**Plan Commission**

**Meeting Minutes**

**February 19, 2019**

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**: Devin Stettler, John Price, Tom Strayer, Jon Horton, Brianne Schneckenberger and Barry Wood.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Steve Duhamell

**OTHERS PRESENT**: Director of Planning Ryan Crum, Attorney Greg Morelock, Town Engineer Mark Witsman, Town Manager Tonya Galbraith and Planning Administrative Assistant Michelle Strader.

**Oath of Office**

Mr. Stettler, Mr. Strayer, Mr. Horton, Ms. Schneckenberger and Mr. Wood were sworn in by Atty. Morelock.

**Election of Officers – 2019**

**Motion by Mr. Strayer to appoint Devin Stettler for President and Jon Horton for Vice President of the Plan Commission for 2019. Second by Mr. Wood. Motion carried 6/0.**

**Agenda Consideration – None**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Motion made by Mr. Horton to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2019 meeting as presented. Second by Mr. Price. Motion passed 5/0/1 with Ms. Schneckenberger abstaining.**

**Old Business**

**Daniel’s Vineyard Commitment Modification**

Mr. Crum stated last month there was a request to withdraw that and the Commission voted to not quite accept the withdrawal yet and directed staff and Mr. Strayer to meet with the Vineyard folks and discuss some things. We have done that, and I would defer to Tom to share what those discussions amounted to.

Mr. Strayer stated we discussed in the last meeting that we wanted to make sure that before we were asked to move that request that we wanted to make sure they thought they had a fair hearing in front of this board. We had a good discussion with them. Their concerns were really dealing with the fact that with the noise ordinance, as approved, they didn’t feel that they could do some of the other things that they had originally requested because they felt that for all of those things to be successful, they needed to have the outside venue. I don’t want to get too much into the noise ordinance because that’s not part of this board, but in their eyes, they feel they are all combined. I believe they feel that they can meet the noise ordinance in the existing developments around their vineyard. We did say, to make everybody feel a little more comfortable, whether that would work or not, we might talk to them about doing a one-time event where they could actually test it and see just where they needed to be. I think the Town could probably work toward giving them an exception; I’m not sure how that would go through, whether the Council will be able to do that or how that would work, but we just wanted to make sure that everybody felt like they were being treated fairly. There were some questions that will have to come in front of this board as far as commitments on future developments and that’s something that we’re looking into.

Mr. Crum stated the takeaways were there were some things they asked the Town to look at and evaluate; we have agreed to do that, but in order to do that we do need some more time in order to make those evaluations and those assessments. Staff will be requesting, again, a continuance to their Commitment Modification request for at least another 30 days so we can continue to evaluate all options to make sure that our position allows for them to grow as a company as long as they still follow the rules.

Mr. Horton asked so they do not want to withdraw. Mr. Crum stated they do not want to withdraw. Mr. Strayers stated and they are still looking into it on their end to see, in that same timeframe, if they do decide while it still makes sense for them to withdraw or whether it makes sense to work toward bringing it back up again.

**Motion by Mr. Strayer to continue the Daniel’s Vineyard Commitment Modification to the next Plan Commission meeting. Second by Mr. Horton. Motion passed 4/1/1 with Mr. Price denying and Ms. Schneckenberger abstaining.**

**New Business**

**Weavers Landing, Section 1, Development Plan and Secondary Plat**

Richard Henderson, represented the petitioner, stated we’ve gone through TAC, as mentioned in his commitments, there’s a couple minor issues that we’re working through on the storm sewer as far as sub-surface drain with Mark, but we’ve addressed all the other comments at this point.

Mr. Crum stated this is the first section of Weavers Landing so it does have an exterior entrance; that is a median landscaped entrance as required by the PUD Ordinance and staff has done its typical review of development standards, lot sizes, bulk standards and it does comply with all aspects of the ordinance.

Mr. Price asked if Nottingham Lane would be connected and paved. Mr. Crum stated Nottingham is split so just to the stub would be asphalt. Mr. Henderson stated for this section it will and then the next phase, Section 2, we’ll connect those two stub streets. Mr. Crum stated those stubs aren’t long enough for us to require cul-de-sacs, so they are stubbed and barricaded until Section 2 is built.

Ms. Schneckenberger asked if this would connect with Austin Trace. Mr. Henderson stated it does. The first Section, we have a sub street to Laredo Drive. That’s also where our utilities are being serviced from; sanitary and water both get extended from that sub street from Austin Trace.

Mr. Price asked what the issues were that came up at TAC. Mr. Witsman stated there were some drainage comments, street light locations. The biggest issues I had were associated with the sub-surface drain where those were tied in. Drainage is not finalized; we still are going through the review with Christopher B. Burke. We had some issues with the sub-surface as far as some of the comments and discovered some issues just today about those, but it’s not unusual to have those not wrapped up by Plan Commission. The drainage review sometimes takes months or weeks after Plan Commission sometimes to resolve all the comments. My comments were more on the location of the sub-surface risers and the laterals to individual lots and making sure they were all served. Those have not all been addressed; we will have revisions to go through on the plan. Talking with Richard Henderson today and the builder, who is Westport now, and some revisions to their plans as far as if the basements are included or not and making sure we provide lateral stubs for those to connect to the sub-surface drains. Nothing earth shattering on those comments, just making sure they comply with our standards.

Mr. Stettler stated there was quite a bit of discussion regarding the downstream and Lawrence. Is there continued dialogue between? Mr. Witsman stated yes, as far as I was concerned, and what I’ve heard, everything is resolved. Richard Henderson and I did meet with Lawrence and it was worked out between the developer and Lawrence; an agreement to do some improvements on our end and Lawrence would actually do improvements on the ditch, as well. Mr. Henderson stated we are replacing the culvert underneath Carroll Road; enlarging it to a 30-inch pipe, it’s currently a 24-inch culvert under there. One of the issues they have is it’s right at the edge of the pavement, so it needs to get extended. We’ve gone through the detention calculations, we’ve responded to Christopher Burke’s initial set of comments and as far as the downstream discharge, we submitted all of that to Lawrence and they’re receptable to that. They’re picking up the cleaning of the ditch downstream from the culvert we’re installing from Carroll Road. Mr. Witsman stated, and that cleaning of the ditch is going to be critical to addressing resident concerns along that ditch. It’s built up over time and it was not flowing well so that portion will hopefully eliminate any standing water issues on those lots. Mr. Strayer stated it looks like there’s a lot of erosion coming off that field currently and that should totally go away with development. Mr. Henderson stated yes, with the detention ponds that we’ll be installing; they will act as sediment basins to collect sediment from upstream even of our project so it will get deposited into our facilities and transport them downstream. We have an extensive erosion control plan that we’ve provided to Mark; they’ve reviewed that, as well. I think we’ve addressed all the comments and concerns on the erosion control plan. We will be paying attention to this site very closely just to make sure we don’t have any issues throughout the construction of this project. It should improve their conditions with our sediment basins that we will be installing with the development of this project.

There were no public comments.

**Motion by Mr. Horton to approve the Development Plan and Secondary Plat for Weavers Landing, Section 1 as presented. Second by Mr. Wood. Motion carried 6/0.**

**Oakcrest Rezone from Residential 1 (R-1) & Deer Crossing Planned-unit Development (PUD) to Oakcrest PUD**

Mr. Crum stated we are not rezoning any lots in Deer Crossing. A portion of the property the petitioner is acquiring is property owned by Geist Community Church. That church is zoned Deer Crossing PUD, which is the reason why the Deer Crossing PUD is involved, but there are no actual lots involved in Deer Crossing.

Caitlin Dopher, representative from Pulte Homes, stated since Pulte hasn’t built in McCordsville for a while we just wanted to reintroduce you to our brand. The project we’re here to talk about tonight is about 25 acres. The land plan has changed a little bit since our introduction at Town Council. Originally the road was fairly straight; we still have 55 lots, but based off of feedback from staff, Town Council and TAC we did jog the road a little bit and added a median at the entrance and the traffic circle both to improve safety in the neighborhood. The subdivision features two detention ponds and a walking trail going south along Carroll Road, which will connect to Deer Crossing to encourage connectivity. The density of Oakcrest is 2.2 acres so it falls inline with the other subdivisions in the area. The entry monument is a little more modern than what you typically see, but we wanted it to be eye-catching and to be a little different from the surrounding subdivisions. The specific homes that we’re bringing to Oakcrest is what we call our Landing Series; they are a little more open-concept. Square footages range from 1,800 to over 3,000 square feet, 3 to 4 bedrooms, 2.5 bathrooms and floorplans also feature loft and flex rooms. These floor plans are also what we call life-tested living spaces, which means we bring focus groups together to actually walk the floorplans and give us feedback on what they like, what they don’t like. Ms. Dopher reviewed the floor plans and architectural requirements with the board.

One of staff’s comments in the Staff Report was our language for garage sizes. The language we proposed is all homes shall contain a minimum of a two-car garage with a minimum width or depth of 20’ or shall incorporate additional interior garage storage space at a minimum of 4x4. That first part was taken from other PUD’s; McCord Pointe and Weavers Landing. All but two of the homes meet that 20’ width or depth standard except for the Bennett and Continental plans, which is why we then added the language of the storage space requirement. Our garages, the Bennett and Continental, are two of the three largest garages we have in the Landing Series so it’s not that they’re small garages or they don’t have the storage space, it’s just their size and shape are a little different.

The other item that was mentioned in the Staff Report was the anti-monotony code. McCordsville’s anti-monotony code is pretty simple; it’s only two items. Our anti-monotony code factors in color packages and masonry packages in addition to the elevation and as the town’s monotony code is written now, it doesn’t factor those two things in. Our sales counselors monitor our anti-monotony code during the home buying process.

Mr. Strayer stated Mark, I know you had a concern about the drive entrance and the length of the median. Mr. Witsman stated yes, they did address my concerns. Mr. Horton asked where the north bound road off the round-a-bout goes. Mr. Witsman stated it’s a stub to a future property. The assumption is that will develop sometime in the future and the stub is a requirement of us because if we didn’t have the stub there, the property would only have one entrance and not have any connectivity where you could, for safety reasons, have multiple access points. It also provides this property with, once that future to the north develops, a secondary access point.

Mr. Horton stated can we talk about the lighting. Mr. Crum stated the petitioner is proposing a little bit different lighting than our standard. Mr. Witsman stated our standard is 200 to 250 on alternating sides of the streets and at intersections and entrances. Mr. Crum stated it’s probably closer to 400-foot roughly of spacing, maybe a little less. The idea is to use dusk of dawn lights on garages to help illuminate the street and therefore reduce the dependency on street lights. That is something in the past that the town has been real interested in doing, but we thought that this was a good test site for that because it’s a small development so staff was supportive of the concept. Mr. Strayer stated the only concern would be the residents are part of the maintenance requirement for that street lighting. Mr. Crum stated it would be on the homeowner to actually turn them on. Mr. Strayer stated I’m less concerned now with LED’s and the length of time they last, but still that’s one place that there could be dark area without anybody really telling them to change their lights out. Are there other neighborhoods that you’re currently doing this? Ms. Dopher stated yes, all of our neighborhoods have that standard. We looked at comparable communities, Noblesville and Fishers, and they have the requirement of street lights are typically at the entrance and at the intersections then the carriage lights are used to illuminate in between. Our carriage lights are automatic so there wouldn’t be an issue of homeowners making sure they turn on. It’s on either side of the garage and it would be monitored by the HOA. Mr. Witsman stated the difference in the number of lights they are proposing 4 and our standards would be 9.

Mr. Price asked if there are going to be turn lanes at the entrance off Carroll. Mr. Witsman stated 700 West is actually controlled by Lawrence, so the entrance improvements are dictated by Lawrence. Obviously, we haven’t gotten to detailed plans at this point, but the assumption is that we will have similar entrance requirements that they have imposed on other developments such as Deer Crossing or Geist Woods. Mr. Crum stated it does line up across the street, so the passing blister is almost built-in to some degree. Mr. Horton asked if the houses will have basements. Ms. Dopher stated basements will be optional. Mr. Price stated the garage width of 19-feet is non-negotiable. Ms. Dopher stated those are our standard based floor plans so there will be a 4-feet bump and three-car garage options if it’s an issue for the homebuyer they can easily change it, but because these floor plans are life tested, they are that way because our homebuyers feel like that works for them. Mr. Price stated we had a change in the garbage pick-up with the large toters that take up quite a bit of space and if we start off with the relatively narrow garages because I think it’s supposed to be 22-feet. Mr. Crum stated our standard is 20-feet and a storage area or 22-feet without a storage area. Pulte is 20 without storage area or if it’s less than 20 with storage area. Ms. Dopher stated four out of the five of our plans have a storage area standard and then the one that does not meet the 20-foot requirement. Mr. Strayer stated I would be more concerned with that one than these because you are losing a foot, but you’re gaining a lot more storage then what we would have asked anyway.

Public Comment

Brad Schoeff stated we are located two properties north of the planned Pulte development. One of the things that sold our property are the big evergreens out front of our whole property that gives us privacy and a nice setting. We’re on board with the development until we saw a disruption planned that wasn’t brought directly to our attention that I read in the Staff Report about the infrastructure that the developer is planning on routing a sanitary sewer through our property and disrupting our lives, our property, and disrupting us potentially financially. We’re not a fan of that right now and feel like we’re being blindsided on this. I know I’m not alone with the other neighbors that are north of our house. We have buried tiles through our front properties, we have well and septic that work just fine and not to mention these 40 some foot-tall evergreens that give us privacy along the, now getting busier, Carroll Road.

Curtis Baker stated I’m concerned about the retention pond and maybe the pros and cons of it affecting Deer Crossing. I know they can cause issues at times when it’s so close to ours. There are two entryways, correct? Atty. Morelock stated it’s just the one. Mr. Baker stated is that for now or is that going to be another way to get through. My concern is we have had some new developments built adjacent to our properties and now we have a lot more traffic, not just from our community, but from other communities so we’re concerned about that.

James Lyons stated I’m concerned about the drainage; we’ve had water problems there for years. I’ve spent about $5,000 to have drainage put in the backyard where our well is and it goes down to the creek. If they come through there, are they going to cut that off? That water comes from all the surrounding areas and, of course, this area is going to being in more water. That keeps the water from going under the house so if they block all of that off if they come through there then we’ll be flooded out. We’re the lowest house on the street through there between the project and 900. Our finger system is out in front of the house and so is the neighbor on the north side of me; he’s got the same thing, a drain that runs from his backyard and it’s like a finger system. They both go into the drain that goes to the creek. I don’t think the County has a record of that, but that was put in by a farmer years ago. I think it’s about a 12 or 14-inch drainage tile that goes down through there. I’ve fought that for years and every time I tried to get something done about the drainage, they say it’s Marion County. Atty. Morelock stated technically that’s true, but that doesn’t help.

Grant Goodnight stated I live next to proposed Lot 27. I see some landscaping, but curious or maybe a recommendation to put some additional landscaping to help with the privacy and as he said maybe some additional landscaping where he might lose his evergreens. Just to kind of help keep the privacy and the division between the two housing.

Ms. Dopher stated for Brad, the sanitary sewer connection, we will definitely reach out to you, but something to note with the sanitary sewer, you don’t need to hook-up unless your sanitary sewer fails. Curtis, there is only one entrance right now to the subdivision and it’s off Carroll Road. There is a stub-street to the north and that will connect to this future development whenever it happens; we’re not sure when, but we have to plan for that. There will not be any roads connecting to Deer Crossing; the only connection will be the trail along Carroll. Drainage, I’m not an Engineer so our Engineer can get into more detail, but water flows from east to west on this site which is why we have a detention pond over here and it should catch a lot of the water that’s flowing through the property and off to other people’s properties. The additional landscaping, we are happy to meet with neighbors and discuss any ideas they have for buffering or any concerns they have about the development. We’re certainly willing to discuss that and work towards a resolution.

Mr. Witsman stated the sanitary sewer extension, I did meet with the homeowners along 900 North and 700 West last year. There was a property owner request for sanitary sewer and wanted to feel out the residents to see if any of them desired sanitary sewer service. The answer was an emphatic no, but they did have some drainage concerns. The town has not required mandatory connections so if there’s a resident that has a septic and their septic is working fine; we would not be requiring them to connect, but we would provide you a lateral to your property so in the event that you have issues in the future you can then make the decision on whether or not you wanted to repair your septic or make a connection. Having that lateral for your home would add value to your property. The landscaping concern, the Town would direct you to speak with Caitlin about any trees that are lost with the construction. I think that’s a property owner and developer negotiation. If you have landscaping that’s taken out with construction, make sure you address that with the developer and talk through what’s impacted and how to best restore that. You can’t replace 40-foot evergreens directly, but there may be some options that you might find agreeable. The Town does not have any drainage projects planned for that area and I was kind of hoping this project might address some of those drainage concerns, but it will not. The drainage actually routes to the southwest corner and discharges over where Deer Crossing does – the culvert crossing to Lawrence. They have a sanitary sewer line that would extend from the corner of 900 North and Carroll Road due south, but there is no drainage project associated with that. There is quite a bit of ponding and standing water that does occur; the Town is aware of that. We don’t have a project defined, but it is something we are looking at t see if there’s any improvement we may be able to incorporate in. There may be a Town driven project to extend the catch basin we have on the southeast corner of that intersection. At the same time this construction is going on we might have discussions with property owners about trying to solve that drainage problem at the same time.

Mr. Horton stated I heard Mr. Lyons say that he had put $5,000 worth of work to address the flooding on his property, but what I thought I heard was any of the work that is going to go through has the potential to cut some of the work and the other property, as well, and potentially put them in jeopardy for a period of time. Mr. Witsman stated they would be in jeopardy when construction goes through. Obviously, they would have to have those restored after it goes through. The other concerns, besides drainage, would also be the finger system for their septic. When the construction drawings are put together, we would have to survey to know exactly where those improvements are to attempt to make as best plans, we can ahead of time and then field adjust as we discover lines are not necessarily where we thought they were or if we have different lines. It was mentioned there are no plans on record for that, I’m sure that is correct, we have no plans for that and I’m sure the County has none either. We’ll have to depend a little on property owner knowledge and it might just have to be field located when the contractor goes through. The best way to alleviate that concern is just make sure it’s properly inspected, and we catch any of those lines that are uncovered when we do construction.

Mr. Strayer stated have you ever met with Brad before on his concerns because I didn’t think that line was going that far south when we were talking about it before. Mr. Witsman stated we were looking at extending the line along the east/west to get over to that property on the far east side of that block of homes, but that sanitary sewer is also planned to serve the five lots that are along 700 West. Mr. Strayer stated I understand that. I was just wondering if Brad was one of the people you had talked to. Mr. Witsman stated I’m afraid I don’t recall. It was about a year ago and we did send out a letter to all the property owners there to invite them to that meeting. I don’t remember if Brad was present or not. Mr. Schoeff stated I was present at that meeting. I expressed the same concerns there about disrupting, I don’t want to repeat myself, but yes. Mr. Strayer stated because it does look like that is one property that would have more of a hardship as far as that line because those are big trees. Mr. Witsman stated I agree. Mr. Schoeff stated there’s a water main currently not quite 15 feet off the edge of the road within the canopy of those evergreens so the sanitary would have to be about 10 foot off of that. Mr. Witsman stated it’s likely the sanitary sewer would not impact the large evergreens, but there are some other trees farther north. Mr. Strayer stated as far as the largest evergreens, do you think we can plan around those? Mr. Witsman stated if the alignment were to match where the existing manhole structure is at the corner of 900 North and if it extended due south it would miss those, but we do have some coordination because we need to find out where the finger systems are and where the other drainage discharge to. It’s easier to replace drainage lines and finger systems then it is rather large trees, but until we get into detailed engineering I hate to. Mr. Strayer stated but it could be coordinated. Mr. Witsman stated yes, we’re going to have impacts along those four lots; there’s not a doubt we’re going to have impacts to them. Aside from where the sanitary sewer would run through, if we also planned for a storm sewer project to extend up, at least to the third lot line, to catch some of that standing water we would be impacted at that line, as well. Mr. Price asked if there are any other alternatives for connecting to the sewer. Mr. Witsman stated no, that’s the Master Plan sanitary sewer to serve his property. Mr. Strayer asked so Deer Crossing is in a different basin. Mr. Witsman stated yes, it is. The sanitary sewer is, where it runs through Winding Bend, very shallow. It’s the very end of the line so it can’t be extended to serve his property. Mr. Horton stated we aren’t going to solution this tonight. Mr. Witsman stated no, there’s details that need to be worked out. The petitioner will have to acquire the sanitary sewer easements to cross five parcels in order to make this development work. That has not happened until the Town, of course, is agreeable with this particular development, the layout of it. Mr. Crum stated all are legitimate concerns, but all things we can’t answer at a re-zone stage.

Mr. Crum stated I wanted to outline the three things that staff had as discussion points in our Staff Report: One is the garages. Two is the anti-monotony, and I will completely agree with the petitioner that their anti-monotony standards are more restrictive than ours. If the Plan Commission would like to accept those, staff will enforce those anti-monotony standards. Personally, I would prefer to enforce ours; it simplifies things for us. If you can imagine, different anti-monotony standards across every single subdivision becomes a little bit cantankerous over time. Mr. Horton stated they can still go by their standard even if we enforce ours. There’s nothing that will prevent them from going above and beyond what our standards are. Mr. Crum stated the third item is staff felt like Lots 1 and 55, those will have some screening from Carroll Road in the form of landscaping and mounding, but we still wanted, at least, some brick on those side elevations facing Carroll. Mr. Strayer stated those two elevations would really be considered exposed elevations.

Mr. Horton stated but no concerns about the lighting; it just doesn’t seem safe long-term. Mr. Strayer stated if there’s an HOA requirement to maintaining that, I would have less concern about it. Ms. Dopher stated we’ve done it in all of our other subdivisions and haven’t had any issues. Mr. Crum asked if there is standard language about the lighting that is in the covenants that would give the HOA discretion to address potential problems. Ms. Dopher stated yes, our HOA’s are professionally managed outside so it’s a whole separate company that makes sure that every house conforms the way it should and keeps up to those standards.

Dave Compton, Vice President Land Acquisition at Pulte Homes, stated every association has professional outside management required – that’s our enforcement action. Sometimes I’m not very popular, if you leave your trash cans out, your boat stays out too long, you decide to do auto repair in your driveway; we’ll do things that are important to the quality of a long-term community. I call them nasty grams, but if your lights are out you’re going to get a nasty gram and there is enforcement action, including fines in the HOA, as far as making sure that things are kept up. It’s a standard that Pulte has. Mr. Horton asked does the HOA get handed to the neighborhood. Mr. Compton yes, when it does it’s still part of the requirement for that reason so that it doesn’t get dropped through the cracks and it also provides for the collection of fees.

Mr. Price stated the side-yard setbacks are 6-feet and there’s no minimum between houses. Ms. Dopher stated that is done to allow for three car garages on every single lot. There’s a possibility that every single lot could be like that, but chances are it likely won’t be. Mr. Price stated the minimum for lot width is 60-feet. Ms. Dopher stated that’s the minimum in the PUD, but as they are now, they are 62. Mr. Price stated I’m still concerned about the garage width because we have these big toters and where do you put it. Mr. Strayer stated I’m less concerned about those. The one that was only 19 wide, did that have an option on the side? Ms. Dopher stated yes, every home as a 4-foot bump option or a third car garage option. Mr. Strayer stated can we require that on the one that doesn’t have any additional storage on the garage because that would take care of that problem on that home. Ms. Dopher stated that is something that we would be comfortable with. Mr. Crum stated assuming this moves forward, we’ll fine-tune it before it goes to Council.

Mr. Price asked are we going to enforce the Town’s anti-monotony. Mr. Horton asked can we attach commitments to the recommendation or does that come later. Mr. Crum stated I think you can make it part of your recommendation. Mr. Strayer asked if they enforce theirs would it automatically meet ours? Is there any overlap where it wouldn’t? Atty. Morelock stated if it gets approved at Council level, that makes us the enforcement agency and that’s what Ryan is saying we don’t want. We want them, from our standpoint, it’s our anti-monotony policy. If they want to adopt something internally, that’s up to them, but Ryan doesn’t want to, and I agree with him, remember from subdivision to subdivision what the anti-monotony rules are. You can attach conditions to your motion and Council can take those into consideration. Ms. Dopher stated I would want to have more discussions with Ryan to make sure we’re on the same page. Mr. Crum stated I would be comfortable with the direction of letting staff and the petitioner work out that language in advance of Town Council.

Ms. Dopher stated lots 1 and 55, due to the added landscaping, that was added to the PUD after submittal and this was based off of staff comments saying that we needed to meet landscaping standards of other PUD’s that were in place. We just thought that having a wainscot requirement on these two lots facing Carroll Road might not be the best place to require our buyers to spend money, but it’s something that we are open to if staff and the Town feel strongly about that; that’s something we can commit to. Mr. Strayer stated I would like to see more detail on those sides that you would see from the street, but they, at least, need to meet a standard that we would normally want to see on a side-yard.

**Motion by Mr. Price if the petition moves forward it is subject to the following conditions: Staff and petitioner will work out language for a 4-foot bump-out for the Newberry model, staff and petitioner will work on anti-monotony language prior to Town Council meeting, and the requirement of wainscot on the side elevation facing Carroll Road for Lots 1 and 55. Second by Mr. Horton. Motion passed 6/0.**

**Motion by Mr. Price to make a favorable recommendation on Oakcrest Rezone from Residential 1 (R-1) & Deer Crossing Planned-unit Development (PUD) to Oakcrest PUD contingent on approved conditions. Mr. Stettler seconded. Motion passed 6/0.**

At this time, the Commission took a two-minute break.

**McCord Pointe, Section 2, Development Plan and Secondary Plat**

Brett Huff, representative from Stoeppelwerth, stated this is a continuation of the development that is already going on. We’ve addressed all of staff’s comments; we might have one lingering drainage comment to discuss with Mark and Christopher Burke, but we’ll get a meeting together to discuss that.

Mr. Crum stated we have gone through this, it’s been through TAC, and Mark and I have issued comments. All of the Planning & Building comments have been addressed; we always make sure that happens before these come to Plan Commission. Mark is working through some minor drainage comments, which is typical. This does meet all the requirements for the McCord Pointe PUD. This is a perimeter section so it does have some common area, landscaping and buffering along McCord Road, including a sidewalk along McCord Road for the width of the section and that will connect into future sections to create a sidewalk all along McCord Road. Mr. Witsman stated I will add there were improvements that also needed to be included along McCord Road and after looking at the overall development and how the sections were brought out, we decided to put off those improvements to do it all in one shot and include that with a future section.

There were no public comments.

**Motion by Mr. Horton to approve the Development Plan and Secondary Plat for McCord Pointe, Section 2 as presented. Second by Mr. Wood. Motion carried 6/0.**

**Old Business**

**Wastewater Plant Rezone**

Mr. Crum stated this current expansion would take it from 0.5 million gallons per day to 1 million gallons per day occurs all on that existing parcel. For some reason, many years ago the site was zoned Professional Business Office. My assumption would be it was zoned that way via the County decades ago and when we took over planning and zoning jurisdiction in 2011, we probably just maintained that zoning. It is now time to rezone that to something that makes more sense, which will be the P district (public/semi-public). That is the same zoning as the Town Hall site so having one consistent zoning designation across both parcels makes sense.

There were no public comments.

**Motion by Mr. Price to make a favorable recommendation on the Wastewater Plant Rezone. Second by Mr. Strayer. Motion passed 6/0.**

**Announcements**

Mr. Crum stated we will bring our Annual Report forward to this board in March. We are going to do some training and education for Plan Commission on April 6th at Buck Creek Fire Department. It will be held in conjunction with Cumberland and New Palestine’s Plan Commission and staffs. We are going to extend the invite for other BZA members, Town Council that want to come, but the focus is just Plan Commission. Lastly, I will also send everyone information on the ULI panel to give you a better idea of what that was, but national experts came into town back in mid-January and focused on the Mt. Comfort Road corridor. The big takeaway is they expect status quo development along the Mt. Comfort Road corridor from 96th Street to New Pal, the status quo to be $350 million market value over the next decade. If we do things properly, control land use, we market and brand that corridor they can see a market value in 10 years of $800 to 900 million. All of that is risked without a solution to the traffic.

**Adjournment**

**There being no further business, meeting was adjourned.**