

March 9, 2021

A meeting of the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission was held on Tuesday, March 9, 2021 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; Mr. Ron Kneeland; Mr. Bob Gentry; Mr. Damon Palmer; Mr. Walt O'Riley and Mrs. Margaret Gladden. Members absent were Mr. Tom Whitaker. Staff members present were Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Secretary and Director of Planning; Mr. Graham Young, County Attorney Representative; Mrs. Suzanne Baker, Senior Planner; and Mrs. Brandy Swinford, Recording Secretary. Also present was Mr. Jeff Pell.

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

Mr. Whicker stated that the first order of business was to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2021 meeting.

Mr. Gentry motioned for approval of the February 9, 2021 meeting minutes.

Mrs. Gladden seconded the motion.

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

**ZA 481/21: ALAN & CASSANDRA SIKTBERG;** a zoning amendment change from RB to AGR for the purpose of raising alpacas and farming hay; 11.16 acres; Union Township; S32-T17-R1W; located at 1945 W. County Road 775 N., Lizton (Alan Siktberg)

Mr. Alan Siktberg appeared. They are asking for a zoning amendment change for their property. He stated that their home sits on the back part of the property and they have a 5-acre pasture in the front. They intend to use this for raising alpacas and will need to set up proper shelter for them. Based on their current zoning it would not be allowed. They are in an agricultural area and nearby parcels are zoned that way as well. They are involved in the 4-H and FFA and plan to use the animals for educational use as well as breeding them.

Mr. Dombrosky noted that RB designation was not a requested rezone, but just what the district is because of its proximity to town.

Mr. Whicker asked if the adjoining property to the south was zoned AGR or RB. He felt it was a reasonable request. He asked if there were any initial questions from plan commission members.

Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to speak, he then closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Baker replied that she believed it was zoned RB along the east side and across the street on the west side is zoned AGR.

Mr. Dombrosky responded that it was zoned AGR along the west side of CR 200. All the parcels around Mr. Siktberg were zoned RB.

Mr. Gentry asked if there were any objections from the neighbors to the west.

Mr. Siktberg replied that they were okay with it. They have notified them with the letters as well as talked to them personally. He plans to match the lean-tos to their existing pole barn so that they fit in with the property.

Mr. Gentry motioned for a favorable recommendation of **ZA 481/21: Alan & Cassandra Siktberg.**

March 9, 2021

Mr. Palmer seconded the motion.

FOR – 6 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

**DPR 488/21: HENDRICKS GATEWAY PARK, BLDG. 3 (PRIMARY);** a development plan review for a new warehouse building; 26.148 acres; Liberty Township; S35-T14N-R1W; located 2260 feet west of intersection of State Road 39 and Gateway Drive (American Structurepoint)

Mr. Collin Patterson, American Structurepoint appeared. He stated that this was the last spot in the park. He reviewed the plans. They had received drainage board approval. They were requesting 4 modifications and went over those in more detail. These were the same modifications granted previously for the other buildings.

Mr. Whicker asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Whicker then opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to speak, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ayres stated that there were other staff comments and asked if Mr. Patterson understood them. Because they were sharing the drive with the adjacent building to the east, he asked if there was common ownership for those properties or were they owned by the tenants.

Mr. Patterson replied that currently they were under common ownership, but that in the future they may be sold.

Mr. Ayres asked if there was an easement in place or an ingress/egress easement in place to show that drive.

Mr. Patterson stated that if there was not, there would be one.

Mr. Whicker asked for a motion.

Mr. Palmer motioned for approval of **DPR 488/21: Hendricks Gateway Park, Bldg. 3 (Primary)** subject to staff recommendations with the requested modifications.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

FOR – 6 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

**MAP 722/21: I-70 WEST – AMENDMENT TO PRIMARY PLAT;** an amendment to the primary major plat; 106.34 acres; Liberty Township; S26-T14N-R1W; located at Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39 (Studio A of Indianapolis)

**DPR 489/21: I-70 WEST, BLDG. 4 (PRIMARY);** a development plan review for a new warehouse building; 70.722 acres; Liberty Township; S26-T14N-R1W; located at Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39 (Studio A of Indianapolis)

**DPR 490/21: I-70 WEST, BLDG. 5 (PRIMARY);** a development plan review for a new warehouse building; 35.617 acres; Liberty Township; S26-T14N-R1W; located at Innovation Boulevard and State Road 39 (Studio A of Indianapolis)

March 9, 2021

Mr. Max Mouser, Studio A of Indianapolis appeared. He noted that Mr. Ken Kern and Mr. Jamie Chrisman with I-70 West, LLC were in attendance as well. He reviewed the slide with the modification of the plat. There was a 10-acre difference from the original plat to now with a different configuration. The primary plat was to have a road extension and he showed the location on the slide. He then discussed the plans for the new buildings 4 and 5. The access road they were talking about would go between buildings 2 and 3 and continues up between the new buildings. They have asked and were granted four (4) variances through the BZA for the following: bicycle parking, lot coverage, landscaping and line of sight. He discussed those briefly to recap.

Mr. Whicker opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to speak, he then closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions from the plan commission members.

Mr. Gentry asked if any of these projects would come to the commissioners for approval.

Mr. Dombrosky stated they would not.

Mr. Gentry asked Mr. Mouser if he had met with Ms. Jennifer Welch.

Mr. Mouser stated that he had not but had met with her neighbor. He had emailed with her today.

Mr. Gentry stated that she wanted to know if they were going to continue with the plantings up to her existing row of trees.

Mr. Mouser replied the mound will be along her north boundary, but the tree line will be extended down along the east.

Mr. Gentry asked about the access road. He asked Mr. Ayres if that would be up to the highway department to put up the dead-end signs that Ms. Welch was asking for.

Mr. Ayres replied that it would not. They would ask the developer to do it. He believed she was referring to what happened at Innovation Boulevard down to County Road 1000 and did not connect and they had people cutting through there.

There was some discussion about the road and how there was a similar scenario in Pittsboro with the steel mill.

Mr. Gentry asked if Mr. Dombrosky if he felt that they had addressed Ms. Welch's concerns.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he believed so. She had attended the last meeting for the other building, and they talked about her concerns then as well. He believed it was as good as it can be.

Mr. Ayres asked if they were okay with the other staff comments and recommendations for the mechanical things and drawings.

Mr. Mouser replied that he was.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he had two big things he wanted to bring up. One was that the properties to the east between them and Johnson and Johnson were zoned AGR, so a buffer is required on the east side and its not shown. They will need a modification for that since no variance was given for that east side.

Mr. Mouser stated that the variance was for the north and the east side.

Mr. Dombrosky thought it was the north and west side.

March 9, 2021

Mr. Mouser replied that the north and east side was for the plant reduction and increasing it on the west side.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if they knew what they were doing with the existing road yet. He wanted to know if it was going to be rebuilt or not.

Mr. Mouser stated that his plans are showing it not being rebuilt. The new portion will be built to county standards and they are hoping that it will be turned over to the county or a resolution will be reached before the park is completed.

Mr. Ayres explained that the road between buildings 2 and 3 is currently a private drive, so for those lots to have frontage there must be some dedication to ROW and they will extend that ROW up between buildings 4 and 5. The road originally built was not done to county standards. They have two options; reconstruct it to county standards or do a privately maintained public driveway. They do see those in residential developments but not as much in these types of developments.

Mr. Palmer asked who is impacted by the road. He wanted to know if it was internal only.

Mr. Ayres replied that it was not a through road to any other properties even though it is public ROW.

Mr. Whicker reminded them that they would need three separate motions.

Mr. Palmer asked if there needed to be any special circumstances since they did not receive drainage board approval.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they would hold up the secondary until they received that.

Mr. Palmer motioned for approval of **MAP 722/21: I-70 West – Amendment to Primary Plat** subject to staff recommendations.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Palmer motioned for approval of **DPR 489/21: I-70 West, Bldg. 4 (Primary)** subject to staff recommendations.

Mr. O'Riley seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Palmer motioned for approval of **DPR 490/21: I-70 West, Bldg. 5 (Primary)** subject to staff recommendations.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

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

There was more discussion about upcoming projects.

March 9, 2021

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

---

Tim Dombrosky, Chairman