

August 8, 2017

A meeting of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, August 8, 2017 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; Mrs. Sonnie Johnston; Mr. Tim Whicker; Mr. Walt O'Riley; Mr. Bob Gentry; and Mr. Damon Palmer. Member absent was: Angela Tilton. Staff members present were: Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Secretary and Director of Planning; Mr. Greg Steuerwald, County Attorney; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor; Mr. Nick Hufford, Planner; and Mrs. Kim Cearnal, Acting Recording Secretary.

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

Mr. Brad Whicker then called for a motion to approve the July 11, 2017 Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Mrs. Johnston then made a motion to approve the July 11, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Gentry seconded the motion.

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

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

ZA 451/17: PYRAMID ENTERPRISES, LLC; a zoning amendment change from AGR/Agriculture /Residential District to PUD/Planned Unit Development District, 2 lots, 53.56 acres, Guilford Township, S08-T14N-R2E, located on the west side of Raceway Road and on the north side of County Road 700 South. (Comer Law Office)

Mr. Ben Comer of the Comer Law Office appeared on behalf of the applicant, Randy Ebert with Pyramid Enterprises, LLC, who was also present.

Mr. Comer reviewed the history and location of the property currently known as Camp Camby. He stated the property contained 53 acres and beginning in the 1940's the Lutheran Church began constructing buildings on the property which today numbered 40. He stated the structures included a large tabernacle, a dining hall, small cottages, maintenance buildings and a hotel. He stated these structures totaled approximately 95,000 square feet of building space. He explained that also included on the site was an office building, campground, RV park, recreational ball fields, gardens, parking lots, and private driveways. He added that there were a lot of retreat/church type activities occurring at the site. He stated that the current zoning of AGR had been in place for a long period of time. He stated that the previous owners, the Lutheran Church, were moving out and the new owners were moving in; which was a great time to establish the proper zoning for the site to legitimize the existing historical uses and to request other uses that would fit well into the existing development. Mr. Comer then displayed some photographs of the site. He then pointed out on the display the location of the two entrances from County Road 700 South and from Raceway Road. He pointed out the church and dining hall and various smaller cottages used by visitors and church goers. He added that there was also housing on the site for the staff. He stated that the only way to get all of the uses proposed to fit in the PUD zoning, they had submitted a very specific list of uses that could fit there. He then discussed two new uses that were being proposed for the site. He indicated that one of them would be educational services such as a private school and trade school. He stated that since a site proposed at a previous meeting for the National Transportation Center had not yet gone forward due to delays in obtaining utility services, that this proposed site would be a good place to start their educational services. He stated that veterans needed the opportunity to attend a trade school with housing and dining services also available to them while attending school. He added that Cinda Kelley-Hutchings was also present to answer questions regarding the National Transportation Center's plans for the site. He stated that currently institutional services had also been used at the site and a similar use was being proposed by an organization such as "Family Promise" that assisted families in crises. Mr. Comer also added that there were no new structures being proposed for the site other than maintenance issues for existing structures which might need to be

August 8, 2017

replaced. He stated that his submitted PUD paperwork attempted to narrow down what could be used there and under what parameters. He added that the Hendricks County planning staff had recommended approval for the proposed rezoning. He added that surrounding zoning showed the property between industrial and preservation as the facility could go either way. He stated they were trying to preserve the property in its historical context and allow it to continue to be a buffer in the area between the other agriculture/residential uses in the area. He stated that there had been a community day held at the site on August 3rd with surrounding neighbors invited to a question & answer session. He stated that they had received some letters of support which had been included in the PUD paperwork submitted.

Mr. Brad Whicker then asked for questions or comments from the members.

Mr. O'Riley asked if Mr. Comer meant that the current uses on the property had been in place for 75 years.

Mr. Comer replied that the Lutheran Church had begun building structures on the site in the 1940's.

Mr. Tim Whicker then added that it appeared the applicant wished to clean up the property but not add any additional structures and maintaining zoning development standards.

Mr. Comer responded that was correct.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked for further questions or comments and there being none, Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing.

Ms. Connie Geiger of 10591 East County Road 700 South appeared. She stated that her property was located across the road from the proposed project. She stated she had lived there since she was a child. She explained what she had observed at the campground site over the years. She stated that the property had never been a place where people lived permanently. She stated that the proposal was for people to live there on a permanent basis. She stated that she was not opposed to helping people in need but that she worried what could happen to the area and the additional traffic that would be generated. She added that she also thought the airport had placed certain zoning restrictions in that area.

Ms. Laura Day of 10863 East County Road 700 South appeared. She stated that she had recently moved to that location and that her home was handicapped accessible to accommodate her daughter. She stated it was her understanding that the applicant proposed to help homeless veterans and families in crises. She added that while she was at work, her daughter was home alone. She stated at those times, she would have concerns about her daughter's safety. She stated other concerns were the effect on property values in the area and the generation of more traffic. She added that she was not notified of the question and answer community night session that had taken place.

Ms. Paige Hayes of 10965 East County Road 700 South appeared. She stated that her father-in-law owned property on the back side of Camp Camby and was unable to attend this meeting. She stated their concerns were the amount of occupancy on the site, amount of traffic to be generated and the offer of security by the applicant's representative and what that entailed. She also added that their new Pastor was currently facing charges of substance addiction and why hadn't there been full transparency on that issue.

Ms. Michelle White of 1600 Stafford Road, Plainfield, appeared and stated that she would be living on the camp grounds with her three children, ages 8, 11 and 14. She stated that she felt very safe with the living arrangements there. She stated that they grew up in the area and were moving back to Plainfield. She stated that she was also an elementary school teacher at Van Buren School teaching math and PE. She expressed her opinion on what she felt would be a good service to those less

August 8, 2017

fortunate and in particular homeless children to ensure that they had a safe place to go to after school and not a car or a motel. She stated she felt our community needed this service.

Justin White of 1600 Stafford Road, Plainfield, appeared. He stated he was thankful to partner with the services on this project. He stated that as the Pastor it was true that he had an addiction problem and that he had learned through his recovery about the need for helping other people with opiate addictions. He added that was why they wanted to live on the camp and be a resource and an encouragement for others.

Mr. Matt Nysewander of 7803 South County Road 600 South appeared. He stated he was a representative of the "Active Grace" organization. He stated at the community meeting it was indicated that in order for a family to visit or live on the grounds, they would have to be known for at least three months. He stated this would involve participating in the camp programs for three months, weekly meetings and with a proven track record that they did want to improve their lives. He stated after three months, there would be a series of interviews by three different groups of "Active Grace" volunteers and staff. He stated these meetings would be videotaped in order for answer comparisons. He stated participants would have full drug screenings and full background checks. He added that everyone on the "Active Grace" team had small children and were comfortable having their children around the participants in the programs. He stated they had narrowed it down to one concern of many that the community be gated, which was being considered seriously.

Ms. Mackenzie Fears of 514 Elm Drive, Plainfield, appeared. She stated she was an intern for "Active Grace." She stated that she had been able to meet the families. She stated that there were a few who really did not want help to improve their lives but only wanted the organization to pay for things. She discussed the process the participants went through and how it helped many of those families improve their lives. She stated that the staff and volunteers sacrificed time with their families to help others. She stated participants would not be living on campus long term but there long enough to give them a boost up.

Mr. Stephen White, 240 Masten Road, Plainfield, appeared and stated he appreciated the concerns expressed by those present and stated that he knew the people of the "Active Grace" organization and knew their integrity. He stated they were not interested in giving handouts but in lifting people up. He stated that it would be a great thing for our county to lead the way in helping eradicate homelessness and help people help themselves.

Mr. Mike Isaacs of 1600 Stafford Road, Plainfield, appeared. He stated he retired from Duke Energy after 40 years. He stated he had been involved in seeing the "Active Grace" program get started. He stated we all knew about the problems and how they could make a difference in the lives of some people who were struggling. He stated that three of his grandchildren would be living on the campus and he did not have a fear for them living there.

There being no one else signed up to be heard, Mr. Whicker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Comer then introduced Mr. Randy Ebert of 1715 Stafford Road, Plainfield, a principal in the Pyramid Enterprises LLC.

Mr. Ebert stated that "Active Grace" was involved in the families in need aspect. He stated that the National Transportation Center was involved in the education and training for veterans. He stated the project would be a great outreach for people in the community who were interested in learning about God. He discussed the security aspect for the project with 24 hour security with a guard shack scenario and the existing gate off of Raceway Road with security cameras. He stated there would be curfews in place so as not to have coming and going freely at all hours. He stated there would be limits to outside visitors with visits being scheduled.

Mr. Comer stated that another concern had to do with traffic.

August 8, 2017

Mr. Ebert stated he did not believe there would be a concern with traffic. He stated that worship services were scheduled for Saturday nights at seven. He gave examples of events they would possibly be hosting, many of which were and had been occurring.

Mr. Comer then asked Mr. Ebert to comment on whether or not this project would be a "tiny home development."

Ms. Cinda Kelley-Hutchings appeared as a representative of the National Transportation Center and stated that they may be using the cottages somewhat but would primarily be using the hotel for the transitioning veterans. She stated it was a misrepresentation that the veterans were homeless. She said they were veterans transitioning out of military service and wanting to seek employment in the transportation industry and would be relocating to the camp to start their classes.

Mr. Whicker asked Mr. Comer to speak further on the tiny home issue. He stated that Mr. Comer had indicated in previous comments that there would be no additional structures and that a commitment could be made to this.

Mr. Comer responded that there would be no additional residences and that there was a set number already existing. He stated that there could, however, be replacements.

Ms. Kelley stated that they had meetings with the County Environmental Health Department Director, Julie Haan, and she gave them information on the location of the existing wells and septic systems for the cottages and each of the different facilities.

Mr. O'Riley asked how many people they anticipated would be occupying the facility on a regular basis.

Mr. Ebert responded that they expected it to be between fifty (50) to seventy (70) percent or around 200 and that would fluctuate as people completed their training. He stated that to start off, he anticipated about three or four families would be living there temporarily and around fifty (50) veterans for the first initial part of their training.

Mr. Comer stated an estimate of about 14 families for each of the 14 cottages.

Mr. O'Riley asked about background checks.

Mr. Ebert stated that although the Nazarenes had not done those, their organization would conduct those checks. He reviewed what had occurred in the past with people living at the camp.

Mr. Comer stated that there would be a three month vetting process with background checks.

Mr. Palmer asked for more information on the organizations involved in this project.

Mr. Ebert explained that Pyramid Enterprises LLC was a real estate holding company owned by himself and his wife. He stated that Pyramid Technologies was a telecommunications, wireless, fiber optic construction company also owned by them.

Mr. Palmer asked if the other parties discussed would be tenants.

Mr. Ebert stated that was correct.

Mr. Palmer asked if Mr. Ayers had looked at this project from a traffic standpoint.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes and that there were no concerns regarding traffic because of no new construction.

August 8, 2017

Mr. Palmer asked if the traffic patterns would change when more people would be commuting in. He stated he was aware that the road was pretty narrow there.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he and Mr. Ayers had talked about the traffic with no concerns but that he would talk with him again about it.

Mr. Palmer then asked if the Sheriff had been consulted on this project.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he had not consulted with the Sheriff.

Mr. Comer stated they had consulted with the Sheriff and that it was difficult to get police calls to current facilities as there were no addresses for tracking purposes.

Mr. Palmer stated his question had to do with growth in that part of the county and that if there were an issue, what would be the response time.

Mr. Ebert made further comments and indicated that they had talked with the Sheriff's Department and had discussed a security plan with them. He stated they were advocating for three passes a night by the Sheriff's Department. He stated that the Sheriff's Department currently used the open field for training their police dogs.

Mr. Palmer then stated that he was still unclear on the total capacity for the site and in particular the dormitories.

Mr. Comer gave rough calculations on the capacity. He stated that there were 16 existing single family houses and 24 hotel rooms. He stated that the dorm buildings were not broken down by bedroom.

Mr. Ebert stated that they did not have a full-time plan for the dorms.

Mr. Palmer stated that he had been surprised to see the National Transportation Center mentioned on this application. He asked if there were issues with their utilities as now there might be two Planned Unit Developments associated with the NTC.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the condition the members might need to be concerned about was over supplying or under supplying for a different type of land use. He stated that in certain conditions, you could over supply for a certain type of land use which would have an effect on property values. He stated that in this case, there were two types of large properties zoned for vocational schools. He stated he did not think that constituted an oversupply. He stated as far as utilities go, he had discussed this with Julie Haan, Environmental Health Director. He stated that there were septs and that she did have concerns with one of the buildings and would work with them on getting a new septic installed. He stated that she was confident that could be done.

Mr. O'Riley asked if public sewer and water might be available down the road for the site.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes that the site was pretty close to the Plainfield facilities. He stated that the town was not moving in that direction because it was restricted by the airport. Mr. Dombrosky stated that septic systems were a good limiter for more construction on the site.

Ms. Kelley then gave an update on the National Transportation Center on State Road 39. She stated that obviously they could not start building on that site until the utilities were brought out and that would not be occurring yet. She stated that since the facilities for the veterans would not be available at that site yet, they felt that what was available at the Camp Camby site would be a great opportunity and that they were working with Ivy Tech and Vincennes University toward providing those transportation classes for the first 24 veterans in the interim.

August 8, 2017

Mr. Palmer then mentioned another item that had been brought up during the public hearing and that was the question about zoning and the airport.

Mr. Dombrosky responded that the airport controlled most of the property at the south end of Guilford Township. He stated that the County did not have any particular restrictions as far as the airport district as they controlled that property. He stated that they had an airport district for Danville airport and it limited height but not necessarily buildings.

Mr. Whicker asked other members if they had any further questions. Mr. Whicker explained to those in attendance about the process whereby the Plan Commission could only make a recommendation on this matter to the Board of County Commissioners which would make the final determination to rezone the property. He stated that the date for the Commissioners' hearing on this matter would be Tuesday, August 22, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. or shortly thereafter.

Mr. Palmer then asked about making a commitment to work with the County Sheriff's department for a security plan.

Mr. Whicker stated he believed that could be included in a favorable recommendation to the Commissioners.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he believed it would be a good idea to build something into the commitments regarding working out a security plan with the County Sheriff's Department for this proposed project.

Mr. Steuerwald suggested that the wording should say that the Sheriff would review the proposed security plan and allow him the chance to make comments.

Mr. Brad Whicker then called for a motion.

Mr. Tim Whicker then made a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the County Commissioners and adopt the positive Findings of Fact/Law for **ZA 451/17: Pyramid Enterprises, LLC** and with the conditions discussed as to working with the County Sheriff's Department on a security plan.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

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

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Brad Whicker again reminded those in attendance that the matter would be heard by the Board of County Commissioners on Tuesday, August 22, 2017 at 9:00 A.M.

The staff recommendations were as follows:

-Staff Comments-

Background;

The request concerns property commonly known as Camp Camby. It is an existing Church, camp, and retreat center with legal non-conforming uses that are listed in the applicants provided material. The applicant wishes to establish institutional uses and multi-family residential uses in conjunction with the other uses. In order to permit that, a rezone is necessary. The rezone also serves to legitimize the non-conforming uses. All of these uses together necessitate a PUD or Planned Unit Development zoning district, as they are not all permitted in any one single district. **The PUD only permits the uses listed, and only in the form and function stated.**

August 8, 2017

The residential is intended to provide permanent housing for non-profit groups, guests of the retreat center, and students and faculty for the institution. The latter two groups are included in the definitions for their respective uses, but the PUD ordinance clarifies that they are permitted. The non-profit clause is unique to this PUD, as there is no distinction in housing types made by the zoning ordinance based on the occupant's financial status. The petitioner is volunteering this information and imposing it as a restriction.

The comprehensive plan;

The Comprehensive Plan shows this area as Industrial, bordering on Open Space/Conservation. The recommendation for the Conservation land use states, "Adjacent land use designations should provide areas of transition or buffers between these sorts of lands and more intense development." This request represents that transition between potential industrial uses recommended nearby, and the more sensitive existing uses.

Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;

The current conditions of the area will change very little as part of this request. Single family residential is already permitted here. The single family homes on the property line the perimeter, and mirror the residences bordering to the east and south. The only real change in the character of the uses will be the ability to house families year-round, and not just for retreats. The PUD Ordinance addresses who can stay in the housing.

The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted;

The property under consideration is surrounded by agriculture, rural density housing, significant natural topography and waterways, as well as large tracts of land controlled by the Indianapolis Airport Authority. The existing use will be hard to completely convert to an industrial use or a residential subdivision. Its highest and best use is some version of its current use like the one proposed that takes advantage of natural conditions.

The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction;

There can be a negative effect from a concentration of any single land use type. In this case, I recommend that the diversity of uses on the site will protect from potential negative effects of the multi-family dwellings.

The only other concern for property values throughout the jurisdiction is the reduced amount of available land recommended for industrial development. This only represents an adaptation of an existing use on a challenging property, and has no effect on the Comprehensive Plan or the market.

Responsible development and growth;

The adaptive reuse of this established legal non-conforming property will serve to provide a needed service, while remaining consistent with the character of the area.

Other considerations;

The proposal would not require development plan approval, as there are no plans for improvement at this time.

-Staff Recommendation-

Based on the information provided, staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend:
APPROVAL

August 8, 2017

MAP 738/17 (PRIMARY): DORSEY BUSINESS PARK; a 4-lot major commercial subdivision, 11.704 acres, Center Township, S32-T16N-R1W, located on the east side of State Road 236 and the west side of State Road 39, approximately 0.16 mile north of the confluence of said thoroughfare as measured on and along State Road 236. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Mike Sells of Kruse Consulting, Inc. and the applicant, Justin Dorsey, appeared. Mr. Sells reviewed the location of the proposed project. He explained the applicant's desire to utilize the four lots for General Business development. He stated that they had consulted with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) regarding access to the site from State Road 236. He stated they had also met with adjoining property owners, the Roseboom's, regarding the proposal. He stated they had met with INDOT at the Crawfordsville office and also on site regarding what encumbrances might be present with regard to access. He explained that INDOT had made a determination that the best access point would be the mid-point of Lot #2. Lot #2 would have the only access from State Road 236 and the other lots would have access from a private drive. Mr. Sells then discussed the recommendations in staff's letter dated August 8, 2017. He stated that once users for the lots were determined, development plan applications would be filed for approval of a use on each lot to include landscaping and stormwater designs. He stated each potential user would need to comply with the uses allowed in the General Business District. He stated he was aware of the INDOT entrance permit being required prior to any drive construction and that sidewalks would be installed at the time of each development plan review application.

Mr. Brad Whicker then asked for questions or comments from the members.

Mr. O'Riley asked Mr. Sells to explain access for the lots.

Mr. Sells complied and stated that there would be no access from State Road 39 where sight distance would be a major problem.

Mr. O'Riley then asked about a retention pond.

Mr. Sells pointed out the location and added that they had received primary Drainage Board approval.

There being no further questions or comments, Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing.

Mrs. Cindy Roseboom of 1083 State Road 236 appeared. She stated that they had resided at that location for the past 16 years and would be the only party directly affected by the petition. She expressed her concerns regarding observations she had made as to the applicant's current business operations including excessive traffic and trash. She stated that even though INDOT had approved the entrance onto State Road 236, they did not observe the truck traffic coming down the hill from the south at excessive speed and applying their brakes to enter the applicant's site. She stated it was also dangerous coming from the north with a curve and hill. She stated that she felt that State Road 236 would be the less dangerous of the two highways. She expressed her concerns about not wanting to see a gas station or restaurant. She stated she was not necessarily concerned with Mr. Dorsey's business but was more concerned with other property owners deciding to sell their properties for commercial uses.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated he understood her concerns and that this property already carried the proper zoning for General Business.

Mrs. Roseboom then commented on the small public hearing signs that had been posted and how difficult it was to read those signs.

Mr. Whicker stated he understood her concern and that the size of the signs were regulated by the State. He thanked her for appearing to express her concerns.

August 8, 2017

Mr. Sells then commented that they did not know at this time what type of businesses would be interested in developing the lots other than being uses allowed in the General Business District.

Mrs. Roseboom asked another question concerning her property and whether business development around her would devalue her property.

Mr. Whicker stated there would probably be varying opinions on that and he would lean toward a favorable valuation.

Mr. Sells then stated that they were sensitive to Mrs. Roseboom's concerns. He stated that in regard to the access point, there were certain criteria reviewed by INDOT taking into account speed of vehicles and sight obstructions. He stated in their preliminary meetings with INDOT, the current placement of the drive had been recommended. He added that this had been only the preliminary determination and that a final would need to be approved prior to issuance of a permit for construction.

Mr. Brad Whicker asked for further questions or comments.

Mr. Gentry then asked if the Roseboom's could be involved in the discussions with INDOT.

Mr. Sells stated that they could be involved if they wished. He went over the criteria used by INDOT to approve access points.

Mr. Gentry then asked at what point an adjoining property owner could be involved in the stipulations for development plan approval.

Mr. Brad Whicker responded that if an application fell within the guidelines of the GB district, the Plan Commission would not necessarily be able to disapprove it. He stated that they would have to work within the ordinance and give consideration to any possible relief as to Mrs. Roseboom's concerns.

Mrs. Roseboom asked one more question as to whether public water and sewer would be brought to the site.

Mr. Sells responded that there were no centralized utilities available for the site. He stated they were currently looking at community septic fields and wells.

Mr. Brad Whicker stated that fact would limit the type of uses pretty significantly.

Mr. Paul Minor asked to be allowed to sign up to make some comments. He signed in.

Before he spoke, Mr. Dombrosky directed some remarks toward Mr. Gentry that the INDOT process was not a democratic one. He stated although he appreciated Mr. Sells' wish to allow the Roseboom's to participate in the INDOT discussions, there would not be any public participation allowed.

Mr. Paul Miner of 113 Shockley, Lizton, appeared and observed that if the proposed retention pond was manicured, they would have a big problem with geese. He also asked if they had considered a wetlands solution as to the community septics.

Mr. Brad Whicker commented that at this stage, a discussion on that would be premature.

Mr. Sells responded regarding drainage for the site.

There was some discussion on approvals for major subdivisions by Mr. Dombrosky.

Mr. Brad Whicker then called for a motion.

August 8, 2017

Mr. Palmer then made a motion to grant primary approval for **MAP 738/17: Dorsey Business Park (Primary)** subject to the conditions and recommendations in staff's letter dated August 8, 2017.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

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

The vote was unanimous.

The staff conditions and recommendations were as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A detail development plan for shared improvements will be required prior to approval of any secondary or development plan approvals.
2. An INDOT entrance permit will be required before any drive construction.
3. This site is within 1 mile of a school, and will require sidewalks at secondary phase.

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.
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. Addresses must be added to the final plat prior to recording. To obtain addresses, the applicant must submit a request to the Planning and Building Department well in advance of the recording package being forwarded to the Hendricks County Engineer's Office.
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. 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.

That concluding the regular agenda, Mr. Brad Whicker asked if there were any discussion items needing to be considered.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes as to accessory dwelling units and also outdoor storage. He and Mr. Hufford presented the suggested changes to the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance and explained why those changes may be necessary. Questions were asked and answered by the members and staff.

Accessory Dwelling Units

7. Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory **dwelling units** shall require an Improvement Location Permit **and can be attached or detached**.

a. **Attached**

1. In any ~~single-family residential~~ districts where an accessory dwelling unit is a special exception may be granted one accessory dwelling unit to be constructed attached to or within an accessory structure., ~~provided such a lot has a minimum area of 10,000 square feet. The minimum required lot size shall be reduced to 5,000 square feet in the Town Center Overlay TC-OL.~~
2. Occupation of accessory dwelling units may be limited by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
3. The owner(s) of the single-family lot upon which the accessory dwelling unit is located shall occupy at least one (1) of the dwelling units on the premises.
4. For minimum floor area requirements of accessory apartments, refer to Table 4.4: Residential Lot Standards and Table 4.5: Non-Residential Lot Standards.
5. If an accessory apartment is located within the principal building, the only entry to such unit and its design shall be such that, the appearance of the buildings will remain as a single-family residence
6. No exterior stairway to the second floor shall be permitted at the front or side of the building.
7. Accessory dwelling units located in accessory structures shall be located, designed, constructed, and landscaped in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the appearance of the property remains as a single-family lot.
8. A minimum of two (2) off-street parking spaces, including the driveway, shall be provided.

b. **Detached**

1. In any districts where an accessory dwelling unit is a special exception may be granted one detached accessory dwelling unit. ~~provided such a lot has a minimum area of 10,000 square feet. The minimum required lot size shall be reduced to 5,000 square feet in the Town Center Overlay TC-OL.~~
 - i In the Agriculture Residential Zoning District a minimum of 5 acres is required.
2. Occupation of accessory dwelling units may be limited by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
3. The owner(s) of the single-family lot upon which the accessory dwelling unit is located shall occupy at least one (1) of the dwelling units on the premises.
4. A detached accessory dwelling unit size shall not exceed 75% of the footprint of the principal dwelling
5. A detached accessory dwelling unit shall be located less than 100 linear feet from the primary dwelling
6. A screening plan will be a part of the Special Exception Approval
7. Shall not be given a separate address and driveway cut
8. The dwelling shall be subject to Section 8.1 Residential Design Standards

7.14 Outdoor Sales, Display, and Storage Standards

- A) GENERAL PROVISIONS. The following shall apply to all districts whether the use is permitted, special exception, accessory, or temporary:
- 1) Approved and documented permanent outdoor sales, display, and storage areas shall be permitted accessory uses, tied to the primary use.
 - 2) Outdoor sales, display, and storage shall not be located in any setbacks, easements, right-of-way, or off-street parking or loading areas.
 - a) Motor vehicle sales and display may be permitted in off-street parking areas.
 - 3) Lighting shall comply with Section 7.11 Outdoor Lighting.
 - 4) Outdoor sales, display, and storage shall be located behind the front or exterior wall of the main building facing any street and shall comply with all lot requirements of this Ordinance and with intersection visibility standards as set forth in Section 7.4 Sight Visibility.
 - ~~5) Outdoor sales, display, and storage shall not cover more than five percent (5%) of the lot area or an area in excess of twice the ground floor area of the main building on the lot, whichever is less.~~
 - 6) Outdoor sales, display, and storage shall be screened according to the provisions of this Section.
 - ~~7) No outdoor sales, display, or storage shall occur within any right-of-way.~~
- B) NO CHANGES
- C) OUTDOOR STORAGE. Outdoor storage in compliance with the requirements of this Section shall be permitted ~~for commercial and industrial uses within the Planned/Flex Business (PB), Light Industrial (LI), and Major Industrial (MI) zoning districts~~ as a primary or an accessory use in the Light Industrial (LI) and Major Industrial (MI) zoning districts
- 1) Screening. Outdoor storage of the types described below shall be screened with an opaque fence, split face block wall, continuous evergreen screen, or a combination of the three. The screen must measure a minimum of seven (7) feet in height. The fences or walls shall be compatible with or constructed from the same building material as the primary structure, and integrated into the design of the primary structure.
 - ~~2) Storage In Required Setbacks. No portion of any setback shall be used for permanent storage except during construction and in accordance with the terms of this Ordinance.~~
 - 3) Bulk Storage
 - a) In any district in which bulk storage is permitted, structures, buildings or above ground tanks used for bulk storage of flammable or explosive liquids, gases or other materials, shall not be located closer than fifty (50) feet to the property line.
 - ~~b) The area where the bulk storage is located shall be enclosed within an opaque fence, or equivalent, of not less than seven (7) feet high, except as otherwise required by Section 7.14 Outdoor Sales, Display, And Storage Standards (this section).~~
 - ~~c) Lots containing bulk storage shall be screened according to the provisions of this Section.~~
 - d) Additional information regarding evidence of safety measures may be required in order to determine the public safety therein.
 - 4) Primary – Outdoor storage is a permitted primary use in the LI + MI zoning districts

August 8, 2017

- a) Uses: Outdoor storage can be a primary use in, but not limited to: contractor yard, RV and boat storage, agricultural distribution & storage, impound facility, bottle gas storage & distribution, junk yard, lumber yard, mineral extraction operation, salvage yard, and sanitary landfill
- 5) Accessory- Outdoor storage is accessory when it:
Does not exceed the greater of 25% of the building footprint

After discussion, the members were in agreement with the proposed changes.

Mr. Dombrosky stated they would present the ordinance changes in final form for a public hearing before the Plan Commission and then to the Board of Commissioners for final approvals.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Tim Dombrosky, Secretary