



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** January 14, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

---

## Call to Order

6:37pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Dennis Anderson, Vice Pres
- L.J. Jernstadt
- Jan Jones
- Jason Lawson
- Joe Anderson
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Administrative Items

1. Election of 2013 Officers
  - a. D Anderson – I do not wish to continue on as Vice-president.
  - b. Worthley – the Executive Committee membership will remain the same.

*Motion for Worthley as President and J Anderson as Vice-president by Jernstadt. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*
2. Rules and Procedures
  - a. Jernstadt – I believe that the change to “Administrator” is incorrect. We should have the “Town Planner” and it should fall under the auspices of the Town Council. If we need to revisit the Zoning Ordinance for an amendment, then we should do that.
  - b. Molitor – the Plan Commission should oversee its own staff and not be assigned someone by the Town Manager. We should revisit this in the Zoning Ordinance.
  - c. J Anderson – keep the “Administrator” and change the Zoning Ordinance definition, then we can consider this.
  - d. Jernstadt – we also have to change the calendar tonight.
  - e. Worthley – we can change

*Motion to approve Rules and Procedures in Article V: Meeting Schedule only by Jernstadt. Second by Worthley. Motion passes unanimously.*

- f. Worthley – we need to change “Administrator” to “Town Planner” in the definitions as well as throughout the Zoning Ordinance.
- g. Molitor – what is it referred to in the budget?
- h. Scott Dompke, GRW – the contract refers to it as “Zoning Administrator”.
- i. Jernstadt – the Town Planner is paid for by the WPC.
- j. Worthley – Luzier, please move forward with this amendment.
- k. Worthley – Molitor, do we need to renew our contract with you?
- l. Molitor – no, it is on-going.

## Approve Agenda

- a. Luzier – I was not able to prepare a draft of the UDO in time for tonight’s meeting, so I would ask that we omit this item from the agenda.

*Motion to approve agenda, omitting the UDO Raw Draft Presentation by Worthley. Second by J Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

- 3. December 10, 2012
  - a. J Anderson – Agenda Item #3, the Motion passed 4/2 with D Anderson and J Anderson dissenting.

*Motion to approve minutes as amended by Worthley. Second by D Anderson. Motion passes 6/0 with Jernstadt abstaining.*

## New Business – Public Hearing

- 4. **Docket PC12-021-TA – PUD Text Amendment.** The Commission to consider the proposed technical amendments needed to convert the two PUDs from Boone County Ordinances to Whitestown Ordinances. (Golf Club of Indiana PUD, Boone County Ord #1999-10; Anson PUD, Boone County Ord #2004-10)
  - a. Staff Report – Luzier. Both PUDs were contacted. Anson was in agreement, but I did not hear anything from Golf Club of Indiana
  - b. Public Input – none.
  - c. WPC Comments – none.

*Motion to give a favorable recommendation by Jernstadt . Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Discussion Items

- 5. **Transportation Plan.** The Commission to receive a status update of the Transportation Plan.
  - a. Dompke – (distributed hand-out) We defined a study area and the land uses within. This information was used to calculate future population in order to estimate road use, miles of roadways, and ultimate build-out scenarios. Note that this is a 20-year Transportation Plan – not a traffic study. We are trying to use what we do know to help estimate what we don’t know.
    - i. Population projection scenarios were calculated for platted lots, building permits, wastewater flow study, and land use.
    - ii. The estimated average lane miles per square mile of developed property was calculated.
      - 1. Jernstadt – have we surveyed the public about what they experience?
      - 2. Worthley – we all know that traffic fluctuates on the roads we live/travel depending on when and where we are, even seasonally.

3. J Anderson – this is an update of the study. We are about 75% of the way through the process of gathering information. We have not put this into an actual plan yet. Tonight is just an update of what we have done so far.
4. Semmler – the agenda does say “update”, not the presentation of a finished plan.
- iii. We have also determined that there is disconnect between the road classification terms used in the various documents that govern development. The Comp Plan is a good start, but additional classifications are needed.
  1. Worthley – it appears that we cannot update the classifications in the Anson PUD.
  2. Molitor – we can work with them through this process, but essentially, you are correct.
- iv. We have started to develop a map showing where the proposed modifications to the existing road classifications should be in Whitestown as well as the Anson PUD.
  1. Jernstadt – how are we going to get the general public to understand this?
  2. D Anderson – this is part of the data collection process to recommend changes. Once we get to the recommendations part of the plan, we can document our methodology. We may not be able to necessarily get the public to understand the technical matters.
- v. We have started to develop a map where the proposed multi-purpose trail plan is shown along with the proposed road classification plan.
- vi. Our next steps include determining road classification details, address discrepancies between the development documents, and define capital projects. We will then draft the document and present it for public hearing by the Plan Commission and the Town Council.
- b. Jernstadt – given the annexation situation, I think we should just step aside and not deal with the Transportation right now.
- c. Semmler – that is not a good idea. We can’t put the entire town in “neutral” and wait around.
- d. Worthley – Dompke – would any of this information change if annexation occurred by us or the other towns?
- e. J Anderson – the Transportation Plan would not change, only our jurisdiction.
- f. Jernstadt – you have to lay down traffic count strips to get accurate counts on traffics.
- g. Dompke – we are not doing a traffic study. We are creating a plan based on land uses.
- h. Jernstadt – if we don’t know what businesses are going in, how can we develop a traffic plan?
- i. D Anderson – with regard to the seasonal traffic flow, we don’t have control of all the roads and we can’t do anything about it. We have to have a plan in place so that we know what direction to go with the infrastructure we do control. Pausing this process will not alleviate current problems.
- j. Dompke – we may need to look at alternative funding provisions for these roadways such as impact fees.
- k. Jernstadt – I thought the state legislature struck down impact fees.
- l. Molitor – incorrect – impact fees are still legal.
- m. Jernstadt – Boone County did a traffic study in 1999, which I know is out of date. How do we create a plan that is advanced enough to stay 5-10 years ahead of the process?
- n. Dompke – make regular updates with traffic counters.
- o. Lawson – we have already started doing traffic counts in high-intensity areas in the last couple of months.
- p. J Anderson – we can keep collecting data to show how inadequate and out-of-date our current plan is. We need to get enough data to have a future plan last into the future.
- q. Jernstadt – what happens when land use changes from what the plans shows?
- r. Semmler – this plan will not solve current problems, per se.

- s. J Anderson – the plan looks at maximum build-out as a scenario.
- t. Jernstadt – there has been a lot of short-sightedness in the past. I don't want to repeat these problems.
- u. Lawson – we are going to meet with INDOT and the other jurisdictions to try to solve the current issues.
- v. J Anderson – Dompke, you have concluded your presentation and we are needlessly discussing things. Let's give Dompke direction for the rest of the plan's development process.
- w. Jernstadt – let's place traffic counters in key areas and compare the traffic volume to what was projected in 1999, we would have a comparison starting point.
- x. Dompke – traffic counts in undeveloped areas aren't an effective communicator.
- y. J Anderson – was the county basing their planning efforts on traffic counts instead of land use in 1999.
- z. Jernstadt – exactly. But we could still use their 1999 data as a comparison to determine what happens in the next 20 years. I have been to a community that was effectively planned for transportation.
- aa. J Anderson – the "high-density build-out" is worst-case scenario. Were the same factors used for commercial and industrial development?
- bb. Dompke – trip generation for commercial and industrial land uses is numerous times higher than residential because they are destination places.
- cc. J Anderson – I think that some of us are concerned about the methodology for residential versus commercial/industrial.
- dd. Dompke – in the planning process, if you never show it, then you'll never get it.
- ee. D Anderson – in our meetings with INDOT, they indicated that they would be more receptive to an overpass midway on I-65 than the creation of a new interchange in this area.
- ff. Semmler – I suggest that we let the study process continue.
- gg. J Anderson – be sure that your methodology carries us in the future.

## Adjourn

8:30pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting - Cancelled

---

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

***Date:*** February 11, 2013

***Time:*** 6:30pm

***Location:*** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

***Members:*** Mark Worthley, Joe Anderson, Dennis Anderson, Jan Jones, Jason Lawson, Greg Semmler

---

**Due to a lack of agenda items, the WPC meeting for February has been cancelled.**



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** March 11, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:32pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President (arrived 6:35pm)
- Joe Anderson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson
- Jan Jones
- Jason Lawson
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

Comments

*Motion to approve agenda by D Anderson. Second by Jones. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

1. January 14, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Semmler. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

*Worthley arrives (6:35pm)*

## New Business – Public Hearing

2. **Docket PC13-001-DP - Development Plan - Crest 1 Building.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Development Plan for an industrial spec building. The subject property contains 1 acre and is located at 3930 Perry Blvd, on the north side of Perry Blvd, east of SR267, in Perry Industrial Park subdivision, Lot 12. The property is zoned I2 Heavy Industrial. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 2/12/2013. The petitioner and project engineer is Keeler-Web Associates and the owner is Crest 1, LLC.
  - a. Presentation – Adam DeHart and Tom Osterhaus. Distributed some additional information about the project. Osterhaus has built several buildings and additions in this business park and also owns

vacant lots there. The structure and design are compatible with the development standards for the industrial park. We have received architectural review and site plan review from Valenti-Held for the industrial park. The site configuration has changed slightly on the north end. It allows us to add a slightly larger lot. The building will be masonry block on the bottom with architectural metal paneling above. This is a spec building and includes a truck dock and small office area. We anticipate 15 employees to be able to work out of a building this size. We would anticipate a warehouse-type business. We believe that TAC comments have all been addressed with the revised plan submittal. We believe that the proposed development plan is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

- b. Staff Report – Luzier
- c. Discussion –
  - i. J Anderson – does the existing main provide adequate water flow for fire protection?
  - ii. DeHart – yes.
  - iii. J Anderson – I also wanted to note that the Perry Township Volunteer Fire Department does not have jurisdiction here, Whitestown does. Please update this information.
  - iv. Worthley – have you addressed all of the comments with resubmittal of your plans?
  - v. DeHart – we believe so. We haven’t gotten official confirmation from everyone yet.
  - vi. Worthley – how is your project unique?
  - vii. DeHart – this is designed for a smaller warehouse -type business who wants to have their own space.
  - viii. Osterhaus – Our buildings are designed for single-tenant occupancy, and we can build to suit.
  - ix. Jones – you said that you haven’t gotten approval from the Surveyor’s Office?
  - x. DeHart – correct. We expect feedback any day.

*Motion to approve PC13-001-DP with conditions by Worthley. Second by D Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

*1. TAC Comments be addressed.*

*2. Architectural and Development Plan approval from Valenti-Held be received.*

- 3. **Docket PC13-002-SP – Secondary Plat - Walker Farms, Sect 13B.** The petitioner is requesting approval of the Secondary Plat for Walker Farms, Section 13B. The subject property contains 10 acres and is located south of 400 S and west of South Main Street. The property is zoned R3 Residential. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 2/12/2013. The petitioner and owner is Beazer Homes of Indiana, LLP and the project engineer is Weihe Engineers, Inc.

- a. Staff Report – Luzier
- b. Presentation – Jim Shields with Weihe Engineering and Steve Cook with Beazer Homes. We have submitted revised drawings and are waiting for confirmation that we’ve addressed all of the TAC comments.
- c. Discussion – none.

*Motion to approve PC13-002-SP with conditions by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

*1. TAC Comments be addressed.*

## Announcements

- 4. Membership

- a. Luzier - After the January Meeting, L.J. Jernstadt resigned from the Plan Commission. He also served on the BZA and per the membership requirements, this position must also be a PC member. Therefore, L.J. can no longer serve on the BZA.
- b. Worthley – L.J. was a valuable member of the PC and BZA and he will be missed.

## Adjourn

6:56pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** April 8, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:33pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Dennis Anderson
- Jan Jones
- Jason Lawson
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## 2013 Officers

1. Re-election of Vice-president to replace former member Joe Anderson.

*Motion to nominate Jason Lawson by Anderson. Second by Worthley. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Approve Agenda

1. April 8, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. March 11, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Role of the Plan Commission.** PC Attorney, John Molitor will give an overview of the role of the Plan Commission and its members.
  - a. Molitor – present handout outlining the role of the Plan Commission and its members.
4. **Land Use Law Update.** PC Attorney, John Molitor will give and update on this year's changes to the Indiana Land Use Law that may affect Whitestown.

- a. Molitor – presents handout outlining recent changes to state statute.
- 5. **Annual Report and Budget Update.** PC Staff, Deborah Luzier, will give a 2013 budget update as well as go over the 2012 Annual Report.
  - a. Luzier – presents handout for 2012 Annual Report and the first quarter of 2013.
  - b. Luzier – presents handout for 2012-2013 budget.

## Announcements

### Adjourn

7:50pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** May 13, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:48pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President (absent)
- Jason Lawson
- Dennis Anderson (absent)
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Carey Domres
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. May 13, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Semmler. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. April 8, 2013

- a. Semmler – do you have to have been present at the meeting to be able to vote on the minutes?
- b. Molitor – No you don't. You can vote on the minutes even if you weren't at the meeting.

*Motion to approve the minutes by Jones. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Docket PC13-005-SP – Secondary Plat - Eagles Nest, 9B.** The petitioner is requesting approval of the secondary plat for Section 9B of Eagles Nest. The subject property contains 35 lots on 13 acres and is located south of 750 S and east of 600 E. The property is zoned R3 – Medium Density Residential. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 4/17/2013. The petitioner and owner is Eagles Nest Developer LLC and the project engineer is Benchmark Consulting.

- a. Presentation: Bill Ottinger, Benchmark Consulting. This is the last section of the development.

- b. Staff Report: Luzier
- c. Discussion:
  - i. Semmler – congratulations on completing the subdivision

*Motion to approve subdivision subject to meeting TAC comments by Lawson. Second by Jones. Motion passes unanimously.*

- 4. **Docket PC13-006-SP - Secondary Plat - Walker Farms, Sect 14.** The petitioner is requesting approval of the secondary plat for Section 14 of Walker Farms. The subject property contains 53 lots on 15 acres and is located on the south side of 400 S, west of S Main Street. The property is zoned R3 - Medium Density Residential. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 4/17/2013. The petitioner and owner is Beazer Homes of Indiana, LLP and the project engineer is WEIHE Engineers.
  - a. Presentation: Jim Shields, Weigh Engineering.
  - b. Staff Report: Luzier
  - c. Discussion:
    - i. Semmler – is there an indication about using the backflow prevention valves for meeting the finished floor elevation standards?
    - ii. Shield – we expect to meet the elevation and not need to use the valves.

*Motion to approve subdivision subject to meeting TAC comments by Lawson. Second by Jones. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Announcements

- 5. **EDC Fees.** Luzier gives an overview of Ordinance 2005-23, part of an inter-local agreement throughout Boone County for the purpose of establishing a special economic development charge to help fund the Boone County Economic Development Corporation. These fees will be collected by Whitestown when building permits are issued for all new commercial, industrial, and multi-family primary structures. The Boone County Auditor also collects fees at the time single-family residential subdivisions are platted anywhere in the county.

## Adjourn

7:05pm

---

Jason Lawson, Vice-President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** June 10, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:30pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson (absent)
- Carey Domres
- Trevor Hanshew (absent)
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Minutes

1. May 13, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

2. **Docket PC13-007-SP – Secondary Subdivision - Maple Grove, Sect 2.** The petitioner is requesting approval of Section 2 of Maple Grove subdivision with 27 lots as well as a waiver to reduce the centerline radius requirement from 200 feet to 50 feet in order to accommodate a 90° turn. The subject property contains 7 acres and is located in the southeast corner of Maple Grove subdivision, on the south side of Whitestown Parkway, east of 700 E. The property is zoned R-3 Residential. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 5/14/2013. The petitioner is M/I Homes of Indiana, LP, the owner is Diversified Property Group, LLC, and the project engineer is Innovative Engineering.
  - a. Presentation – Jerry Kittle. On the TAC comments, #7 references “lot numbers 15 and 16”. It should reference “manhole structure numbers 15 and 16”. Explains the waiver request for the curve at the southeast corner of the development. We have submitted

some sight-line calculations for that intersection based on INDOT standards (see handout). According to the calculations, we should be fine in this area for visibility.

- b. Staff Report - Luzier
- c. Discussion
  - i. Semmler – can you discuss drainage with the property owner to the south?
  - ii. Kittle – that property wants more drainage than the ordinance and the County Drainage Board allows. We have met the standards of the ordinance and will do so unless the Drainage Board asks us to do otherwise. The Drainage Board does not want the maintenance responsibility associated with the extra drainage that they are asking for.
  - iii. Worthley – with regard to the waiver, I don't think that stop signs would be necessary

*Motion to approve PC13-007-SP and waiver request with the condition that the TAC comments be addressed as amended by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

### Announcements

- 3. **Delegating Secondary Plats to Staff.** The Commission to discuss the possibility of having Staff take on the review and approval of Secondary Plats by utilizing a hearing officer.
  - a. Luzier – A couple of PC members have asked if Secondary Plat approval should be delegated to staff. I am comfortable with whatever you decide.
  - b. Semmler – I think that there's still value with having the PC review these petitions. It keeps us in touch with what's going on and some of us may have questions and can learn about the projects.
  - c. Molitor – I agree with Semmler. While we have a light load, there's no sense in trying to reduce our meeting agendas.

### Announcements

- 4. **Transportation Plan.**
  - a. Luzier – the Transportation Plan will be available for public review this week. It will be on the Plan Commission agenda at our July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for adoption consideration. If adopted, it will go to the next Town Council meeting for Resolution. I will distribute copies (hard or electronic) to PC members tomorrow.

### Adjourn

7:06pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** July 8, 2013

**Time:** Immediately following the BZA Meeting

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

7:07pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres (absent)
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres
- Trevor Hanshew (absent)
- Jan Jones (absent)
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. July 8, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. June 10, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Domres. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Docket PC13-009-CP - Comp Plan Amendment - Transportation Plan.** The Commission to consider approval of the Transportation Plan for incorporation by amendment into the Comprehensive Plan.
  - a. Presentation – Jay Johnson. Reviews differences between 2005 plan and the proposed plan. Rights-of-way have been reduced for all roadway designations, and some pavement requirements have remained the same or increased slightly. The right-of-way reduction is a cost savings for both the town and the developer. Outside of neighborhoods, none of the roadways meet the current or proposed requirements. The new roadway designs allow room

for expansion where needed. It's the pavement width, not the right-of-way, that helps to control speed. The proposed plan recognizes the Ronald Reagan Pky that will be coming through Whitestown in the future. The primary north-south collector has been moved from 700 E in the old plan to Main Street in the new plan. There is a proposed east-west crossing in between SR267 and Whitestown Pky. INDOT will support a bridge, but not an interchange on I-65. This would especially help alleviate some of the seasonal Amazon congestion.

b. WPC Discussion

- i. Worthley – who would be building the 146<sup>th</sup> St portion east of Whitestown?
- ii. Johnson – it will be either Whitestown or Boone County, depending on the timing. INDOT will also have a hand in it.
- iii. Worthley – when will the Ronald Reagan Pky be constructed?
- iv. Anderson – that has been in the works for more than 20 years. They just got the Hendricks County section near Avon and the airport constructed, so it could still be awhile before Boone County's portion is constructed.
- v. Semmler – Boone County also asked for an impact study on agricultural land as part of the Ronald Reagan Pky, but INDOT has not moved forward with that.
- vi. Johnson – the critical connection for Whitestown will be from 400 S to 146<sup>th</sup> St on the east side of town.
- vii. Semmler – that “bypass” will benefit historic Whitestown a lot.

c. Public Hearing – None.

d. Further Discussion

- i. Molitor – Scott Dompke from GRW is looking into impact fees. Do we need to discuss this?
- ii. Johnson – Dompke is still researching whether the fees are beneficial. A discussion on impact fees needs to be independent from adopting the Plan.
- iii. Worthley – what was the main issue with the seasonal Amazon traffic?
- iv. Anderson – it was getting people off of I-65 and into Amazon. Traffic slow-downs and stops create a chain reaction and back-ups. We worked with INDOT to collect data over several days that showed we had a major problem in this area. We have 30 mins to move 2,500 cars out and 2,500 cars in, so we were experiencing double back-ups. We defined and mandated alternative traffic routes for incoming and outgoing vehicles.
- v. Molitor – someone from the Town Council should contact Governor Pence about the exit-only ramp from I-65 to 400 S to help move it along.
- vi. Worthley – is there a roundabout planned for Indianapolis Rd and Whitestown Pky?
- vii. Anderson – yes.
- viii. Worthley – is there a reason not to vote on this tonight?
- ix. Semmler – this is a comprehensive document and received a lot of input from surrounding communities and jurisdictions. This is a good starting point for transportation in Whitestown.
- x. Worthley – do roundabouts fully replace stop lights?
- xi. Johnson – they are recommended wherever a signal would normally be.

- xii. Worthley – they are better for traffic, keep things moving, and are less costly for the town to maintain.
- xiii. Semmler – did this address signage and road markings for roundabouts?
- xiv. Johnson – the plan doesn't go into that much detail.
- xv. Domres – if an accident occurs, they aren't as major along a roundabout versus a signalized intersection.
- xvi. Semmler – I think that the document is ready to go to the Town Council.

*Motion to adopt the Transportation Plan by Anderson . Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## **Adjourn**

8:00pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** August 12, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

7:07pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres (absent)
- Josh Westrich
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. August 12, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. July 8, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Docket PC13-011-SP - Secondary Plat - Clark Meadows, Sect 2.** The petitioner is requesting approval of the Secondary Plat for Clark Meadows, Section 2. The subject property contains 35 lots on 16 acres and is located on the west side of S Main St at 550 S. The property is zoned PUD. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 7/16/2013. The petitioner is Pulte Homes of Indiana, the owner is Duke Construction Limited, and the project engineer is HWC Engineering.
  - a. Presentation – Brandon Burke, HWC Engineering. Introduces Matt Lohmeyer with Pulte Homes. This is a continuation of the development for Clark Meadows. There will be an off-site sanitary sewer

extension to the west that will serve an upcoming apartment development. There is also an overall drainage plan that serves this area that was coordinated with the Boone County Surveyor's Office.

- b. Staff Report – Luzier.
- c. Public Comment.
  - i. LJ Jernstadt, 601 E Pierce St, Whitestown – is this coordinated with the floodway capacity for drainage?
  - ii. Burke – yes.
- d. Further Discussion.
  - i. Worthley – do you have any issues in complying with the TAC Comments?
  - ii. Burke – no.

*Motion to approve the plat with condition that the TAC comments are addressed by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

- 4. **Docket PC13-013-W – Waiver – Clark Meadows.** The Petitioner is requesting a Waiver to reduce the driveway setback for corner lots throughout the Clark Meadows subdivision from 75 feet to 40 feet.
  - a. Presentation – Jon Dobosiewicz (distributes handout). Describes overall layout, affected lots, and sample lot. The 75' setback doesn't address road type, land use, or land intensity and limits the buildability of the corner lots in this subdivision. The reduction does not affect the "visibility triangle" at the corners. We have no issues with the proposed "no driveway access" note being added to the plat.
  - b. Staff Report – Luzier.
  - c. Public Discussion.
    - i. Jernstadt - I am opposed to any reduction in the 75' requirement. A reduction down to 60' may be reasonable, but reducing it to 40' as requested is unreasonable. It inhibits emergency traffic, snow plowing, etc. It was specifically designed for residential subdivisions and should not be reduced.
  - d. WPC Discussion.
    - i. Anderson – do you have any side-load garage floor plans?
    - ii. Lohmeyer – No. Given the depth of the sample lot, if you re-orient the home it will fit, but it will be invading the visual space of the homes around it. It will become an undesirable lot.
    - iii. Westrich – I haven't experienced any difficulty navigating parked cars on the street.
    - iv. Worthley – if this were to be opposed, what would your options be?
    - v. Dobosiewicz – we would have to re-design the future sections and it would particularly have a negative impact on the cul-de-sac corner lots. (distributes and describes samples of what other communities have as guidelines).
    - vi. Luzier – Maple Grove got a reduction down to 54 feet. Furthermore, Table 3 of the ZO says that the minimum road frontage of 50 feet, so there is conflict in the text.
    - vii. Jernstadt – the standard was established to push homes away from the intersections. There is conflict within the ordinance.
    - viii. Worthley – I think this mostly has an impact on lots 21, 46, and 50.
    - ix. Jernstadt – the cul-de-sac setback could be reduced without impact, but on the through streets, I don't think it should.
    - x. Worthley – do we have to consider this "as-is"? Or can we amend the request?
    - xi. Molitor – you could see if they are willing to amend it, but otherwise it's a yes/no.

- xii. Anderson – I agree that the cul-de-sac corners can be reduced to 40'. Could we go to 60' setback on the others?
- xiii. Dave Compton, Pulte Homes – This is a legitimate concern. I've dealt with this in many communities. Along thoroughfares, the setback should definitely be greater. I would ask that this be continued until next month so that this could be examined further. We already have approval of Section 1, so we are most concerned with the lots in this area. We will come back to you with a lot-by-lot analysis of the others to see what we can do.
- xiv. Semmler – I would agree that we should consider these on a case-by-case basis and see if we can't negotiate the minimum reduction needed for each lot.
- xv. Worthley – I think that Lot 21 should definitely not be granted this waiver on the north side.

*Motion to continue to September 9<sup>th</sup> WPC meeting by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Discussion

5. **Driveway Setback Waivers.** Given the recent requests for reducing the driveway setbacks for corner lots, the Commission to discuss the possibility of continuing to consider the waivers on a case-by-case basis or amending the ordinance to allow flexibility.
  - a. Worthley – when are we proposing to make an amendment if we did?
  - b. Luzier – we could go as quickly as September, or if we look at conflict in the UDO, it would be January.
  - c. Anderson – I think that a 60' setback would be more reasonable.
  - d. Worthley – would 60' stop the waiver requests?
  - e. Luzier – everyone has a right to request a waiver, so nothing would put a guarantee “stop” to them.
  - f. Compton – street width is important for parking. Everyone's goal is to minimize on-street parking. We could do some research for you as well. 50' would probably cut the number of waivers.
  - g. Worthley – Luzier, what did your research uncover?
  - h. Luzier – some communities had no standard. Some communities had a one-size-fits-all standard like Whitestown (60-100'). Other communities had a graduated scale based on the road classification.
  - i. Worthley – is our new Transportation Plan advanced enough to create a graduated scale for the setbacks?
  - j. Scott Dompke, GRW – yes. But it would require some updates to the ZO and SCO as well.
  - k. Worthley – since we've completed the Transportation Plan, then we should use it as a guide to develop a graduated system.
  - l. Molitor – we will put a draft ordinance on the September agenda for discussion and then hopefully we will be ready for final consideration in October.
  - m. Anderson – the Town Hall will be undergoing some remodeling, so when the meeting time gets closer, we may have to use a different meeting place. I will keep Staff posted.

## Adjourn

7:20pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** September 9, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:30pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres
- Josh Westrich
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. September 9, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. August 12, 2013

*Motion to approve the minutes by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Old Business

3. **Docket PC13-013-W – Waiver – Clark Meadows.** The Petitioner is requesting a Waiver to reduce the driveway setback for corner lots within the Clark Meadows subdivision from 75 feet to 40 feet.  
**Continued to 10/14/2013 - Petitioner is still reviewing the proposed waiver.**

## New Business – Public Meeting

4. **Docket PC13-012-SP - Development Plan - Woodlands Apts.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Development Plan for an apartment complex to be known as Woodlands Apartments. The subject property contains 26 acres and is located on the north side of New Hope Blvd, west of S Main St, and immediately

west of the Clark Meadows subdivision in Anson. The property is zoned PUD and it is part of the Town Center Residential District and is to contain 172 single-story apartments. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 7/16/2013 and then again on 8/13/2013 for a revised layout. The petitioner is Redwood Acquisition, LLC, the owner is Duke Realty, and the project engineer is Structurepoint.

- a. Presentation – Bill Butz, Structurepoint; Russell Brown, Redwood Acquisition; Craig Anderson, Duke/Anson. We reduced our design by 50-60 units from our original submittal. Units are all single-story, two-bedroom, two-bath, two-car garage with high-end finishes. Zoning allows 3-story, but we are designing for residents who desire ground-entry units. We are seeking approval of phase 1, which is south of 550 S. Phase 2 will be to the north and submitted at a later date. Utilities are being extended and New Hope Blvd is also being extended. Russell – Redwood is out of Ohio, so this is new to the Indiana market. Average occupancy is two persons per unit. Some units back up to New Hope Blvd, but they will all have a stone-wrap all the way around the buildings. The product will look good from the back as well as the front. There are no amenities (pool, clubhouse, and playground) because the anticipated residents will not require these types of things.
- b. Staff Report – Luzier.
- c. Discussion.
  - i. D Anderson – What is the outside material on the buildings?
  - ii. C Anderson – There will be a stone and wainscoting wrap for the first 8 feet up per the PUD ordinance. This company has presented a product and layout that will appeal to Whitestown.
  - iii. LJ Jernstadt, resident – what will the backs of the buildings look like? Will there be patios and sliding doors? Is that what people will have to see when they drive by?
  - iv. Butz – There is a grade difference, landscaping, and a setback that will break that typical view. The residents don't want to see the road either, so that's why we designed things the way we did. (distributes architectural elevations)
  - v. Worthley – What is the anticipated rent?
  - vi. Russell – About \$1,100/month/unit.
  - vii. C Anderson – Anson apartments fall in this same range for rent as well. Redwood will close on the property for Phase 2 in late fall.
  - viii. D Anderson – So if they get approval for Phase 1, will the design for Phase 2 will mirror this first phase?
  - ix. Butz – Yes, the Phase 2 product will be the same. In Phase 1, construction will begin on the east part of the site and continue to the west.
  - x. C Anderson – They are also investing in the utility and road extensions, so they will be committed. They will have to build New Hope Blvd all the way to their western property line.
  - xi. Jones – How big are the units?
  - xii. Butz – 1,200sqft-1,600sqft. Some have sun rooms attached as well.
  - xiii. D Anderson – So you won't build multi-story units?
  - xiv. Butz – Redwood does not build multi-story units. If multi-story units were desired, a different developer would have to come before you for a separate, new approval.
  - xv. Domres – are the finished walls 8 feet or 9 feet tall inside?
  - xvi. Butz – it's 2x6 construction, but I'm unsure of the exact interior finished height.
  - xvii. Semmler – we need to keep a high standard of bufferyard along the main roads for both the residents living here and persons that drive by.
  - xviii. Butz – there is a landscape bufferyard and sidewalks along New Hope Blvd. The project connects to these sidewalks and open spaces. The finished floor will be below the elevation of New Hope Blvd (it is elevated), so this will also assist with buffering.

- xix. Worthley – do you have any issues with satisfying the outstanding TAC comments?
- xx. Butz – we have no issues.
- xxi. Semmler – Since the layout has changed, I just want to emphasize that staff needs to look over the plans very carefully throughout this process.

*Motion to approve the plat with condition that the TAC comments are addressed by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Discussion

5. **Driveway Setback Ordinance Amendment.** Commission to review proposed language for driveway setbacks based on the intensity of the roadway.
  - a. Luzier – presents draft ordinance.
  - b. Jernstadt – I reviewed my notes from the original ordinance updates. There is no variation in the front yard setbacks of the current subdivisions that are currently being approved and constructed. This was something we wanted to start seeing with new development.
  - c. Worthley – the proposed language would increase the driveway setback from the intersections along the larger roads. Do you see this as a problem?
  - d. Luzier – the current development along the major roadways has had frontage roads for their access, so driveway setbacks haven't even been a problem. Putting this language in the ordinance would assist developers in knowing that they can't get a driveway cut wherever they want.
  - e. Worthley – Staff should draft language for presentation and discussion at a public hearing at the October PC meeting.
  - f. LJ Jernstadt – this would still have to be approved by the Town Council.
  - g. Molitor – to clarify, the PC would hold a public hearing on the proposed amendment and make a recommendation to the Town Council. If the PC's recommendation is favorable, then the Town Council could decide to approve it. If the minimum driveway setback of 50 feet is not what you're thinking of, let us know now so that we can make revisions.
  - h. Worthley – since we recently granted a waiver to reduce the setback from 75 feet down to 52 feet, I don't think that making an ordinance amendment reducing it to 50 feet is unreasonable. We can leave it as-is.

## Announcements

6. **APA-Indiana Fall Conference, October 10-11 in Muncie, IN.** The 2013 APA Indiana Fall Conference *Planning for Healthy Communities* will be held at Ball State University's L.A. Pittenger Student Center October 10th & 11th, 2013. Come join planning colleagues across Indiana as experts convene to discuss ways to integrate public health initiatives into the planning practice. Visit [www.IndianaPlanning.org](http://www.IndianaPlanning.org) for more information. Contact Deborah if you would like to attend [wpcStaff@whitestown.in.gov](mailto:wpcStaff@whitestown.in.gov) or (317) 966-8640.

## Adjourn

7:11pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** October 14, 2013

**Time:** Immediately following the 6:30pm BZA hearing.

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

7:15pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres
- Josh Westrich
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. October 14, 2013

*Motion to approve the agenda by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

- a. L.J. Jernstadt, resident – I request that anything addressing a driveway setback be removed from the agenda.
- b. Molitor – there is nothing on the agenda regarding the driveway setbacks that requires a public hearing.
- c. Jernstadt – I thought that an ordinance amendment was being considered.
- d. Worthley – if no one wants to re-visit approval of the agenda, then it stands as approved.

## Minutes

2. September 9, 2013

*Motion to approve the minutes by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Hearing

3. **Docket PC13-016-PP – Primary Plat - Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Primary Plat to be known as Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision with one lot and one block (for future subdivision). The subject property contains 24 acres and is located on the south side of Whitestown Pky and east of 700 E. The property is zoned GB-General Business and MF-Multi-family. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 9/17/2013 and revised plans addressing all of the TAC comments were submitted on 9/30/13. The petitioner and owner is Diversified Property Group, LLC and the project engineer is Innovative Engineering.
  - a. Presentation – Jerry Kittle, Innovative Engineering and Diversified Property Group. Describes the proposed primary plat. Lot 1 is for the Watermark Stonegate Apartments and Block 1 is for future commercial development and will be further subdivided as needed.
  - b. Staff Report - Luzier
  - c. Public Discussion
    - i. Jernstadt – The plans for the apartment complex show a dog park area. I don't believe that a dog park is permitted in the proposed zoning districts. I also don't think that parking spaces can be located in the utility easements.
    - ii. Kittle – Jernstadt is referring to our proposed Development Plan, which will be discussed at the time it is brought to the WPC for consideration. Only the primary plat is being considered tonight.
    - iii. Worthley – the property is properly zoned for the proposed plat and uses.
    - iv. Jernstadt – I was under the impression that the Development Plan was already approved for this project.
  - d. WPC Discussion
    - i. Worthley – what types of businesses do you expect in Block 1?
    - ii. Kittle – uses are limited as part of our commitments, but could include restaurants, commercial businesses, etc that would require approximately 1.5 acre sites.
    - iii. Worthley – are the concerns of the property owner to the south being addressed? I remember that discussion from the previous hearing.
    - iv. Luzier – commitments are in place for special landscaping along the southern property line. The site design will reflect these commitments in the proposed development plan and will be considered at a later date.

*Motion to approve the primary plat by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Old Business – Public Meeting

4. **Driveway Setbacks.** Given the recent requests for reducing the driveway setbacks for corner lots as well as the potential draft amendment, Staff has asked Steve Fehribach from A&F Engineering to give a presentation on driveway setbacks and visibility at corners to provide the Commission with additional information on the subject.
  - a. Fehribach – A&F specializes in traffic engineering. Staff has asked that we provide you with some more information about driveway setbacks and answer questions that you may have about the standards in your ordinance and contemplations in changing them. The issue of driveway setbacks has come up in many communities and we have researched why the setbacks vary. Your current rule is 75 feet from your right-of-way line and this is concerning because the right-of-way could change. Other communities use the centerline of the road

- or the edge of the pavement as a starting point because these elements are firm and do not change. Secondly, why 75 feet? This may be for visibility for persons already on the road who need to see someone backing out of their driveway and vice-versa. Referring to the diagram, at the 75-foot distance, someone has the opportunity to plant a tree or shrub that could block the visibility. In addition, your ordinance describes a “25-foot sight-triangle” per the second diagram. This is an excellent rule. However, this triangle doesn’t fall within the 75-foot setback requirement. Therefore, the 25-foot triangle rule already achieves your goal of visibility. Thusly, the driveway setback should be established as at least 25 feet, but we find no basis to have a driveway setback greater than that.
- b. Worthley – is the 25-foot sight-triangle measured from the right-of-way?
  - c. Faribach – yes.
  - d. Domres – and since the right-of-way could change, the sight triangle is adjusted accordingly.
  - e. Worthley – what about speed?
  - f. Faribach – as long as you can see, speed wouldn’t come into play on a residential street. I am specifically talking about a residential street in this discussion and diagrams.
  - g. Worthley – you are saying that as long as the driveway is anywhere outside the 25-foot sight-triangle, then we should be fine on a residential street.
  - h. Faribach – correct. We are also working on your impact fee study, so we are familiar with Whitestown. The farther you push the driveway from the intersection, the larger the residential lot widths need to be, which may defeat some of the goals of your Subdivision Control Ordinance.
  - i. Anderson – I understand this and it makes sense to me.
  - j. Molitor – Staff is currently under direction from the WPC to prepare an ordinance amendment. We postponed the discussion to accommodate more discussion tonight. We are currently considering reducing the driveway setback from 75 feet down to 50 feet. Let Staff know if this figure needs to be changed. The Town Council will ultimately make the final decision.
5. **Docket PC13-013-W – Waiver – Clark Meadows.** The Petitioner is requesting a Waiver to reduce the driveway setback for corner lots within the Clark Meadows subdivision from 75 feet to 40 feet.
- a. Presentation – Jon Dobosiewicz. Staff has asked that we focus on only the affected lots in Section 1 at this time. Therefore, we analyzed each of the three affected lots and provided a sample layout of exactly the minimum waiver requested, 40’, 54’ and 54’ for lots 21, 22, and 29 respectively. If the ordinance was amended to a 50’ driveway setback, then all but two of the waivers for the remaining development would disappear. Lots 44 and 129 do not need a waiver from your current standards and should be removed from the list regardless.
  - b. WPC Discussion
    - i. Jones – would anything prevent a lot owner from coming back in the future to accommodate a u-shaped drive?
    - ii. Dobosiewicz – the ordinance does not allow you to have a u-shaped driveway.
    - iii. Anderson – also, the driveway has to be on the same side of the lot that the address is based from.
    - iv. Semmler – the relief that they’re asking for on these three lots mirrors what was granted for the Maple Grove subdivision. I have no issue with the waiver requested for these lots.
    - v. Domres – this isn’t an ordinance amendment, so considering these three lots isn’t unreasonable.

- vi. Worthley – the affected lots in Section 1 are lots 21, 22, and 29. Only lot 21 is asking for less than 50 feet.
- vii. Domres – are the purchasers informed of the 25-foot sight-triangle requirements?
- viii. Dobosiewicz – it’s on the plat. If they’re in violation, it will have to be addressed. In addition to the condition requested by staff, we can add a condition that the sight-triangle be added too.
- ix. Matt Lohmeyer, Pulte Homes – we can also make a note on the plot plan to ensure that the lot owner has been notified.
- x. Worthley – the 25-foot sight-triangle is part of the ordinance, so if they violate it then it’s up to the town to enforce regardless.

*Motion to approve the waiver with conditions for lots 21, 22, and 29 in Section 1 by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

*CONDITION: 1) The existing plat for Section 1 shall be changed to should show a, “no driveway access” line along the frontage of the affected corner lots. Said line should be measured from the intersection of the rights-of-way bordering each lot. 2)A note about the sight-triangle shall be added to the plat and plot plan.*

## **New Business from the Floor**

- 6. **2014 Calendar.** The Commission to review and potentially approve the proposed 2014 meeting calendar.
  - a. Luzier – the calendar for next year shows the meetings to be on the second Monday of each month as usual. All of the other dates fall into place accordingly based on the hearing date.
  - b. Worthley – does the meeting calendar avoid all of the holidays?
  - c. Luzier – yes.

*Motion to approve the 2014 Calendar by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## **General Public Comment**

- a. Jernstadt – First, I would like to be given permission to discuss WPC petitions with Commission Member Jones prior to the meetings. I am a subject-matter expert and she has asked for assistance with things she doesn’t understand. Second, Commission President Worthley, you can call me and I can tell you about why the 75-foot requirement is in place to begin with.
- b. Worthley – I don’t understand what your contact with Ms. Jones is in regard to. This matter isn’t on the agenda anyway.
- c. Molitor – there are restrictions on ex parte conversations with BZA members, but there are no such restrictions for WPC members. Jones can discuss matters with Jernstadt if she chooses.
- d. Jernstadt – Are the Whitestown PC Rules and Procedures different from the Boone County APC Rules and Procedures? At Boone County, you couldn’t discuss things with WPC members.
- e. Worthley – if you are a resident, concerned citizen, or anyone else, you can talk individually to a WPC member.
- f. Molitor – that is correct. However, if you’re on the BZA you cannot discuss pending matters with anyone.

## Adjourn

8:06pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** November 11, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

7:32pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres (absent)
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Josh Westrich
- Staff:
  - Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. November 11, 2013

*Motion to approve agenda by Worthley. Second by Lawson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. October 14, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Old Business

## New Business – Public Hearing

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Docket PC13-015-SP** - Secondary Plat - Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision: ***Continued until plans are finalized (tentatively December 9<sup>th</sup>)***
4. **Docket PC13-014-DP** - Development Plan – Watermark-Stonegate Apartments: ***Continued until plans are finalized (tentatively December 9<sup>th</sup>)***

- a. Jerry Kittle, Innovative Engineering – I can answer any questions on both projects listed. Both are time-sensitive and must be done concurrently. We have errors on the plans yet to address that we missed. Matt Griffin with Watermark is also here. Since this is time-sensitive, we are requesting a special meeting of the PC to hear these in November, possibly the 25<sup>th</sup>. We are aware that public notice would be required for a special meeting. We'd like to have it sometime that week, though. December 9<sup>th</sup> is simply too long for us to wait.
- b. Worthley – so you acknowledge that the staff review comments are legitimate?
- c. Kittle – yes. Plans have been revised and are scheduled to be submitted on November 12<sup>th</sup>.
- d. Worthley – who contacted the Town Manager asking that we put this on our agenda tonight?
- e. Dax Norton, Town Manager – the property owner, Valenti-Held.
- f. Kittle – I was not aware that they called to request this.
- g. Molitor - I have a conflict on the 25<sup>th</sup>. You could send this to the executive committee who could make the decision on behalf of the PC.
- h. Worthley – let's see if the full PC would be available. Would everyone be available on the 26<sup>th</sup> for a meeting?
- i. Lawson – we would only need four members for quorum.
- j. Worthley – true, but if someone has to cancel, then we can't have the meeting and that would be cutting it close. The special meeting will be on November 26<sup>th</sup> at 5:30pm.

*Motion to continue the two petitions to a Special Meeting on November 26<sup>th</sup> at 5:30pm at the Town Hall by Worthley, Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

5. **Docket PC13-017-DP - Development Plan - Huntington Bank.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Development Plan for Huntington Bank. The subject property contains 1 acre and is located northeast of the corner of Whitestown Pky and S Main St in the Anson Development. The property is zoned PUD. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 10/15/2013. The petitioner is Huntington National Bank, the owner is Duke Realty, and the project engineer is Civil and Environmental Consultants.
  - a. Presentation – Aaron Hurt, CEC, describes site plan. This is a single-story bank with a drive-through and 27 parking spaces.
  - b. Staff Report - Luzier
  - c. Public Discussion – none.
  - d. PC Discussion – none.

*Motion to approve the Development Plan by Worthley. Second by Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.*

## **New Business from the Floor**

6. **Driveway Setback Ordinance Amendment.** Commission to further discuss the proposed language for driveway setbacks.
  - a. Luzier – presents proposed text
  - b. Worthley – my goal would be to make this fair to those who have complied with the current requirements, but also to avoid the hassles of waivers in the future. I would like to pick a setback and then be very strict about future development adhering. Does anyone have issues with 50 feet becoming the new minimum residential driveway setback instead of 75 feet? Maple Grove got waivers for 52 feet and Clark Meadows got waivers for both 40 feet and 54 feet. If we let them know that we will be strict with the new dimension, then developers would probably hesitate to ask for future waivers.

- c. L.J Jernstadt – when the Whitestown Comprehensive Plan was done in 2005, Ground Rules wrote provisions to improve the development standards. BAGI immediately came in and filed a lawsuit. A compromise was made to require better architectural standards. Our goal is not to be another “Fishers” or “Noblesville”. We wanted to control development without allowing cookie-cutter development.
- d. Worthley – is this ready to be voted on?
- e. Luzier – No. It is on the agenda merely for discussion tonight.
- f. Lawson – Anderson, as police chief, do you see this as having a negative impact on development?
- g. Anderson – no, but we need to make sure that landscaping wouldn’t occur in the “sight triangle” and block vision. Whose responsibility would it be to enforce this?
- h. Luzier – it would be the Planning Department’s responsibility to enforce.
- i. Kevin Riddle, Town Councilman – is the setback measured from the right-of-way? Would it be blocking parking?
- j. Worthley – it is measured from the right-of-way and it would not affect parking. Does the PUD Ord and the SCO both govern development in Anson?
- k. Molitor – yes, the PUD cross-references the SCO and the ZO. If you put language on the plat about the sight-triangle, then the town could enforce it.
- l. David Argon, Eagles Nest – how would this apply to the existing subdivisions putting landscaping in the line of sight?
- m. Worthley – this is a requirement in the existing ordinance, so it would apply to existing sight line requirements.
- n. Molitor – if you grant a driveway setback waiver, then a note should be added to the plat for perpetuity.
- o. Worthley – at our last meeting, we had a presentation from a traffic engineer who emphasized that preserving this sight triangle is the important element in traffic safety.
- p. Anderson – and we’ve also learned that our current 75-foot setback is too restrictive for standard residential development.
- q. Scott Dompke, GRW – there is additional language in the SCO that would require new subdivisions to have larger corner lots in order to meet this requirement.
- r. Worthley – I’m afraid that considering waivers on a case-by-case basis could cause some problems in the future based on history. I’d like to get a reasonable number approved and keep it tight. I think we should go with the first Alternative. I think 50 feet for residential driveway setbacks is reasonable.

**7. Impact Fees Study.** Presentation on the impact fee studies for parks and roadways.

- a. Parks
  - i. Matt Eckerly, Umbaugh – we were engaged by Whitestown to work on a Recreational Impact Fee Zone Improvement Plan. We established an advisory committee to assist with the development of the plan. Our intent is to present this plan for consideration as a Comp Plan amendment at the December 9<sup>th</sup> PC meeting and final adoption at the December 10<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. There is a six-month waiting period after adoption before impact fees could be assessed. Page 8 shows the calculated impact fee that would be charged for new residential development: \$953 per single-family unit and \$715 per multi-family unit.
  - ii. Worthley – what statute governs impact fees?
  - iii. Molitor – the state statute starts at Series 1300 of your Planning Law books.
  - iv. Luzier – the Plan would be adopted as an amendment to the Comp Plan. The impact fee would be an ordinance to be adopted. So, there would be two components to overall adoption.
  - v. Worthley – once collected, where do the impact fees go?

- vi. Eckerly – the fees are collected and put into an account. They are set aside for specific parks projects. Pages 11 and 14 layout the current inventory, target inventory, and the shortfalls to be funded prior to using the impact fee monies that are collected. Distributes contact information.
  - vii. Semmler – will this impact the greenspaces that are donated by developers?
  - viii. Eckerly – the establishment of the fees actually encourages developers to donate land in lieu of paying the fee. This is common practice.
  - ix. Worthley – when they donate the land, do they have to provide amenities?
  - x. Eckerly – not necessarily.
  - xi. Nathan Messer, Parks Department – we would calculate their total impact fee. This is the fee that we can use for comparison to decide if donation of land/amenities is equitable instead.
  - xii. Worthley – who spurred this into action?
  - xiii. Messer – I asked for the allocation of funds for the study to be done, so we proceeded from there.
- b. Roadways
- i. Matt Brown, A&F Engineering – we are just starting the process for road impact fees. We are currently doing traffic counts on the roads and then we'll move forward with the study. We just had our first Committee meeting last week and got a lot of great input. We will be back before the PC with updates as the process continues.

## Announcements

### Adjourn

7:24pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** November 26, 2013

**Time:** 5:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

---

## Call to Order

5:34pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres (absent)
- Dennis Anderson
- Carey Domres (absent)
- Jan Jones (arrived at 5:37pm)
- Greg Semmler
- Josh Westrich
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. November 26, 2013

*Motion to approve agenda by Worthley. Second by Westrich. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Approve Minutes

2. November 11, 2013 – continued to 12/9/

*Continue to next regular meeting, 12/9/2013.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

3. **Docket PC13-015-SP - Secondary Plat - Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Secondary Plat for Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision with one Lot and one Block. The subject property contains 24 acres and is located at the southwest corner of Whitestown Pky and Maple Grove Blvd. The property is zoned GB-General Business and MF-Multi-family. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 10/15/2013. The petitioner is Diversified Property Group, LLC, the owner is Diversified Property Group, LLC, and the project engineer is Innovative Engineering.

- a. Presentation: Jerry Kittle, Innovative Engineering. Thanks for holding this Special Meeting to accommodate these two projects tonight. Reviews site location and proposed plat layout.
  - \*\*<Jan Jones arrives> \*\* Reviews site history per Staff Report. The overall project has been before you numerous times for zoning, residential platting, and now the western half for the commercial and multi-family development.
- b. Staff Report: Luzier
- c. Public Comments: none.
- d. PC Comments:
  - i. Worthley – Kittle, are there any concerns with the condition of building the private road?
  - ii. Kittle – no. Access has already been approved and the private drive
  - iii. Semmler – will there be any driveway cuts off of Whitestown Pky?
  - iv. Kittle – no access to Whitestown Pky.
  - v. Worthley – how many commercial lots do you expect on the commercial site?
  - vi. Kittle – we haven’t confirmed anyone, but expect at least 3 outlots. Utilities will be in place as part of this project, so it will be ready to go.

*Motion to approve secondary plat with conditions by Worthley. Second by Jones. Motion passes unanimously.*

*CONDITION: The proposed private road that connects the frontage road to 700 E be constructed at the same time that the frontage road itself is constructed.*

- 4. **Docket PC13-014-DP - Development Plan – Watermark-Stonegate Apartments.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Development Plan to be known as Watermark-Stonegate Apartments. The subject property contains 19 acres and is located on the south side of Whitestown Pky, east of 700 E, on Lot 1 of Maple Grove Commercial subdivision. The property is zoned GB-General Business and MF-Multi-family. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 10/15/2013. The petitioner is Watermark Residential, the owner is Diversified Property Group, LLC, and the project engineer is Innovative Engineering.
  - a. Presentation:
    - i. Jerry Kittle, Innovative Engineering - Introduces Matt Griffin and Josh Purvis of Watermark. Describes site location. Watermark will maintain ownership after the apartment complex is developed. Site borders Royal Run subdivision to the south. There is a 15’ bufferyard provided as required along this property line. There are 23 buildings and there are two different types: Type I buildings have garages (about half) and Type II buildings do not have garages. Reviews site history per Staff Report. The eastern property line contains the overhead power lines. There is also a maintenance building, clubhouse, and pool proposed.
    - ii. Matt Griffin, Watermark Residential – Watermark Residential is an owner, developer, and manger of luxury apartment projects. We have a current project going on in Fishers. This project has an expansive amenity center. Buildings have 10-14 units each. Buildings are two-story with a lot of architectural features such as building materials and roof breaks. We expect to lead the market in rent. We are in compliance with the zoning commitments as well as the ordinances.
  - b. Staff Report: Luzier

- c. Public Comments:
- i. Chris Badger – represent Johnson property southeast of this property. Drainage to the Johnson property is being coordinated with the Boone County Surveyor. We would like to ask if the landscaping can be rearranged on the southern boundary so that the larger trees and landscaping to the southwest corner of the site in order to block the apartment complex garages from the view of the existing residential properties.
  - ii. Worthley – is this landscaping within the bufferyard?
  - iii. Badger – yes. We’re not asking for additional plantings, just to shift what’s proposed to the west. We’d also like to coordinate drainage with Kittle.
  - iv. Kittle – we have provided drainage information to Badger and his client. They want more water to come to their site than is usually permitted. We coordinated overall drainage calculations with the Boone County Surveyor and they have approved the plan, so this is what we must comply with.
- d. PC Comments:
- i. Worthley – Griffin, have you spoken with Badger?
  - ii. Griffin – no, we have not. We would be willing to slide the landscaping down within the bufferyard as requested, provided we do not plant in any drainage easements.
  - iii. Worthley – what obstacles do you foresee?
  - iv. Griffin – I don’t foresee any, as long as we avoid the drainage easements. That is not a problem.
  - v. Badger – there are some existing pine trees in this area, so anything you can add will help. We live in Zionsville’s jurisdiction, in the Eagle Township area.
  - vi. Worthley – Griffin, please contact Badger to coordinate. Kittle, will there be a stoplight at the Stonegate/Maple Grove Blvd intersection on Whitestown Pky?
  - vii. Kittle – no, there will not. The nearest light is at 700E.
  - viii. Worthley – when will leases start?
  - ix. Griffin – late summer or early fall of 2014.
  - x. Westrich – what is the width of the private roads internal to the complex?
  - xi. Kittle – 24’ curb-to-curb with no on-street parking permitted. Roll curb will be used. We won’t have “no parking” signs, but management would have the vehicle removed.
  - xii. Worthley – is the dog park proposed to be public or private?
  - xiii. Griffin – it is for private use by the residents of the apartment complex. It will be fenced in with a transition area to take dogs off their leash.
  - xiv. Semmler – there is a median split for the entrance road. Westrich, can you navigate this with a fire truck?
  - xv. Westrich – yes, we can make that.
  - xvi. Worthley – Luzier, is a roundabout proposed at the entrance of this project per the Transportation Plan?
  - xvii. Luzier – A roundabout is not required in this location. Since this is the only way in and out of the private development, one would not be placed here anyway.

*Motion to approve the development plan with conditions by Worthley. Second by Westrich. Motion passes unanimously.*

*CONDITION: Before building construction above the foundation can occur, 1) the base construction of Grove Pass and the private road connecting to 700E will be coordinated with safety services (Fire*

*Department and Police Department) and Staff; 2) necessary fire hydrants shall be in place and active; and 3) the secondary plat for Maple Grove Commercial Subdivision shall be recorded.*

## **New Business from the Floor**

### **Announcements**

### **Adjourn**

6:10pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary



# Meeting Minutes

*Whitestown Plan Commission*

**Date:** December 9, 2013

**Time:** 6:30pm

**Location:** Whitestown Town Hall, 6320 S. Cozy Lane, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

## Call to Order

6:35pm

## Pledge of Allegiance

## Roll Call

- Mark Worthley, President
- Jason Lawson, Vice Pres (absent)
- Dennis Anderson (absent)
- Carey Domres
- Jan Jones
- Greg Semmler
- Josh Westrich (absent)
- Staff:
  - o Deborah Luzier, Town Planner, GRW
  - o John Molitor, WPC/WBZA Attorney

## Approve Agenda

1. December 9, 2013

*Motion to approve agenda by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

## Minutes

2. November 11, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Domres. Motion passes unanimously.*

3. November 26, 2013

*Motion to approve minutes by Worthley. Second by Jones. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Hearing

4. **PC13-019-CP – Parks and Recreation Zone Improvement Plan.** The Commission to consider approval of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for establishing a Parks and Recreation Zone Improvement plan. The amendment is a prelude to the establishment of park impact fees for the Town of Whitestown.

- a. Presentation – Matt Eckerly, Umbaugh & Associates. I can answer any questions about the study and the final draft of the plan. Page 8 has the main summary of the plan and it outlines the fees to be charged at building permit time for park impact fees. The single-family fee will be \$953 per unit and the multi-family fee will be \$715 per unit. The Plan itself is being considered tonight and the impact fee ordinance will come to you next month.
- b. Public Input
  - i. L.J. Jernstadt, resident – when will the fees take affect? When are they collected?
  - ii. Eckerly – fees go into effect six months after the ordinance is passed. Fees are paid at the time a building permit is issued. You cannot use impact fees to pay for deficits in your parks system, which are shown on page 14 of the plan.
  - iii. Worthley – when are the parks brought up to current needs?
  - iv. Eckerly – the plan is for five years. There are stipulations about when the impact fee funds can be used to supplement the parks.
  - v. Worthley – how are the standards established?
  - vi. Eckerly – they are based on current standards and those calculated locally.
  - vii. Nathan Messer, Parks Dept – we also expect grant monies to come in to help fund the parks system. We hope to accomplish things within five years as well as complete a couple of things on the wish list. Total budget for next year is approximately \$56,500 plus some funds for land acquisition. Counting donations and grants, we have received over \$600,000.
  - viii. Worthley – can developers contest the fees if we’re deficient?
  - ix. Eckerly – no, because we’ve already itemized them as part of the plan.
  - x. Molitor – tonight will be PC approval of the Plan and then the Town Council will adopt a resolution adopting the plan. At the next PC meeting, we will make a recommendation about the Impact Fee Ordinance and then the Town Council will adopt an ordinance putting it into effect.
- c. PC Discussion – none.

*Motion to approve the Parks and Recreation Zone Improvement Plan by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

5. **PC13-020-TA - Text Amendment for Waivers and Driveway Setbacks.** The Commission to consider recommendation of text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Control Ordinance for the provision of waivers and establishing driveway setbacks from intersections on corner lots.
  - a. Public Comment
    - i. Jernstadt – Am I to understand that this ordinance addresses how close a driveway can be from an intersection and this has nothing to do with the building setback itself?
    - ii. Worthley – that is correct.
  - b. PC Discussion –
    - i. Semmler – three members are absent from the meeting tonight (Police Chief, Fire Chief, and Utilities Manager) and I feel that since these three deal first hand with traffic and safety within the town, we should continue the discussion to the next meeting when they can be present to answer any questions.

*Motion to continue the public hearing to January 13, 2014 by Semmler. Second by Worthley. Motion passes unanimously.*

## New Business – Public Meeting

6. **Docket PC13-018-DP - Development Plan - Goodwill Store.** The petitioner is requesting approval of a Development Plan for a Goodwill Store. The subject property contains 3 acres and is located at 6065 S Main St, in Anson. The property is zoned PUD. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the plans on 11/12/2013. The petitioner and project engineer is Woolpert, Inc, and the owner is Duke Construction Limited Partnership.
- a. Presentation – Ben Houle, Woolpert Engineering. We have addressed Staff’s comments in our most recent set of plans. These revised plans will be submitted shortly to Staff.
  - b. Staff Report – Luzier
    - i. Worthley – Houle, do you have any issue with the TAC comments?
    - ii. Houle – none. We have updated the plans and will be delivering revised plans to staff this week.
  - c. Public Comment
    - i. Craig Anderson, Duke – we have reviewed the plans and have worked with Staff on the plans. They meet the standards established by the Anson PUD.
  - d. PC Discussion
    - i. Semmler – Is there a landscape buffer along Central Ave that would block the view of the truck bays?
    - ii. Houle – our docks face Meijer’s Docks and we share a common entry. This is the best scenario for limiting the visibility of our docks as well as their docks and still providing access.
    - iii. Anderson – the building materials are the same all the way around, so the back side will look like the front of the store.
    - iv. Semmler – I just want to make sure that this building looks as nice as the rest of the Anson buildings.
    - v. Worthley – is there a roundabout at your front entry?
    - vi. Houle – it is a pavement design to indicate an intersection that gives the visual appearance of a roundabout. We have completed the northern half of this element.

*Motion to approve the Goodwill Development Plan with conditions by Worthley. Second by Semmler. Motion passes unanimously.*

### **CONDITIONS:**

1. *The parking lot sidewalk on the west side of the building needs to connect directly from the front doors of the store to the main sidewalk on S Main St as originally shown. This sidewalk should be straight (not curvy).*
2. *Provide a more clear detail of the water meter/fire line/FDC connection area.*
3. *Provide final drainage approval from the Boone County Surveyor.*

## New Business from the Floor

## **Announcements**

Worthley – Since the BZA has a meeting on January 13<sup>th</sup>, let's make the WPC meeting start at 7:15pm to accommodate the BZA's hearing.

## **Adjourn**

7:06pm

---

Mark Worthley, President

---

Deborah Luzier, Secretary