained from voting as he was not on the board during the May meeting.

It was determined that there were not enough members present at the June meeting to vote on the meeting minutes, and they were continued to the August 13, 2019 meeting.

**ZA 464/19: REDWOOD ACQUISITIONS;** a zoning amendment change from AGR/Agriculture Residential District to RE/Multi-Family Residential District; 22.05 acres; Lincoln Township; S6-T16-R2; located approximately 600 feet north of the intersection of E. 600 North and N. 900 East on the east side of the road. (Russell A. Brown, Attorney)

Elizabeth Bentz Williams from Clark, Quinn, Moses, Scott & Grahn LLP of Indianapolis appeared representing Redwood Acquisitions. On June 26, 2019 they held a neighborhood meeting and received input from them. They have also been working with staff for a few months and have completed a fiscal analysis as well as a traffic study. They have been in conversation with one of the town counselors, Brian Jessen, as well as the town attorney, Tricia Leminger and have agreed to ask for a continuance to address some of the questions of the town.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that he would be willing to hear from a few of the key speakers on this petition to share their concerns. He noted that there would be another public hearing on this matter if it were continued and they could wait to speak at that time if they wished.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked for a motion for a continuance.

Mr. Tim Whicker motioned for continuance of **ZA 464/19: Redwood Acquisitions** to the August 13, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

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

Mr. Brad Whicker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Brad Whicker called the names on the sign-up sheet. The first two people signed up wanted to wait until the August meeting to speak.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Brian Jessen, 339 Andscott Drive, Brownsburg appeared. He is the president of the Brownsburg Town Council. He stated he wanted to make the commission members aware that the town recently adopted and update to their 2012 Comprehensive Plan. They have included small areas within the comprehensive plan for that section along Ronald Reagan Parkway. It is referred to as Ronald Reagan Parkway North section. He stated that though Redwood Acquisitions has petitioned to change the zoning, the town would like to preserve sufficient frontage along 56<sup>th</sup> Street and Ronald Reagan Parkway for non-residential development. They have some concerns with current plot the way it is shown. It removes some of the potential especially for the corner. They have some concerns about the corner of County Road 900 and 56<sup>th</sup> Street as he's sure many of the residents will as well with the increase in traffic flow in that area. They want to make sure they address that area with a signal of some kind. He stated that some of the comments at the neighborhood meeting were confusing, as well as some of the comments back from the town were taken out of context. When the petitioner contacted the Town of Brownsburg about this project, there was some confusion as to why they did not ask for annexation into town based on the location. Their concern is if the county allows the development like this and as the other areas start to develop, there will be a hole in the map if they are not annexed into the town. He would like to be able to sit down with Redwood in the next 30 days and talk about a possible annexation into the town. There have also been some concerns brought to them from the Brownsburg Fire Territory and the police department.

Mr. John Voight, 310 Stadium Drive, Brownsburg appeared. He is the Chief Operating Officer for the Brownsburg Community School Corporation. He stated on behalf of the superintendent and the board of trustees; they are not in support of the zoning petition. He stated that their school district is experiencing a high rate of enrollment growth. They are averaging 224 new students a year and have been doing so for the past five (5) years. For context, he noted an elementary school holds approximately 600 students. This current enrollment rate is the high growth projection based on a demographic study they had done in 2015. They have had seven (7) years of declining overall property tax rates for their residents. Their concern is that with enrollment growth that exceeds that projection would cause them to move outside their ability to continue to provide the level of service to their students and maintain the property tax decline. In the past two (2) years there have been several significant multi-family properties approved and completed within the town which have been brought into their school district. Additional multi-family development will put further pressure on their ability to manage and hold capacity. In turn it will make it highly likely that they will be put in a position of having to increase property taxes in order to accommodate the growing number of students and maintain the quality of education they are currently providing.

Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

**MAP 743/19 (PRIMARY): GENTRY WOODS (ESTATE SUBDIVISION);** an 11-lot major estate subdivision; 82.32 acres; Center Township; S31-T16N-R1W; located on the southwest quadrant of the intersection of County Roads 200 North and 200 West. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse, Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared with Mr. Bill Staley who is the developer. He stated that they were there to ask for a continuance. His office mistakenly sent out letters in error for this month instead of August. He explained why they were asking for a continuance. He noted that staff had asked them to consider some revisions for the plans and do a wetlands analysis of the property. They also thought it was appropriate to schedule a meeting with the neighbors outside of this meeting to hear their input. That meeting was held last night. Tomorrow after the Administrative & Plat Committee meeting, they are meeting with staff to go over everything and how to proceed.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked for a motion on the continuance.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Gentry motioned to continue **MAP 743/19: Gentry Woods (Estate Subdivision)** to the August 13, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Pell seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

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

Mr. Brad Whicker opened the public hearing. Both people signed up to speak on the matter declined and wanted to wait until next month.

There being no one else who wished to speak on the matter, Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

**DPR 475/19 (PRIMARY): I-70 WEST, LLC – BLDG. 3;** a development plan review for a new warehouse building; 53.98 acres; Liberty Township; S26-T14N-R1W; located at Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39 (Studio A of Indianapolis, Inc.)

Mr. Max Mouser, Studio A of Indianapolis, Inc. appeared with the developer, Mr. Ken Kern with I-70 West, LLC. He went on to review the modifications requested on their petition.

1. Bicycle parking – they are requesting 6 spaces instead of the 26 required. Three at each end of the building and they would add more if the future tenant needed them.
2. Perimeter landscaping on the north side of the building for the parking lot. Sunbeam owns the property to the north, and they have future plans to develop. Not knowing the connections to the pond and roadways, it would difficult to plan the landscaping now. They will meet all the buffer requirements at that time when any new buildings go in.
3. Perimeter landscaping on the south side – instead of spreading the landscaping out they are proposing doing a 3-foot mound along Innovation Boulevard and doing landscaping on top of it
4. Waste container; they are proposing to wait until the tenant(s) are established first. They are also requesting the modification for screening since they would not know where the tenants want the waste container, they would not know screening at this time. Typically, in this type of facility, there is not a waste container but a compactor that would be located near the loading docks.

He stated that the buffer yard requirement modification that they originally requested; they have since discovered that the 3-foot high mound requirement had been removed during the original zoning case. They now meet the buffer yard 3 requirements, so that would be removed from their petition. They are adding the 4 points or type 3 buffer yard with new landscaping of evergreens. He explained the with a cross section slide of how it would look. It would start with the existing trees in the ditch, then the 9-foot evergreens, the drive lane, then the car parking lot with the parking lot street trees. He showed the elevation as well. He pointed out there will be a 3-foot evergreen shrub lining the parking to shield the headlights from the houses. He stated that they had discussed roof mounted equipment and did the sight triangles from the boundary lines showing a 7-foot unit at 25 feet back. None of those would be seen. If they put any equipment closer than the 25 feet, they would put the screening up. He stated that the enclosure looks very similar to the units themselves. They have proposed the color variations both vertically and horizontally instead of the fifty (50) percent masonry requirement as well as the offset projection ordinance. He provided current photos of the fence row showing the existing trees.

July 9, 2019

Mr. O'Riley asked how tall the sidewalls were on the building.

Mr. Mouser replied that they were forty (40) feet at the high point and thirty-six (36) on the low side.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any other questions from the plan commission members.

Mr. Brad Whicker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Brent Clark, 9859 S. County Road 100 E., Clayton appeared. He had a question about an ordinance about the seven (7) foot height on the roof top mounted equipment. He wanted to know if that was 7 feet from the roof or the curb that the unit sits on. He stated that 7 feet wasn't very tall for a built-up unit, usually they run anywhere from 8 to 12 feet if they are just small package units. He asked if they were using tapered insulation and was curious as to the overall height. He then asked about drainage; wanting to know if all the parking lots were going to drain to the west towards the residential property owners.

Mr. Greg Fernandez, 9641 S. County Road 100 E., Clayton appeared. He thanked the members and staff for granting to the 30-day continuance last month to open dialog and meet with the residents. He stated that the current zoning ordinances are not protecting the residents. He feels that other towns around the county have the appropriate landscaping buffer between industrial and residential. He stated that they have obtained approximately 900 signatures of concerned citizens regarding this petition. He wanted to ask the county to spend more time reviewing this petition and amending the zoning ordinances, and maybe have a meeting with the builders. He is concerned with the safety issues that come with having an industrial zoned property so close to a residential one. He stated they have sent letters to the elected officials in hopes to reach a better solution for the residents.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that what has been presented they have met all the county's requirements of the ordinance. From a legal standpoint they have a very thin line to consider other alternatives. They do review the ordinances on a semi-regular basis, but they cannot take action and change an ordinance and make them abide by a higher standard on a project that is currently before us. It is not a realistic request to change the ordinances mid-stream on a project.

Mr. Fernandez replied that he understood. He stated that they did send a letter with that request and he believed that was why they were granted the 30 days. By hearing the proposal tonight, he feels that their letter has not been considered. He feels that the 30 days was a waste of time because they are not any closer to a happy medium for the residents. He feels that this will set a precedent for the county on how it will be handled in the future.

Ms. Jennifer Welch, 9557 S. County Road 100 E., Clayton appeared. Her property will eventually share two (2) property lines with this development, so what is decided now will determine the standard for the future. She read the letter that was sent to staff and forwarded to the developer as well as the plan commission reviewing the resident's requests. She also presented the petition with the signatures to the plan commission.

Ms. Rachele Baker, 9675 S. County Road 100 E., Clayton appeared. She had a question regarding advertising public notice requirement. She asked if the signage at the site had to be at the closest local road.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that it just has to be on their property, there is no requirement as to where it has to be placed. He stated that is why they rely on the mailers.

July 9, 2019

Ms. Baker stated that she was a natural resource consultant by profession. She wanted to point out the environmental requirements for development. She stated that the ditch was a jurisdictional waterway and cannot be touched without an Army Corps of Engineers section 404 permit. There are isolated wetlands on the property that cannot be touched without permission from IDEM. Any of the trees along the ditch cannot be taken down during bat season without emergent counts. It must be licensed through a permitted bat biologist and they have to do an evaluation of whether there are potential bat roost trees. That would be any tree over three (3) inches DPH which would be pretty much all the trees in the ditch. Then there is Rule 5; she stated that the first thing she noticed this morning was the sound of equipment backing up. Her understanding was that the drainage board approval was going to happen at the same time tonight.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that this was not a drainage board issue. They received drainage board approval this morning and they can legally move dirt.

Ms. Baker stated that the Rule 5 requires weekly inspections or more often if there is a heavy rainfall. She would like to see the Rule 5 permit and the submittal. She asked if that goes to the Clean Water Department or IDEM.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that it goes to the Clean Water Department.

Ms. Baker asked if that was publicly available.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that she would have to ask Mr. Jim Mardis but he believed it was.

Ms. Baker stated that anything over an acre would require that permit and associated inspections. Any discoloration in the water in the ditch is a violation, as well as any mud tracked onto the local roads. She stated that she would be there to help them comply with all the regulations. She asked if all the roads within the industrial park were local jurisdiction and maintained by local monies.

Mr. Ayres replied that they were.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that they dedicate them to the county, and we maintain them. They build them at their expense.

Ms. Baker stated that they were then being paid for and maintained with the taxpayer's money even though the only place they lead is to the warehouses.

Mr. Ayres stated that they were on the county's road inventory and we receive gas tax dollars.

Ms. Baker then asked if any tax incentives granted.

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that on every one of those buildings there are incentives. He stated that the incentives start at fifty (50) percent.

Ms. Baker asked if any permits needed to be posted onsite at the beginning of earth moving.

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that it was at the beginning of any constructural construction, not earth moving.

Ms. Baker asked if the Rule 5 permit needed to be posted at the beginning of earth moving.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Brad Whicker replied that he could not comment on that, but he believed that the acreage size provides them with less oversight. When you have a larger parcel, the key component is to maintain the erosion and silt on your site. He stated that she was welcome to check with the Clean Water Department on that.

Ms. Baker noted that many of the people in the audience were not adjacent property owners, but that they were there to show support for what is going to eventually affect them. She stated that this will eventually affect everyone's property values within the area. In her opinion this will be taking money from the property owners. She stated she understood it was going to be a job creator, but in today's world of social media, everyone will know that those 300 jobs came at the expense of their property values.

Mr. Adam Beck, 1196 E. County Road 1000 S., Clayton appeared. He pointed out his property on the overhead. He had spoken to Mr. Jason Widner that morning. He stated that his property line was where the fence was located. Mr. Widner explained to him that the center of the road was going to be 35-feet from that line. He stated that that would be extremely close to his property. His driveway is approximately 20-feet and then 35 feet from there would be the center of the road. He was unsure why it had to be that close. He had asked Mr. Widner if there was going to be any sort of barrier, and he stated there was not any plan for a barrier. Mr. Beck has four (4) small children so he is concerned about safety. He stated that the people coming out of the existing warehouses now drive recklessly so he would like to see some sort of barrier or fence there.

Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Mouser responded to the statements and concerns. The previous spacing of the evergreen trees was going to be 40 feet, they are now placing them at 18-20 feet apart. They have come back and beefed up the landscaping and they are leaving the ditch and existing trees as it is. They are not changing drainage patterns at all. He stated that the bats were discussed. What was said is accurate if you have federal funding. This being a private project the bats do not play a part in tree clearing. They had a wetland evaluation done and they have had the property mitigated. He stated that the Rule 5 is done and has been submitted to the state. The state would have a copy of that as well as the Clean Water Department. He stated from the county's comprehensive plan the entire section up to County Road 900 over to County Road 100 as well on the other side of the interstate are on the comp plan zoned for industrial. In reference to the height of the roof mounted equipment; he stated that is a number they use for standard units. They will not have any units on them until they have a tenant. They do line of sight studies to show if something were there. He stated that the parking lot does drain to the west into the retention pond then to the ditch. He stated that they would be willing to work with Mr. Beck on a barrier of some sort.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if Mr. Mouser could touch on the concerns of the constituents in their letter. He believed there were six (6) major requests and that they had committed to four (4) of them.

Mr. Mouser replied that the ditch, tree line, and evergreens were all met. As far as the light/noise pollution, he stated they were meeting the ordinance. They aren't trying to over light the site by any means. Regarding the mound, it is no longer required based on the previous zoning case. He stated the parking lot is screened by a 3-foot high shrub. They would be open to a fence if the residents are open to some losing some of the landscaping. It is not what they want, as they think the evergreens will create a more long-term screening than a fence would.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any questions from Plan Commission members. He asked Mr. Dombrosky to clarify an email that was sent out on the minimum landscaping requirements.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Dombrosky stated that in 2005 when it was rezoned, they committed to landscaping standards which are almost identical to what our requirements are today. When we updated our ordinance a year later, we updated our standard for this situation to match essentially what they committed to in that zoning amendment. The difference is that the mound wasn't a part of the original commitment or the original ordinance because of the drainage problem it could cause, but it's required to be a part of the buffer today. The language says that it is required to be incorporated. We did not hold them to that because of their commitment from the original zoning case. Staff recommended that they stick with what they had, which exceeds the requirement and consider where they could add fencing.

Mr. Mouser stated that the mound is worth 0.5 on the 4-point scale for landscaping. They have the full 4 points with the landscaping. There is additional landscaping there because of the mound not being there.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked where the property line was located. There was a discrepancy last time.

Mr. Mouser replied that it was on the west side of the ditch. The ditch was on their property.

Mr. Gentry asked if there were a mound, what the dimensions would be.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they don't have a requirement for the top, but they do have a minimum slope.

Mr. Gentry asked Mr. Dombrosky, in his opinion, where does the petitioner not meet the remonstrators requests.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that it was the fence and the mound. They requested a 3-foot mound and an 8-foot privacy fence on top of that. He distributed the letter to Mr. Mouser as well as the plan commission members. He stated that it was a subjective issue that they would have to decide on. Staff's recommendation was to try and incorporate fencing into their design where they could. As discussed, many times before, staff does not recommend mounds because of the drainage problems it causes.

Mr. Gentry stated that he wants Mr. Mouser to succeed but not at the remonstrators expense. He stated that he doesn't see how you would keep a fence on top of a mound with the wind. He's seen other places where it starts to look bad. He then asked who maintains the trees. The coniferous trees expire quite frequently. Would they replace an 18-foot tree with a 5-foot tree?

Mr. Dombrosky replied that there is a 3-year maintenance period on them, then it would be a zoning ordinance violation. In theory, they must maintain them in perpetuity. When they die, they do not have to replace them in kind, just a new tree.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that in summary, what we have before us is a sensitive industrial development abutting residential. The property has been zoned many years ago. The petitioner has met or exceeded every requirement the county has in place today.

Mr. Tim Whicker stated that the tree spacing will fit in well.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that it is closer than we normally see.

Mr. Mouser replied that the ordinance required 20 foot spacing and they have gone tighter than that.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked where the trees are going to start and end.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Mouser showed on the slide where they would be going. When the road expands to the north, they would put the same level of landscaping as they are proposing now.

Mr. Tim Whicker asked where the road was stopping to the south.

Mr. Mouser replied that it was stopping 20 feet short of County Road 1000 N.

Mr. O'Riley asked if the road could be moved.

Mr. Mouser stated that it would not work with the plans for the buildings.

Mr. Gentry asked if they could move the road over to accommodate a mound on the south for screening of Mr. Beck's property.

Mr. Mouser replied that they would prefer to do a fence or other landscaping.

Mr. O'Riley asked how feasible it was to put a fence on the high point of the parking lot.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that if he puts a fence in, then they will lose trees.

Mr. Mouser stated that he would be more sympathetic if this were not a 45-foot wide existing, heavily landscaped ditch buffer as well as adding 9-foot tall evergreens. He is sympathetic, but the existing buffer is better than anything you will find in other parts of the county.

Mr. O'Riley stated that he understands it is not required, but he would feel more comfortable with a fence at the edge of the parking lot. He thinks it would help the residents be able to accept this better with not having the mound.

Mr. Gentry asked Mr. Mouser why it is either/or; trees or fence, why could they not have both.

Mr. Mouser replied that it was for financial reasons.

Mr. Gentry asked if when they approach something like this, is there any thought given to building 100-foot less of a warehouse to accommodate.

Mr. Mouser stated that there is thought in certain aspects of it. In this case, the residential ended up with the heavier parking lot to keep the building back. The building technically could be were the edge of the road is. They are 450-feet back from the boundary line.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any further questions or comments. He stated that the petitioner has met, with the exception of the waivers, the requirements of the ordinance. The waivers requested are the normal requests made by a developer for this type of project. He is sensitive to the residents as this will set a precedent for the future buildings that are to come. We cannot impose a greater requirement out of the petitioner outside of dealing with the ordinance. We would have to look at the ordinance after deciding on this. He then asked for a motion for approval or denial.

Mr. Brad Whicker motioned for an approval of **DPR 475/19: I-70 West, LLC – Building 3**. He stated that he does not make the motion lightly, but it meets the requirements set forth.

There being no second to the motion the motion dies. Mr. Brad Whicker then asked if there was a motion for denial.



July 9, 2019

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that we have a petitioner that has met a reasonable number of the requests outside of the fence. He understands it is a sensitive subject, but we have a developer with a zoned property that is meeting the county's requirements with the exception of some typical waivers that have been granted on other projects every time. We are going to put ourselves in a very close grounds for him to take legal action against us.

Mr. Steuerwald stated that they have a ministerial function. If they meet every aspect of the ordinance, then we have no basis for denial. The only basis for denial would be for waivers. That is what the plan commission is here for, to see if the petition meets the ordinance. He cannot defend that if they would file suit.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that if Mr. Mouser removes the waivers, they would have no legal grounds for a denial.

Mr. Tim Whicker motioned for the approval of **DPR 475/19: I-70 West, LLC – Building 3** subject to staff recommendations and waivers requested.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion, with Mr. Gentry and Mr. O'Riley voting against.

FOR – 4 –

AGAINST – 2 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

**DPR 476/19 (PRIMARY): AUTOZONE;** a development plan review for a new auto parts store; 1.254 acres; Guilford Township; S20-T14N-R2E; located approximately 325 feet North of the intersection of Prosperity Circle and Union Mills Drive, along the existing Meijer access road with frontage along State Road 67. (Prism Engineering & Design Group LLC)

Mr. Jason Hall, Prism Engineering & Design Group LLC appeared on behalf of the petitioner. He stated the project would be located on State Road 67 in front of the Meijer store. He stated it would be an outlet of the Meijer development. It would be a 7,381 square foot building. He pointed out that there was no access from State Road 67, it would be from the existing Meijer access road. They are requesting two modifications; the first being dumpster location. They have double frontage, so they are requesting to put the dumpster in the rear between the building and the roadway. They have proposed planting spruce trees to screen from the roadway. The other modification is for parking spaces. According to the zoning ordinance, they would be allowed 28 parking spaces. They are asking for 37 due to the shift changes and peak hours there would likely be more spaces needed. The building would be a split face block in a sand dune color scheme. He showed the west elevation that would be seen from State Road 67. He showed the view from each side of the building noting where delivery doors, and rear access doors would be located. There is a free-standing sign, constructed of painted masonry. They agree with all the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any questions for the petitioner.

Mr. Gentry asked if there was really a need for so many with so many parking spaces located at Meijer that go unused except for the holiday season.

Mr. Hall replied that with their employee count and their shift times, there would possibly be another 8-10 cars in the parking lot. They do have the parking broken up along the side and front to give the appearance of a smaller parking area instead of one big lot.

Mr. Gentry asked if the adjoining property owners were okay with the traffic patterns.

July 9, 2019

Mr. Hall replied that they are connecting the property lines already.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if they had received their tri-county approval for everything.

Mr. Hall replied that they had not at this time. They have submitted plans to them, and he has been in communication with them. They were going to wait until they had the final plans before they approved them.

Mr. Brad Whicker opens the public hearing.

There being no one to speak, Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gentry motioned to approve **DPR 476/19: AutoZone** subject to the staff letter and recommendations.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

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

**DPR 477/19 (PRIMARY): HENDRICKS COUNTY GATEWAY PARK, LOT 1;** a development plan review for a new warehouse building; 37.14 acres; Liberty Township; S36-T14N-R1W; located southwest of the State Road 39 and Interstate 70 interchange. (American Structurepoint)

Mr. Nick Everhart, American Structurepoint appeared on behalf of the petitioner. They were approved earlier this year for a 620,000 square foot building. They have revised the plans for a 442,000 square foot building. The lot is a little smaller due to the decrease in building size. It is located at the State Road 39 and Interstate 70 interchange. The trailer parking is still located on the north and south sides. The office bump outs will be on the southeast and southwest corners. There is employee parking along the east side of the building as well as the south side along Gateway Drive. It is a precast concrete building. He discussed the modifications requested. All the modifications were consistent with what was previously approved with the exception of the substitution of evergreen trees to shrubs. The modifications requested were the following:

1. Type 3 buffer
2. Interior tree spacing
3. Exterior parking plantings
4. Offsets/projections
5. Exterior materials
6. Line of sight/roof mounted equipment

Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any questions from the plan commission members.

Mr. Brad Whicker opened the public hearing.

There being no one to speak, Mr. Brad Whicker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gentry motioned to approve **DPR 477/19: Hendricks County Gateway Park, Lot 1** subject to staff recommendations and comments.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

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

July 9, 2019

BUSINESS SECTION

Appointment of the new member for the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Administrative & Plat Committee.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that it was two (2) separate appointments. It didn't have to be the same person, but it could be.

Mr. Kneeland volunteered to be on the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Gentry stated that he thought Mr. Pell would benefit from being on the Administrative & Plat Committee with him being in town already. He thought it would be a perfect fit.

Mr. Pell volunteered to be on the Administrative & Plat Committee.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

---

Tim Dombrosky, Chairman