

## HENDRICKS COUNTY AREA PLAN COMMISSION

### Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, December 10, 2024

6:30 PM

Hendricks County Government Center • Meeting Rooms 4 & 5  
355 S Washington St #G80  
Danville, IN 46122

**Members Present:** Mr. Brad Whicker; Mr. Damon Palmer; Mr. Bob Gentry; Mr. Ron Kneeland; Mr. Walt O’Riley; and Mrs. Margaret Gladden.

**Members Absent:** Mr. Thomas Whitaker

**Staff Present:** Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Director, Mr. Greg Steuerwald, County Attorney; Mr. Brian Hurskainen, Senior Planner; and Mrs. Anna Wozniak, Recording Secretary.

A quorum was established, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and Mr. Whicker asked for a motion to approve the minutes from November 12th, 2024 meeting. Mr. Gentry made a motion to approve the November minutes. Mr. O’Riley seconded the motion. Motion of approval passed 6-0.

**DPR 519/24: COMMERCIAL TEAM CONSTRUCTION – Section 4 (Primary);** a development plan review; 9.576 acres; Guilford Township; 20-14N-2E; located at 8851 Union Mills Dr., Camby, IN 46113 (Jeffery K. Smith – Projects Plus)

Mr. Dombrosky mentioned the projectors were not working this evening. There is a site plan in the packet and one modification being requested is from the architectural standards. There is a number of semi-industrial buildings that are built with combination of metal and stone. Our ordinance does not permit to use metal as a primary facade material, but we see it fit to review that use of metal as a permitted material if it’s complemented with other materials. They have included stone to match similar architecture to what is already existing in the area. Other than that, there are few more drafting issues we will need to clean up as secondary at a staff meeting.

Joel Fritz – Owner - Commercial Team Construction, James Foust – Commercial Team Construction and Joseph Heck – Projects Plus gave an overview of the petition and the project.

Discussion about the materials being permitted and used in the construction of the buildings. There were conversations with neighbors regarding the projects and all are in agreement and have no objections.

Mr. Whicker opened and closed the public portion of the meeting as no one had signed up to speak.

Mr. O’Riley motioned for approval of DPR 519/24 subject to staff recommendations and conditions of approval.

Mr. Palmer seconded the motion.

**VOTE: For – 6**

**Against – 0**

**Abstained – 0**

**DPR 523/24: BROWNSBURG YOUTH SPORTS, INC (Primary);** a development plan review; 60.852 acres; Brown Township; 36-17-1E; located at NE corner County Road 900 E. & County Road 700 N. (Geoff Ziegler – Banning Engineering)

Mr. Gentry motioned for a continuance of DPR 523/24 till January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion.

**VOTE: For – 6**

**Against – 0**

**Abstained – 0**

**DPR 524/24: CRM REAL ESTATE/CRM EXCAVATING (Primary);** a development plan review; 48.757 acres; Liberty Township; 24-14N-1W; located at 8451 S State Road 39, Clayton, IN 46118 (Dale Kruse – Kruse Consulting)

Mr. Gentry motioned for a continuance of DPR 524/24 till January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

**VOTE: For – 6**

**Against – 0**

**Abstained – 0**

## **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

Mr. Dombrosky explained that the newest draft has been completed. Changes consist of changes in the plan land use map and changes to language in chapter 4. There are four other sections that are most impactful, some of the key things that need to be pointed out. Balancing quality and affordability, new development must contribute to the community character and the cost of growth can't come at the expense of existing residents and business. Language talking about the future land use plan states that even if a development aligns with the future land use map there may be infrastructural or other improvements needed, that proposal should not be approved until the utilities or municipal services are in place or can be readily extended to the site as part of the development process. It is solidly in the plan. Infrastructure and availability, the extension of water and sewer utility infrastructure is the key growth management tool, dictating where and when development can occur. Lastly, the new housing or rehabilitation of existing structures should not conflict with existing neighborhood and existing town character. All of these items support the goals of the county that can be touched on when making decisions and not just the land use plan. The Comprehensive Plan is a guide, it's not controlling there is still place for discretion in making decisions for rezoning. It is not absolute since each parcel is unique as is the time that it's considered.

Mr. Whicker asked if anyone had any questions.

**Adam Peaper – Senior Project Manager – HWC Engineering, 135 N. Pennsylvania Street, Suite 2800, Indianapolis, IN 46204**

Mr. Peaper summarized the changes and explained the process as Mr. Dombrosky had done earlier. Per last month's discussion the text and map amendments that were referenced would be expanding the conservation area in the Northeast County of Brown Township.

Mr. Whicker asked if everyone has a clear understanding of the amendments that have been presented.

Mr. Gentry asked if the amendment give this body authority to respond to different issues or does it lock us into doing something?

Mr. Dombrosky answered the Comprehensive Plan does not lock us into doing anything.

Discussion about a potential development in Brown County and what message it sends to the developer and how it would affect the homeowners on selling their land. It's a combination of certainty and flexibility so we can have certainty for the residents and flexibility so we can respond to favorable petitions. The Comprehensive Plan does not lock you in it gives you flexibility to promote the goals in the county.

Mr. Palmer commented on the Comprehensive Plan, there has been no impact on other parts of the county, there has been significant public support for the people against the land use in the original plan. It seems that everything has been done that was asked for.

Mr. Dombrosky stated the plan is very subjective and there are pros and cons in the plan. The land use plan is not controlling but serves as a guide and will be reviewed regularly.

Mr. Kneeland appreciates all the comments that were made last month and feels that proper planning is required.

Mr. O'Riley feels that overall, the language changes cover everything that needs to be done.

Mrs. Gladden also appreciates the time and comments that went into the changes in the plan.

Mr. Whicker agrees with the language, however, does not feel the same about the land use map changes. It's just unrealistic to think that the area will stay agricultural in the next few years as the growth of this county expands.

Mr. O'Riley made a motion for a favorable recommendation to the Commissioners.

Mr. Gentry seconded the motion.

**VOTE: For – 5**

**Against – 1**

**Abstained – 0**

## **PC MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2025**

Mr. Gentry made a motion to approve the 2025 Meeting Schedule.

Mr. Palmer seconded the motion.

**VOTE: For – 6**

**Against – 0**

**Abstained – 0**

Being no further business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 PM.

---

Tim Dombrosky, Secretary