

Plan Commission Meeting Minutes August 16, 2022

Call to Order and Roll Call

Members Present: Brianne Schneckenberger, Chad Gooding, Jennifer Hermann, Scott Shipley, Devin Stettler, Steve Duhamell; Tom Strayer

Members Absent:

Agenda Considerations

Mr. Crum noted the agenda items that had requested a continuance or were withdrawn.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hermann made a motion to approve the July 2022 Meeting Minutes. Ms. Schneckenberger seconded. The motion was approved 6/0/1. Mr. Duhamell abstained because he was not at the July meeting.

Old Business

StorAmerica's request for a favorable recommendation on a rezone from Gateway Crossing PUD to StorAmerica PUD

The petitioner has requested a continuance until the September 20, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.

Ms. Schneckenberger made a motion to continue. Mr. Duhamell seconded. The motion passed 7/0.

Platinum Properties' request for approval of an amendment to the Preliminary Plan for the Colonnade Subdivision

The petitioner has withdrawn this petition. Staff and petitioner continued to discuss deceleration lane and redesign of lane with the traffic consultant and an acceptable design was submitted.

Ms. Schneckenberger made a motion to accept the withdrawal of the amendment to the preliminary plan. Ms. Hermann seconded. The motion passed 7/0.

New Business

Fischer Homes request for approval of a Development Plan and Secondary Plat for Section 1A of Hampton Walk

Mr. Crum stated that Staff had met with Fischer Homes over concerns with Section 1B that affected Section 1A. Fischer Homes requested a continuance to make changes to Sec. 1A.

Ms. Schneckenberger made a motion to continue this agenda item to the September 2022 meeting. Mr. Duhamell seconded. The motion passed 7/0.

GDI Companies request for a favorable recommendation on a rezone to I-2 for +/-161 acres located near the northeast corner of CR 750N & CR 700N

The petitioner has requested a continuance until the September 20, 2022 Plan Commission.

Ms. Schneckenberger made a motion to continue this agenda item to the September Plan Commission meeting. Ms. Hermann seconded. The motion passed 7/0.

Hartman Capital's request for a favorable recommendation on the rezone and approval of the primary plat for 153 lots located at 6579 W 650 N

Mr. Crum presented Meridian Homes at Sycamore Drive request for a rezone and approval of the primary plat. The request asks to change zoning from County residential to a PUD.

Scott Kunkel presented for the petitioner. He reviewed primary plat and noted the drainage ditch and transmission lines. The proposed development is a rental community comprised of single-family homes that will have a maximum of 153 lots with a mix of 1- and 2-story houses with 2-car garages. The community will be managed by an onsite professional property management company and the PUD includes covenants to ensure the home sites will be maintained.

Members and Staff discussed covenants and restrictions, long-term plans for property management, neighborhood amenities, yard sizes and setbacks, architectural features, and the planned Tree Conservation Easement (TCE).

Mr. Shipley expressed concerns about this type of development attracting people who are not planning on staying in the community long-term. Mr. Kunkel referred to a market study the petitioners commissioned and stated that residents in neighborhoods like this do tend to stay and they are deliberately making the choice to live in a single-family home without the demands of homeownership.

Floor opened for public comments

Brian Burney asked who would maintain the regulated drain, if there would be a sidewalk along CR W 650 N, and for statistics for police/fire/EMS runs to rental homes and the effect of high student turnover on schools. Dr. Burney stated that thinks schools view high student turnover as a burden to their system.

Robert Trittipio asked about the depth of the TCE on the east side along his property and allowable maintenance, voiced concerns about construction trash, and asked about the location of the walking trail.

Kevin Smith asked if it was unusual for the covenants and restrictions to not yet be finalized.

Floor closed for public comment

Mr. Morelock stated that the County position is that if a regulated drain has any part in County jurisdiction it remains the County's responsibility. The County will retain responsibility for this drain. Mr. Witsman stated that the County will clear one side of the drain. Mr. Kunkel noted that the petitioners view the drain as a potential amenity.

Mr. Crum explained that Tree Conservation Easements (TCE) were based on arial maps, and that Staff and the Developers will revise the TCE areas if necessary. He also noted that the TCE's are only on the developer's property and do not affect the surrounding property owners. He stated that the PUD allows

for the clearing of dead vegetation, the clearing of undergrowth, and easements for a walking trail and utilities within the TCE. Mr. Witsman noted that the TCE location is preliminary and when they get further in the process they could move the walking path out of the TCE if it impedes drainage.

Mr. Kunkel said that he does not have the statistics Dr. Burney asked on hand. He said that the petitioners pride themselves on being good neighbors and proactively maintain a clean construction site. Mr. Crum said that the Town requires builders to have dumpsters on site and for them to be emptied regularly. He also said that builders need specific permission to go on private property.

Mr. Kunkel confirmed that covenants and restrictions will come with the platting process.

Mr. Crum noted a few areas the Town is still working with the Developer on and said that Staff is supportive of the petition. He stated that this project is also in front of the County and in the County this project is allowed by right. It will be approved either by the Town or by the County. He listed the benefits of annexing the property into McCordsville instead of having a pocket of County jurisdiction surrounded by McCordsville jurisdiction.

Ms. Schneckenberger asked for clarification on the setback for the TCE on the west property line. Mr. Kunkel said that while it was presented as 10', he thought it was 20' and was willing to keep it at the larger setback.

Ms. Hermann asked how this development would affect the school. Mr. Kunkle stated that based on the market study for this project, it would attract a broad pool of household types, from young families to empty nesters. He also said the market study indicated people attracted to these types of neighborhoods tended to stick to the area and not be transient. Mr. Shipley said studies show children who attend fewer schools do better than children who move schools.

Mr. Shipley asked what happens if McCordsville denies the development. Mr. Crum reiterated that the petitioner has made a primary plat filing in the County that is still active. That filing meets all County requirements and that there is no reason for the County to deny it. If McCordsville denies this development, it will still be built, still use McCordsville schools, and still use McCordsville services.

Mr. Gooding, Mr. Crum, and Mr. Morelock discussed how the properties will be assessed.

Mr. Crum provided the Members with a matrix (attached) comparing the development standards of this development with surrounding developments.

Ms. Schneckenberger made a motion for a favorable recommendation with the condition that Staff continues to work with the Petitioner on the TCE. Mr. Strayer seconded. The motion passed 6/1 with Mr. Shipley voting Nay.

New Business from Floor

No new business

Announcements

Mr. Crum discussed the drop in permits and the timing of different developments.

The next meeting will be September 20, 2022.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Development Standards Comparison Matrix

McCord Pointe

| Standard | Weavers Landing | Austin Trace | Sagebrook | Zoning Code R5 | Sycamore Drive |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| <u>Bulk</u> | | | | | |
| FY Setback | 25' | 25' | 35' | 35' | 40' |
| SY Setback | 6' | 5' | 7' | 10' | 8' |
| Agg. SY Setback | 15' | 10' | 14' | 20' | 16' |
| RY Setback | 25' | Unclear | 20' | 25' | 15' |
| Lot Width | 60' | 60' | 70' | 70' | 52' (48') |
| Min. Lot Area | 7,800 SF | May fall back to County ZO | 8,400 SF | 7,500 SF | 5,980 SF |
| Min. Home Size | 1,600 SF/1,800 SF | 1,200 SF | 1,500/1,800 SF | 1,100 SF | 1,600/1,800 SF |
| Max. Lot Coverage | 40% | May fall back to County ZO | May fall back to County ZO | 40% | 40% |
| Density | 2.59 u/a | 3.16 u/a | | 3 u/a | 2.25 u/a |
| <u>Architectural</u> | | | | | |
| Roof Pitch | 6:12, ancillary may be less | May fall back to County ZO | May fall back to County ZO | 6:12, 8:12 (gables) | 6:12, ancillary may be less |
| Vinyl | Permitted | Permitted | Permitted | Permitted | Prohibited |
| Front Façade Brick | 50% | 50% except for homes that feature a full front porch | 50% | 50% | 50% |
| Front Façade Brick Returns | Limited requirements | No requirement | No requirement | Required | Required |
| Side & Rear Brick | High Viz Lots | No requirement | High Viz Lots | Facades adj to streets, commons areas, parks, and trails | High Viz Lots |
| Façade Articulation | Front facade | No requirement | No requirement | Front & rear façade | Front façade |
| Min. Overhang | 9" | No requirement | 9" | 9" | 8" (brick), 12" (siding) |
| Special Lots (requirements for high visibility lots) | Corner lots must feature 50% brick, perimeter lots must have rear façade articulation & 1 feature | No requirement | Corner lots must feature 3' brick ledger, 1/3 of perimeter & ditch lots shall have 1 feature | 50% of side and/or rear elevation must feature brick | Corner lots must feature 3' brick wainscot wrap & 3 windows. Perimeter lots rear articulation, rear gable, and brick wainscot wrap. |
| Max Elevation % | 10% | No requirement | No requirement | 10% | 17% |
| Anti-monotony | Same elevation shall not be repeated unless separated by 3 homes on either side of the subject home and three immediately across the street | Unclear | No model shall be next to or directly across the street from same model | Single elevation shall not be repeated unless separated by at least different elevations along either side of same street frontage | No model shall be next to or directly across the street from same model or like model |
| Exterior Chimneys | brick or stone | No requirement | May fall back to County ZO | Brick if abutting street | Brick unless on rear elevation |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Front Porch Columns | 6"x6" | No requirement | May fall back to County ZO | 6"x6" | Min. 8"x8" |
| Min. # of Windows | Ranch - 1 on all sides, 2 facing street, 2-story - 2 on all sides, 3 facing street | No requirement | Corner lots shall have a min of 2 windows on secondary frontage | 1 on all sides, 3 facing street | Ranch - 3 on front, 2 on side, and 4 on rear. Multi-story - 4 on front, 2 on side, & 4 on rear. |
| Window Treatment | Shutters, mullions or grids on all facing street except large picture, casement & small non-opening. | No requirement | Shutters on rear elevations facing a County Road | Shutters, mullions or grids on all facing street except large picture, casement & small non-opening | No requirement |
| Window Trim | Min. 1"x6" | No requirement | Min. 1"x6" | Min. 1"x6" | Min. 1"x6" |
| Garage Size | Min. width of 20' | No requirement | No requirement | Min. 22' in width | Min. 398 SF |
| Decorative garage doors | Front-loading garages | No requirement | No requirement | Front-loading garages | Front-loading garages |
| Front-load Garage Off-set | 2' | No requirement | No requirement | 2' recess | No requirement |
| Front-loading 3rd Car Garage Bay | Separate door & recessed at least 2' | No requirement | May fall back to County ZO | Separate door & recessed at least 2' | Separate door & recessed at least 2' |
| Front-load Garage Width | 45% (50% 3-car) of front façade | No requirement | May fall back to County ZO | 45% of front façade | 45% (50% 3-car) of front façade |
| Side-load Garage Requirement | No requirement | No requirement | No requirement | 25% | No requirement |
| Architectural Features | No requirement | No requirement | No requirement | No requirement | No requirement |
| <u>Miscellaneous</u> | | | | | |
| Perimeter Landscaping | 7 trees & 6 shrubs per 100', 3-5' mounding | Appropriate mounding and landscaping | 5 trees & 10 shrubs per 100', 3-4' mounding | No requirement | 5 trees & 8 shrubs per 100', 3-4' mounding |
| Perimeter Landscape Width | 50' | Unclear | Unclear | Depends upon various factors | 30' |
| Perimeter Paths/Sidewalks | Yes | No requirement | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tree Conservation Area | Yes | No requirement | No requirement | Yes | Yes |
| Model Homes | 1 of 2 largest floor plans offered | No requirement | No requirement | No requirement | NA |