

**SHELBYVILLE PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
January 27, 2020**

Mike Evans: Alright, welcome to the Monday, January 27th meeting of the Shelbyville Plan Commission. Before I call this meeting to order, I would like to publicly answer a question that was brought up after our last meeting when a vote ended in a tie while alternate, Perry Richards was seated in the audience. I first need to explain how the make up of our Planning Commission board is done. We have a city board representatives and we have mayoral appointees that comprise this board. When the City Council appointed representative to the Plan Commission, Joanne Bowman, excuse me, Bowen recused herself due to a conflict bias, Mr. Richards cannot assume her seat because he is a mayoral appointee alternate. Similarly, Mr. Richards cannot fill a vacancy for the Parks Board representative, Board of Works representative or our city engineer. We did not have a City Council alternate available to assume her vacated seat, thus ending in an 8 - 8, excuse me a tie. We since have requested for an alternate and the City Councilman Willis was appointed by the City Council and will be seated at tonight's City Council, as the City Council representative to the Plan Commission and a copy of the last meeting minutes have been provided. So now with that said and answer that question, I now call this meeting to order. Mr. Secretary, if you'll please call the roll.

Adam Rude: Of course. Mr. Nolley - here, Mr. Lux - here, Mr. House - here, Mr. Evans - here, Mr. Cassidy - here, Mr. Lewis - here, Mr. Hall - here, Mr. Martin - here, Mr. Willis - here.

Evans: Alright, thank you. First item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the January 8, 2020 meeting.

Gary Nolley: Motion to approve.

Evans: Alright I have a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

Joe Lux: Second.

Evans: With any amendment, Mr. House?

Matt House: No, that's okay.

Laughter.

Evans: Okay all in favor of a minutes approval, signify by saying, "Aye".

In Unison: Aye.

Evans: All those opposed same?

No reply.

Evans: Okay the minutes have been approved. Under Old Business, we have PC 2019-18 Isabelle Farms. I will, before we bring the petitioner up, would like to comment or make a excuse me, that this is the same petition that we had at our last meeting and that after our last meeting, the public comment portion on this had been closed. We had written letters submitted and read into the record. There were many members of the public that stepped forward and made comments or asked questions and most of these comments can be summed up into three categories: stub road connectivity and safety, storm water collection and drainage and building lot setbacks. We have listened to these concerns and I can't foresee any new comments or questions being addressed. However I have decided later to reopen public comment and allow any members of the public to approach with their question or comment that is not on record. So I would ask that the portions of the staff report pertaining to these aforementioned concerns be read into the record aloud for all to hear later. I would like to bring the petitioner forward, have him state his name for the record and be ready to answer any questions from the board. Go ahead and please read the portions of the staff report.

Rude: The only item on the agenda tonight is PC 2019-18 Isabelle Farms PUD Conceptual Plan. Petitioner's name is Arbor Homes. The current property owner's name is Gordon Farms, LLC and the petitioner's representative tonight is Paul Munoz. The address of the property is along both North Michigan Road and north Riley Highway. Subject proposed or subject zoning classification currently is A2, agricultural and the proposal tonight is a request for approval of a PUD Conceptual Plan for the development of Isabelle Farms. Would you like me to go into....

Evans: Yes, I would like you to go ahead for the, based on public comment from the last meeting read the staff report revisions.

Rude: So if you guys want to follow along with your staff report, I'm just gonna go through and hit all of these blue items and talk about briefly. We did this in the pre-meeting as well but briefly what all these items are. So on page 2 you'll see there was a question from a Plan Commission member about the differences in current and proposed architectural standards. That's been added to this chart that compares our current R1 standards versus the proposed standards. So that's the only change to this page and to this table. The current minimal architectural standards is a minimum 1' eave overhang and then there's no other standards. What's being proposed is a minimum 1' eave overhang, some anti-monotony standards which does not allow similar elevations within a certain number of homes from one another and then a minimum 25% brick or masonry on the front facade of the home. So those are the changes or the differences between the current standards and the proposed standards. On page 3, this is where we explain how the PUD process, planned unit development process differs from the subdivision process and we're trying to lay out the ability for the Plan Commission, both Plan Commission and City Council to have a little bit of negotiating leverage to require some of these

higher standards while also differing from our standards so the obvious difference here is a 5' side yard setback instead of a 7' but because we're giving there we can ask in a different category, let's say, for a higher minimum architectural standard or higher front yard setback, higher open space requirement. So in this section, we're just explaining how this process allows for that leverage where a typical subdivision would just meet these requirements and move on. On page 4, 5, 6 & 7, I'll go into the comments that were made by members of the public that pertain to some of the decision criteria of the Plan Commission. Those being as Mr. Evans had addressed drainage, setbacks and connectivity. From the drainage standpoint, we already discussed in the pre-meeting that generally speaking the drainage in the entire area will be improved because all of the current water that's draining onto the site will have to be captured. It will have to be reviewed and designed by engineers and then reviewed by our engineers to insure it meets all of our standards. But generally speaking, we go into a little bit more detail here. Generally speaking, the drainage issues throughout the area will improve. All of the drainage will be handled on site and with agreements with surrounding property owners. From the setback, the questions about the setback, we talk a little bit about how the setback differs from our current setback. We also talk about how this difference allows us the leverage for ask for things in other categories but also we mention that we'll reference this plan that Arbor Homes had submitted to us that not all the lots throughout the subdivision will actually have this 5' setback. This is just a minimum in some instances where that 5' is needed. Most of the lots in the subdivision are as you see here 54'+ so you actually do have the opportunity for those larger setbacks. Sorry. The next section goes into connectivity. This was one of the big concerns that was brought up because the our current requirement of the UDO is that those stub streets in Rolling Ridge be connected into Isabelle Farms. We explain in this the benefits of connecting those stub streets and kind of the rationale why we have that. Mainly it's for providing services, either municipal services through snow plows and trash trucks, emergency services, ambulances, police cars but also services through the schools, school buses, kids being picked up. We also reference and talk about a planning advisory services report prepared by the American Planning Association that talks about the benefits, not only from an emergency services and municipal services standpoint, but also for just the general benefits of the entire transportation network if those connections are provided. We also then at the end of that section recommend and mention that sidewalks should be included in the Rolling Ridge neighborhood and we mention that the city's capital improvements plan has been amended to include those sidewalks in the coming years so the city can allocate funds for that and have those installed because a big concern from a lot of the residents was the safety, being able to walk in that neighborhood if there's no sidewalks and if there's an increase in traffic. So to address that concern, the city has committed to installing those sidewalks in that area. And then the final item on here is in working with the fire department there were questions about the fact that Rolling Ridge is one of the is the last complete neighborhood that does not have water service from Indiana American Water. It's all well service out there or private wells. So because there's no water mains, there's no fire hydrants so some areas of that housing addition do not have proper, a fire truck cannot connect with the hoses that they have to a fire hydrant and fight a fire. So as part of that, we're working with Indiana American Water and Arbor Homes to make sure that the fire hydrants that are installed in Isabelle Farms as positioned as closely to Rolling

Ridge as possible to help service as much of that area as possible. And I think those are all the notes I have.

Evans: Okay Mr. Petitioner, if you would state your....

Nolley: Can I interrupt real quick. Point of order; should we address this?

Evans: Well as soon as I get the petitioner on record. This was passed out.

Nolley: Okay.

Evans: Go ahead state your name since I called you up.

Paul Munoz: Good evening. Paul Munoz, Arbor Homes. My current address is 3405 Tallyho Drive Kokomo, Indiana.

Evans: Thank you. Now Adam?

Rude: Yes?

Evans: We were handed this copy so if we have legal counsel tonight, can we have her step to the podium as well and explain this to the rest of the board?

Rude: Inaudible reply.

Evans: I was calling for the city's....

Inaudible comment.

Evans: No I, it's not public comment yet. So if I could have, I see her seated in the back, our city attorney. Were you handed a copy of this as well while.....?

Jennifer Meltzer: I was. Jennifer Meltzer, city attorney. Mr. Adams has filed an objection to service of alternate member in a hearing upon petition by Arbor Homes. I also just received a copy of this. My reading and understanding of it is that he objects to councilman Willis serving as an alternate at this hearing alleging that councilman Willis was not present on January 8th. If I may, can I ask councilman Willis a question?

(?): Yes. Oh, sorry.

Evans: Yes.

Meltzer: Councilman Willis, were you present for the hearing on January 8th of 2020 of the Plan Commission?

Nathan Willis: I was here, yes.

Meltzer: Were you here for the entirety of the Plan Commission meeting?

Willis: No, but I watched it on YouTube.

Meltzer: Okay and so you saw the and were able to hear the entire Plan Commission meeting either in person or on your phone?

Willis: I listened to it twice on my phone and I was here for the first half of the meeting.

Meltzer: Okay. Was there any part of it that you missed?

Willis: No.

Meltzer: Was there any part of the internet connection that was difficult to hear or difficult to see?

Willis: Absolutely not.

Meltzer: Are you confident that you were able to from reading the minutes, you approved the minutes tonight, correct?

Willis: Yes.

Meltzer: Okay and so it for any reason....

Willis: I was also issued a copy of the minutes too.

Meltzer: For any, do you have any reason why you do not think that you would were not able to hear the evidence or were not able to participate when you were here?

Willis: Inaudible reply.

Meltzer: Okay. From just receiving this now and from my limited research, I am unaware of any cases that specifically cite to 36-7-4-220(?). There is only one case to my knowledge that specifically cites to that statute and it is not on point for this point of law that Mr. Adams is alleging. Furthermore, I was able to do a search for 36-7-4-220-3(?) which is the statute under which councilman Bowen has disqualified herself and again there was no cases that came up citing that statute. Therefore, without any guidance from the court of appeals or from the

Indiana Supreme Court, these statutes clearly state that councilman Willis has been properly appointed and it is my opinion that since he was able to hear and would've been able to participate either as a member of the public and stand up and talk or ask a question if he had wanted to, he can vote today.

Evans: Alright, thank you. Okay I'd like to open this up for questions from the board to the petitioner. Let's start down on this end with Mr. Nolley.

Nolley: I can't think of any additional question other than I did think you had some nice, quality homes. I think the adjustment on the setbacks is a reasonable compromise 'cause I was really not for the 5 but I'm okay with what I see there. And the connectivity which I had a big issue was really not your problem 'cause you don't need it. It's with it's on our end and so that's nothing I can hold against you and what you're petitioning. So...(inaudible)...

Munoz: Okay.

Evans: Alright, thank you.

Lux: I'll withhold any questions until after the public input.

Evans: Okay. Mr. House?

House: Did you say there was an adjustment in the setbacks? Or are you just....

Munoz: Adjustment in lot sizes. We took all of those that in yellow there, a good portion of those we actually spread them from the 50, 51, 52 what they originally were out further to allow for more opportunity for those to be a wider lot along any of those barriers where they are close to adjacent uses.

House: Oh I guess I misread that 'cause I thought that was just the way they were laid out already. So if there fewer lots now than there were?

Munoz: So down at least one, possibly two. And what we've done is in there it's not specifically noted where there's going to be drainage easements or utility easements, so we'll probably end up losing a couple more because of that expansion in those lots as we get through the development plan and construction plans, things of that nature. So we are looking to expand those. We have the sizes of those lots currently as they sit and we are over 8,000 square feet on average and that's those are what we'd be committing to.

House: Okay.

Evans: Good?

House: Yep.

Evans: Mr. Cassidy?

Doug Cassidy: No questions at this time.

Evans: Alright. Mr. Lewis?

Wade Lewis: Nothing to add at this time.

Evans: Alright. Mr. Hall?

Ben Hall: I don't have any further questions right now.

Evans: Mr. Martin?

Josh Martin: No questions.

Evans: Mr. Willis?

No audible reply.

Evans: Okay I appreciate this revise so that we can see which lots would meet the or need the 5' setback and which ones are well beyond that so I appreciate that. So alright, you can yield the podium. I'm getting ready to open it up.

Munoz: Okay.

Evans: I just wanna go over a few things before we reopen public comment.

Munoz: Sure.

Evans: Alright, I'm getting ready to reopen public comment on this petition and first, the rules. Please state your full name and address for the record. Spell your last name and begin. Again, each speaker will have a maximum of 3 minutes. Any repetitive question or comment on record will be stopped. If you wish to briefly agree or disagree, I'll allow it. So that means if you've already submitted, if you read last time and staff was kind enough to list all of the comments given, we will ask you to yield the podium. So I will now open the floor to public comment about Arbor Homes planned unit development plan petition. So will you please call the first person on the list?

Allan Henderson: Joanne Bowen?

Joanne Bowen: Joanne Bowen, B-o-w-e-n, 1575 Edgehill Road. I would ask the board to vote in favor of the conceptual plan but to add a variance not to open Crest Drive and Rolling Ridge Road to the vehicular traffic but to connect it in such a way to be used as a trail so there would be a sense of connectivity and belonging. As I stated at our last meeting, you can stop me if you want to, we are not against Arbor Homes building their homes next to our addition. We are only concerned with opening the dead end streets to 263 homes that will more than likely have 2 cars each. That is 526 cars leaving for work and coming home each day and trying to find the fastest route home. If you can envision the new Casey's General Store that would be built across from McDonald's of North Riley Highway and the extra traffic it will bring and waiting longer at the streetlight to turn green and then the current situation at McDonald's on Rampart in which you have to wait through several lights to be able to turn north onto North Riley Highway especially when the factories are letting out. So I am by no means exaggerating at the extra traffic that will be filtering through our neighborhood looking for a shortcut. I ask for a variance for this reason.

Evans: Alright.

Bowen: Did I repeat myself? Thank you.

Evans: No. You repeated some of the other comments but I gave you some leeway.

Laughter.

Evans: Alright would you please....

Henderson: Bob Adams?

Robert Adams: Yes my name is Robert Adams. I live, Bob Adams, at 1453 N. St. Rd. 9, have for over 40 years. Very familiar with this property. Also involved in other development on St. Rd. 9 including the Knauf plant and the administration was behind that all the way to put the factory right on the road. And we, the people in Rolling Ridge and N. St. Rd. 9 objected to it and the Planning Commission required it as a condition that it be placed farther back so it would not ruin the (?). The same thing occurred on the development of the subdivision behind that. You can place conditions on your approval of the matter. Ms. Bowen has indicated that you can do this. I'd like to hand out to all of you the statute which is much broader than it used to be that you can go ahead, here's the copies of that, to approve as she requested. We call it conditions or that we do a variances 'cause that and that can be done so that the streets do not run straight through into Rolling Ridge subdivision as she requested. That is the (?) and what one of the a lot of the people's concern here and you can cure that just like you did on Knauf by requiring to be back farther from the road. That is a major issue. The other matter is I heard a wishy washy answer on drainage. There is no, again we have to get agreements. There is no outlet for this water. It's gonna increase substantially. There's already a

Evans: I do have to point out that you talked about drainage concerns last time, so would you move on to another topic please?

Adams: Yeah this is more comprehensive and subject as to that. And so it's, the drainage presently.....

Evans: You already commented about your drainage concerns.

Adams: So you're saying I cannot comment any more about that?

Evans: Not addition. You already are opposed to and wanna make sure and that will be handled at a different meeting. Do you have another comment?

Adams: Alright. I do. I really do think it's appropriate that we be able to make comments especially because the Plan Commission member was not present there.....(inaudible)...

Evans: Sir, you this is already a major drainage issue throughout the entire area. He finds no reason to accelerate the project and there has been (?) notice and understand the drainage.

Adams: Okay the in addition....

Evans: Let me pause your 3 minutes while you argue with me. Go ahead.

Adams: I'd like to put into the record the objections filed by the members, residents of the, this was not in the record proceedings and request to be made a record of the proceedings. It was only on the website. So that is the objections by the property owners in Rolling Ridge subdivision. Request that be made a part of the record. In addition, this the issue of the connectivity. This is a matter that is very, very, according to the purpose of it. We have Progress Parkway or I actually tried to get connected to the very southeast portion of it. We have a entryway and the city did not connect that entire south Progress Parkway are to the southern side of the city. So it's a matter which is selective. If they're trying to do it in this administration and it's something that is unique and has not been done and you can grant a condition that this approval is based upon not allowing complete connectivity between them. Fire vehicles; we've allowed for that previously. You can always have a lane for fire vehicles and things of that nature. That's been done in subdivisions for years. No difference there. That's not the issue at all. That's it. Thank you.

Evans: Thank you.

Henderson: Fredonna Martin?

Fredonna Martin: My name is Fredonna Martin. That's M-a-r-t-i-n. My husband Jerry and I live at 1581 Crest Drive and we've lived in Rolling Ridge for over 30 years. I have three questions

regarding the new proposed housing area. What type of financing do these homes require? Is it conventional or is any of it subsidized? What about the covenants there? Will these homes be owner/occupied or do they allow a certain percentage of rental property? And I and the third question is what happens if they start building these homes and they find there's not the market for that price home in this area? Then do they have the option of reselling that property to another entity? I ask these questions because I had a front row seat in my backyard to Fountain Lake. And I believe in Fountain Lake there were five I know, maybe six conventionally built homes and they found they didn't sell quickly so the sellers, the builders sold out to someone else. Fortunately it was platted so it's not stacked against each other, but it was resold and then smaller, less expensive homes instead of the homes that were supposed to be just like Fountain Lake. Instead it wasn't. So I have three questions and also I've tried to think of a compromise. City ordinances were not set in stone from day one. Trying to find something...if you look at a cul-de-sac, a cul-de-sac is nothing more than a dead end street with a circle, half circle of concrete around it. What if those were put at the end of our streets? Then they would look like the end of cul-de-sac streets. I'm just trying to suggest a compromise somewhere that the city ordinances works for everybody. We can leave two separate housing areas, but leave us our private streets, our no traffic streets and we can sit side by side but separate. The way it is right now Rolling Ridge, those of us who live on the open streets, we'd lose totally. So let's try to find a compromise. The people of Rolling Ridge thank you. I thank you and thank you for your consideration.

Evans: Thank you.

Henderson: Those were the three people that signed up...(inaudible)...

Evans: Okay. Anyone else wish to step forward that did not sign with a new comment?

Duane Schuler: My name is Duane Schuler. Last name is S-c-h-u-l-e-r. Resident of 1574 Rolling Ridge Road. In the conversations that have been going on tonight, one of my concerns, we're talking about adding sidewalks to Rolling Ridge. From my standpoint, and I don't know how the other neighbors feel, I know part of this is to help with the walking situation if the streets are opened up which you know again, I oppose. But that's what you're talking about is gonna take away from my property. I mean I know that I'm gonna lose trees if you do that. You're gonna have to move the ditch back further if you do that which is gonna infringe on my yard. And on top of that, the sewer line runs right in front of my yard and is currently in that ditch so my guess is there'll probably have to be some movement there. So from my own selfish standpoint, I have a concern with that. You know to me the simplest, cheapest solution for the city of Shelbyville is to follow what Joanne has recommended and not open up the streets to vehicular traffic. Open it up strictly as pedestrian traffic and to me, problem solved. Thank you.

Evans: Thank you. Anyone else?

Lisa Adkins: My name's Lisa Adkins, spelled A-d-k-i-n-s. I live at 1580 Crest Drive for 20 years. I don't know if I missed something or I don't know what things were changed from Arbor Homes but according to a paper that I found that was I believe some of the regulations or whatever that you have that it said minimum lot area is 8000 square feet which that was mentioned. The minimum lot width shall be 60 feet. There shall be a front yard of not less than a depth of 20'. There shall be a rear yard of not less than depth of 20'. Each side yard shall be not less than 10' and the maximum lot coverage for all buildings shall not be more than 40% of the total lot area. I'm not sure where all that comes in with what has been proposed or whatever but I know that you were mentioning 7 1/2'. I'm not sure if that is in place of this 10' so I don't know. I just don't know about that part but if that part has been amended or whatever, then I don't see why some of the other circumstances can't be amended to rectify the problem that we all have about the connectivity of the streets. It's been maybe you know made different here to go along with what they need but if it's good for one side, it's good to amend to another side. Thank you.

Evans: Thank you. Any other member of the public?

No reply.

Evans: Alright, then I will close public comment on this petition and open this back up to questions from the board. Let's start with Mr. Lux because he was yielding until after public comment.

Lux: First off I guess I wonder if we should comment on the two residents that had questions I think because things that we don't necessarily address as the plan commission but I think we deserve an answer (?).

Evans: Well I would like Adam to explain Mrs. Adkins' question. I don't know if she was reading from general R1 requirements and not the PUD.

Rude: Yeah.

Evans: But if you can explain that.

Rude: Yeah so in a planned unit development, all the development standards are established through the detail plan. All of those development standards in any other subdivision would come from Article 5 which I believe is what she was quoting from tonight. Those numbers all sound familiar to Article 5. Article 6 has to do with subdivision layout, location of sidewalks, streets, street connectivity. Those things are have to carry through whether it's a planned unit development like Hamilton Major, like Isabelle Farms or if it's any other subdivision. So the requirement for connectivity comes from UDO I think it's 6.15. So it comes from Article 6 which is a requirement that would stand true if it were a planned unit development or a standard subdivision. So I think that kind of addresses that. The development standards themselves on individual lots, the setbacks, the architectural requirements, all those things typically come from

Article 5 and those are the things that will be, assuming this project continues forward, those are the things that will be written and adopted by the City Council in a detail plan just like Hamilton Major was. And then do you want me to address the other?

Evans: Yeah go ahead please.

Rude: Okay. The comments by Ms. Martin, I believe they were in regard to how the financing would work, how the covenants would work, if these would be owner/occupied versus rental and what would happen if the market would change would the land be able to be sold. So the financing, I can't answer that. That's not under the purview of the Plan Commission, how these homes will be financed. The covenants, under Article 6 we do require covenants. I know Arbor Homes also has language that they put into their covenants so there will be covenants that require some of these development standards be carried through but also because it's going through the planned unit development process instead of a standard subdivision, the requirements that are established are actually codified as part of our zoning ordinance and are enforceable by the city. Typical covenants are only enforceable by a homeowner's association. So these'll be enforceable by the city itself, our office. Violation of them will be a zoning violation and can be pursued that way. The question about owner/occupied versus rental, again that can't be considered by the Plan Commission nor I don't think, I don't think that can be regulated as well. So another comment and I'll let Arbor address that. I assume most of the homes are gonna be owner/occupied. That's

Nolley: An HOA could control that though, right?

Rude: I believe....

Nolley: My HOA.....

Lux(?): I think it....

Rude: Okay yeah. Yes. It sounds like HOAs can do that then.

Lux: And we've been asked before to participate in HOAs and the Plan Commission doesn't have, that's between the homeowners....

Rude: Yes.

Lux:and the association itself.

Rude: Yep. Yeah HOAs have different authorities than the city. We can't regulate owner/occupied versus rental but it sounds like HOAs can, so....

Nolley: It's my understanding. That's what they told me.

Rude: Yeah. And the last question I think was if the market changes and this project isn't working can they sell the land? So the short answer is yes. Any owner of land can sell and transfer land freely. So if something were to happen, they could sell. They the lots themselves will be platted. Because the development standards are going are established through the planned unit development, those will be carried through and enforced no matter who the builder is or the owner of the land is. So if something happens and Arbor goes bankrupt and someone else picks up the project ten years later, those same standards that are established in 2020 will be true in 2030 and they will carry on. So yes, as a landowner they can sell at any time but also whatever decisions are made now will carry through no matter who the owner is. They carry with the land. I think that was all of 'em that all the questions that I'd be able to answer then unless you had more.

Lux: Is this a continuation of an existing neighborhood or a new neighborhood? So as an example if there was an HOA and I don't think you establish HOAs but just thinking about that, maybe Arbor Homes could establish an HOA that includes Rolling Ridge and they could establish standards and by being the existing homeowners of the homeowner's association could regulate what those standards were.

Rude: I think, and I don't know a ton about HOAs. I think to establish an HOA you need 100% landowner participation. So when a developer is establishing an HOA before they've sold off any of the lots, they own 100% of the land and they can get that. Establishing an HOA after the fact is incredibly difficult. It's a possibility.

Lux: I'm just in favor of compromise.

Rude: Oh yeah.

Lux: And it seems like multiple things have come up against it. So either way, I've tried to voice and encourage ideas that I think work either shot down by the firemen or whoever else but I think the residents want a compromise. I was trying to think of a way to be able to do that.

Rude: Oh yeah, yeah.

Lux: But....

Rude: And some of those elements about the design itself, so tonight we're just talking about the conceptual plan, the street layouts and lot layouts. Those design standards, even though they've already been proposed and we kind of know what they look like, that'll be discussed in a future meeting and we'll get to that element later on.

Lux: Inaudible comment.

Rude: Yes.

Lux: Right?

Rude: Yeah, you guys are very familiar with that process.

Lux: Alright. Either way, no other questions.

Evans: Mr. Nolley?

Nolley: I don't have any questions.

Evans: Mr. House?

House: This is kind of a comment. This Rolling Ridge neighborhood was laid out by a Plan Commission in the 50s. Is that right?

Rude: Yes.

Cassidy: County.

Rude: Yep.

House: So I think though it's obviously a really unusual situation. People have lived there for a long time without being connected but you know if we were to build this all at once, if this was all being built at once today, would we connect neighborhoods? You know assuming there were sidewalks on the north side. I think you know I'm not personally gonna benefit from the neighborhoods being connected, but if you read through you know the Plan Commission's report and if you read online you know urban planning stuff, it's better to have connectivity in the bigger scheme of things. You know the future 250 homes, it'll be better for them, so I think you know and when they laid Rolling Ridge out originally it was through a planning commission and that was(?) supposed to be connected.

Rude: Yeah and I think to answer your first question there, if the reverse were happening now, I think you're asking if Isabelle Farms was being built and Rolling Ridge weren't there, or....

House: Almost like hypothetical. If we were to build this whole the whole like the both neighborhoods were built at once, we would very likely connect those two sections.

Rude: Yes. Those would be connected and that's why even back in....

Nolley: But they'd also they'd have sewers and gutters and sidewalks(inaudible)...

Rude: Yeah. Even back in 1955, 56 that requirement for those stubs was put in back then and it still carries through today. But to kind of hit on your first comment there, if the inverse were happening and Isabelle Farms was going in and there were empty land to the north where Rolling Ridge and Fountain Lake is located now, if the opposite were happening, we would require those to be stubbed out so that when those built, you could attach those neighborhoods there. So that would be a requirement even today. If you're building up against developable farm land, that connection is required or that future connection is required.

House: That's all I have.

Evans: Mr. Cassidy?

Cassidy: Have we exhausted, the connectivity thing's good. Have we exhausted everything that the city, not Arbor Homes but that the city can do? Besides going by what the statute is or what the whatever's, we, you know?

Rude: I

Cassidy: I mean I just....you know the thing about the safety. If you have to come through Rolling Ridge to get to a fire in Arbor Homes, that house is gone. 'Cause you're more than 45 seconds to go all the way around up the hill and go back through. So I don't, that's...the school bus thing, that's for the school to decide, not us. So I don't know if that's a you know I just think we need to we could come up with a, whether it's a making those a cul-de-sac or making putting a gate there. The firemen are gonna or the police cars are gonna get there before the fire truck does. Give them a key to put a gate there or whatever. Just....

Rude: Yeah, oh sorry.

Cassidy: You know....

Rude: No and from the city's standpoint, since the last meeting we have been working with other city departments, public safety in particular, about alternatives that would still serve the same purpose but not have that connectivity and quite frankly we didn't think any of the alternatives would work. We didn't think we thought it neglected the premise of the requirement for the connectivity especially because this neighborhood's gonna be built out in phases over the next 7, 8, 9 years maybe. I'm just guessing here. And if those connections into Rolling Ridge don't happen, that second connection onto Michigan Road is not happening until year 6, 7, 8. So there's a chance that you, if you're not connecting into Rolling Ridge, that you have 200 to 220 homes on a single access point which goes completely against the standards that we have both in the UDO and our construction standards and it quite frankly puts lives and then personal property in risk that we shouldn't be putting them in. So from our standpoint we work diligently to try to come up with an alternative that would both provide that added access point

but not connect into Rolling Ridge and we couldn't come up with something that still satisfied the needs of our public safety.

Cassidy: Okay. I'm not against the project but I've been told I was but I'm not against it. I'm just trying to get to

Nolley: You and me both (?).

Cassidy: Yeah. I'm just trying to make a happy medium for everybody. I mean I've been in their shoes 'cause I lived out there with my grandparents so I'm just trying to make a happy medium for everybody. So that's all I have.

Evans: Is that it?

Cassidy: Yes, sir.

Evans: Mr. Lewis?

Lewis: The only comment I have I mean with connectivity and I mentioned this last time was that you know I probably if I lived on Crest or Rolling Ridge Drive, I probably wouldn't you know and had been used to that for that many years, I probably wouldn't like the change either. But I'd also think that I would have to say you know if I bought a house there and I saw those stubs, and I saw the farm land, that I'd have to assume that that was a possibility and you know I may not like it but I mean it's right there. It's not a cul-de-sac. I think the compromise I mean whether you know sidewalks definitely make it safer, especially if there's gonna be increased traffic. But I think the safety with the emergency vehicles and everything is also a big concern and you know I'm that's why I voted the way I voted. So that's the only comment I have.

Evans: Thank you. Mr. Hall?

Hall: I have nothing to add.

Evans: Mr. Martin?

Martin: No questions.

Evans: Mr. Willis?

Willis: Mr. Martin and I have been back here trying to figure out the possibility of any way we can actually prevent them opening up that cul-de-sac and we keep hashing out ideas how it'd work and then positive and negatives also....(inaudible)...we're struggling back here to even consider anyway because that is the main concern. I mean you know I know some of these people in this audience and it(inaudible)...hear what they're saying and it's difficult because

it is quiet you know and even on the street I live it's quiet and I can(inaudible)...what you're saying so trying to come to a compromise anyway if there's any other way to compromise with this, I'm I'd like to hear it. That's it.

Evans: That's it?

Nolley: Can I ask a....

Evans: Yes, go ahead.

Nolley: I passed earlier. But we've talking about Michigan Road being the last part opened up. Is there reason that couldn't be opened up before? In other words could they not build east to west before I don't know before going north? And the reason I say then you would have at least a second opening and you'd delay that. And here's part of it. I mean I have a problem with the connectivity but at the same time it's not the developer's problem. It's our problem. So I can't in all honestly not move forward with this 'cause that's not their requirement. It's ours and I think we have 5 to 7(?) years to figure it out before it does connect but that would delay it even longer. So is that a possibility? And maybe that's more of a question for Arbor.

Rude: I think it is more of a question for them and how their phasing would work. Yeah, sorry.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Nolley: That's you, Paul.

Evans: Yeah I apologize. I thought you were right up here in the front.

Munoz: No, that's fine. The only issue with doing that has to do with utilities and the drainage part of it and really, for the most part, everything's draining south out of that Rolling Ridge across that property and so we wanna try to make sure as we're those ponds and we're installing that infrastructure we're trying to follow what is the best path for that infrastructure as it's coming out and how it stubs per section. So I'm not saying it's out of the realm to consider that and see what we can do as far as engineering is concerned. I just think for efficiency and the utilities as we're moving up and then moving across, it's just more efficient to work that way once we've gotten that southern section where the main pond is at, it would start building north, excuse me north before it would start heading back to that site.

Nolley: Well I think that would while it obviously doesn't fix the ultimate problem, it does provide some other access while you're building, delaying that connectivity. And I think we're gonna have to come up with a solution for that of some kind.

Munoz: Sure.

Nolley: It's gonna take some money to do it and but again it's our problem with that. It's not Arbor.

Munoz: Yeah a lot of it will depend on infrastructure.

Nolley: Thank you. I would encourage that though if you could.

Munoz: Okay.

Nolley: That's all I have.

House: Can I ask him a question real quick?

Evans: Yes, go ahead.

House: Did you say the this Rolling Ridge it will likely be that with the current plan will likely be connected in three years?

Munoz: So we would hope if the project were to move at the pace we believe to break ground on actual earth work still this year and be putting houses down by 2021 so by the progression and how it looks with the number of lots that are in that section, it would easily be and again, I'm just ballparking depending on sizes and infrastructure, another 3 years before you get to that point.

House: I think you said 7 or 8 for Crest depending on....

Munoz: By the time we got all the way across, yeah you're probably 6, 7, 8 years before we would get to a point where we're moving that direction all the way to the other side over on Michigan.

House: That's all. I do, yeah that's a lot, I mean it doesn't make it any better for the long term but it's(inaudible)...

Munoz: Our normal sections are about 50 lots so you have to kind of figure 40 to 50 lots and as we're moving out so you're probably again you know you're talking 5, 6, 7 years before we're gonna get out that far, current pace....(inaudible)...

Evans: Other questions from the board?

No reply.

Evans: If not, I'll entertain a motion on PC 2019-18 Isabelle Farms.

House: Make a motion to approve as presented.

Lewis: Second.

Evans: Alright I have a motion to approve and a second. If everyone would cast their vote for PC 2019-18 Isabelle Farms.

Rude: This is for PC 2019-18 Isabelle Farms PUD concept plan. Mr. House - yes, Mr. Nolley - yes, Mr. Lux - yes, Mr. Willis - yes, Mr. Martin - yes, Mr. Hall - yes, Mr. Lewis - yes, Mr. Cassidy - yes, Mr. Evans - yes. Motion carries.

Evans: Okay could I have you explain to the audience what the next steps are on this project please?

Rude: Yes. So from tonight, the petitioner will submit to what's called the Technical Review Committee. They'll submit some preliminary plat documents. Those will go to the Tech Review Committee which is comprised of all city departments and all the utilities on the site. From that point, they will review. Comments will be made and corrections will then be submitted back to the Plan Commission for what's called Preliminary Plat or Preliminary Plat submission. At that meeting, that will be a public meeting and you will all be notified again of that through the mailer that or the letter you received in the mail and you'll be given another chance to review those plans, see some more details and speak at that meeting as well. From that, once that meeting is held and there's an approval there, the document will go to the City Council for the detailed plan which is the development standards, setbacks, material types, all of those elements. It'll go to City Council, Plan Commission for another public hearing and then back to City Council. All of that I would guess is probably gonna take at least three months. A lot of it just depends on how long it takes to develop some of those documents but for all those Plan Commission meetings you will be notified through a mailer, a letter in the mail and a legal ad in the newspaper because all of those meetings will have a public hearing portion where you're able to speak to the Plan Commission.

Evans: Alright, thank you. Alright, under New Business, we have none. Under Miscellaneous we have none. Any Discussion, Mr. Secretary?

Rude: I will only mention that on February 11, we will be having a joint meeting between the Plan Commission/BZA. We typically would have that joint meeting at the Plan Commission's first meeting. I did not wanna hold you guys an extra hour and a half before this so we kicked that back to the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting in February. We'll send you guys out a time. It'll likely be either 5:00 or 5:30. We'll provide some sandwiches, have a discussion between you guys and the BZA and then they'll hold their regular meeting.

Martin(?): And did you say the 11th or....

Rude: Yes, February 11th.

Martin(?): Okay.

Rude: It's a Tuesday night.

Evans: Any other points of Discussion?

No reply.

Evans: Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

Nolley: Motion to adjourn.

Evans: Second?

House: Second.

Evans: All in favor?

In Unison: Aye.

Evans: All opposed?

No reply.

Evans: We stand adjourned.

Meeting adjourned.