



ZIONSVILLE

ZIONSVILLE PLAN COMMISSION RESULTS

Monday, October 16, 2023

6:30 PM (Local Time)

THIS PUBLIC MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ONSITE AT THE ZIONSVILLE TOWN HALL, 1100 WEST OAK STREET, ROOM 105 (COUNCIL CHAMBERS), AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM

The following items were addressed:

- I. Pledge of Allegiance
- II. Attendance: Mary Grabianoski, Larry Jones, Sharon Walker, and Cindy Madrick attended in person. Dave Franz attended via Zoom. Chris Lake and Jim Hurst were not able to attend.
- III. Community & Economic Development September Monthly Report (Informational Only – no action required)
- IV. Approval of the September 18, 2023 Meeting Minutes: Approved
- V. Continuance or Withdrawal Requests

Docket Number	Name	Project Address	Item to be Considered
2023-27-Z:	Atwater Rezoning	7250 W. Oak Street	<p>Continuance Approved to the November 20, 2023, Meeting as requested by the Petitioner.</p> <p>5 In Favor 0 Opposed</p> <p>Petition for the rezoning of 10.0+/- acres from the Rural Professional Business (PB), Rural Single- and Two-family Residential (R2), and Rural Single- and Two-family (R3) Districts to the Rural General Business (GB) District.</p>
2023-36-Z	Sentry Development/ Holliday Farms Senior Living PUD	3795 S. US Highway 421, Zionsville	<p>Petition discussed and Continuance Approved to the November 20, 2023, Meeting as requested by an Interested Party.</p> <p>5 In Favor 0 Opposed</p> <p>Petition to Rezone 23.18+/- acres from the SU-7 District to a Planned Unit Development to provide for a three-story, 155-unit senior living facility with related accessory buildings. This acreage is to be incorporated into the existing Holliday Farms PUD.</p>
2023-39-DP	Stohler Roofing Office Building	5898 S. 700 East	<p>Continuance Approved to the November 20, 2023, Meeting as requested by the Petitioner.</p> <p>5 In Favor 0 Opposed</p> <p>Petition for Development Plan Approval for the expansion of a parking area for a roofing business being in the Rural Single-family Residential (R-1) District.</p>

2023-40-Z	Fischer Homes / Summers Rezoning	7860 S. 850 East	Petitioner's Letter of Withdrawal acknowledged. Petition for the Rezoning of 66.65+/- acres from the Rural Equestrian (RE) District to the Rural Single- and Two-family Residential (R-2) District to permit a 106-lot single-family subdivision.
-----------	--	------------------	---

VI. Continued Business

Docket Number	Petitioner / Project Name	Project Address	Item to be Considered
2023-53-OA (Formerly 2023-34-CPA)	Town of Zionsville		Recommendation to approve the Ordinance with three text changes. 5 in Favor 0 Opposed An Ordinance Amending the Town's Comprehensive Plan to include a "Zone Improvement Plan" which proposes a road impact fee for future development.
2023-28-Z	Henke Development / Bradley Ridge PUD - Rezoning	Parcels addressed as: 1120, 1310, 1550 S. U.S. Highway 421; 1555 S. 950 East; and 9625 E. 100 South (approx. address)	Petition discussed and Continuance Approved to the November 20, 2023, Meeting as requested by the Petitioner. 5 In Favor 0 Opposed Petition for the rezoning of 349+/- acres (9 parcels) from the Rural General Agriculture (AG), Rural Single-family Residential (R1), and Rural Single- and Two-family Residential (R2) Districts and within the Rural Michigan Road Overlay to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.

VII. New Business

Docket Number	Petitioner/ Project Name	Project Address	Item to be Considered
2023-42-PPA	Henke Development / Holliday Farms - Section 10	Dartmoor Court	Subdivision Control Waivers approved unanimously. Conditionally Approved as presented and filed with exhibits, and per staff report, subject to addressing Staff Comments. 5 In Favor 0 Opposed Petition for approval of a Primary Plat Amendment consisting of 7 single-family lots being in the Planned Unit Development (Holliday Farms PUD) District. Four (4) Waivers of the Subdivision Control Ordinance are also requested.
2023-43-DPA	Henke Development / Holliday Farms - Section 10	Dartmoor Court	Conditionally Approved as presented and filed with exhibits, and per staff report, subject to addressing Staff Comments. 5 In Favor 0 Opposed Petition for approval of a Development Plan for seven (7) residential lots being in the Planned Unit Development (Holliday Farms PUD) District.

2023-41-DPA	Larson Design Group / FedEx Gateway Building Expansion	10301 Bennett Parkway	<p>Conditionally Approved as presented and filed with exhibits, and per staff report, subject to addressing Staff Comments.</p> <p>5 In Favor 0 Opposed</p> <p>Petition for Approval of a Development Plan Amendment to provide for the expansion of an existing gateway building for new security screening equipment being in the Urban General Industrial (I-2) District.</p>
-------------	--	-----------------------	---

VIII. Other Matters Presented (Not requiring Plan Commission action)

Docket Number	Petitioner/ Project Name	Project Address	Item to be Considered
2024 Plan Commission Deadline and Meeting Schedule			2024 Plan Commission Filing and Meeting Date Schedule to be finalized upon Town Council's confirmation of 2024 Town-observed Holidays.

Respectfully Submitted: Mike Dale, AICP
 Director - Department of Community & Economic Development
 Town of Zionsville

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

In Attendance: Larry Jones, Sharon Walker, Mary Grabianowski, Cindy Madrick
Virtual: David Franz
Absent: Jim Hurst, Chris Lake

Staff attending: Mike Dale, Roger Kilmer, Dan Taylor, Attorney

A quorum is present.

Jones Where we at? The October 16, 2023 meeting of the Zionsville Plan Commission will begin. First order of business.

All Pledge of Allegiance.

Dale Roll call?

Jones Roll call please.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Present.

Dale Jim Hurst?
[No response]

Absent.

Dave Franz?
[No response]

Absent.

Mary Grabianowski? Oh, Dave Franz?

Jones Yeah, whoa, whoa.

Dave, you're here? Dave Franz?

Taylor He has to be promoted.

Jones Yeah, you need to promote him please. You want to get the rest then come back to Dave?

Dale Sure. Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Present.

Dale Chris Lake?
[No response]

Absent.

Taylor There's David.

Dale There you are.

Franz Yeah, present.

Dale Great, thank you. Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Present.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Present.

So if anybody is interested, Dave's going to be with us remotely but and since they needed a present person to run the meeting, I'll be doing the same. So, basically we've got the first item up, correct? Is that where we want to go?

Kilmer Minutes.

Taylor Minutes.

Jones Huh?

Franz The minutes.

Jones Ahh yes, sorry. We need approval of the September 18, 2023 regular meeting minutes.

Grabianowski So moved.

Walker Second.

Jones Oh, are we going to do a roll call on everything? So, we need, start with this, we'll do a roll call vote.

Dale Okay. Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Walker I'm down here.

Franz Did you hear me?

Dale Yeah.

Franz All right.

Jones Mary? Sharon?

Dale Who am I missing? Sharon?

Walker Aye.

Dale Thank you.

Jones All good? All right, so the first item of business will be Continuances or Withdrawal Requests. The first one up is 2023-27-Z, petitioner's continuance for the Atwater Rezoning and we've got a request to continue that to the November 20, 2023 meeting. The meeting is requested by the petitioner and –

Grabianowski I move that we continue the Atwater Rezoning until November.

Walker And I'll second.

Jones So, once again, we'll need to do a roll call vote.

Dale Dave Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

- Jones The second is the 2023-36-Z filing for the Sentry Development at Holliday Farms Senior Living PUD. This one we've had a second continuance from the adjoining neighborhood HOA so we are going to go ahead and hear that request for the continuance. Is that correct? And then once done, are we going to continue with –
- Taylor You're just going to consider the continuance request.
- Jones Consider the continuance request. So, I guess we need a motion to consider it, the continuation request.
- Walker So moved.
- Grabianowski Second.
- Jones Do we need to have any discussion on it?
- Franz Are we moving to consider the, the, the continuance or did you want to get any information on the request for the continuance? Roger, did you have anything to say on it?
- Kilmer I know that the representative from the HOA that has requested that is present tonight. He'd be glad to answer any questions. Steve Genco.
- Genco Good evening. Thanks for letting me speak here tonight.
- Jones We always need name and address first please.
- Genco Stephen Genco, 4006 Sugar Pine Lane, Zionsville, Indiana 46077. So, the reason for the continuance is I think we've been working fairly well with both Sentry and Matt Price and Henke. We just have to tie up some loose ends. Basically I've got about eight items that they've all agreed to verbally but we need that to be documented and memorialized into the PUD. The PUD is also not reflective in the map of what we've agreed to so there's a number of items attached to this that we still need to, I guess, finalize and get documented.
- Jones Okay. Matt, do you want to comment on the same? Or Mr. Price?
- Price Yes. Thank you Mr. Jones. I echo what, what Mr. Genco has said regarding – I'm sorry – Matt Price on behalf of Sentry Development. Thank you. I echo what Mr. Genco has said. It's been, we've established a good working relationship and I do believe we are in agreement on the items that he mentioned in his letter. With Mr. Genco's permission though, we presented kind of a, a truncated presentation last month and thought it might be good for all parties concerned to also hear the Plan Commission's thoughts and considerations on this petition with the understanding that we need to go back and add in the items that Mr. Genco has mentioned as well as address comments from the Plan Commission which we've not heard to date. So with his permission and with your good graces, we would ask to be able to move forward with the hearing with the understanding that at the end we will, we will, we're in agreement that we will need a, a continuance.

Jones So, I think we can accept that request. Is there any discussion amongst us? Dave, thoughts on that?

Franz No, I'm, I'm fine with it.

Genco How do we, is there a way to introduce this then? To make sure we follow through?

Jones I think the goal of Mr. Price's presentation is just to get the information out knowing full well that that information there is going to need to be addressed and then brought back to us in a completed package and so if there's points after their presentation you would like make a few comments on that's fine but we'll try to kind of limit it to keep it moving forward. Does that sound good?

Genco All right.

Price Thank you Mr. Jones and members of the Commission. For the record, once, again, my name is Matt Price, attorney for Sentry Development. If I could ask my colleagues in the back to pull up our Power Point. We want to take you through the project and kind of reacquaint ourselves with the proposal as well as the changes that we've made to it since our, our last meeting.

First off, I have Mr. Jordan Dorsey with Sentry Development who is here this evening in the front from the second row. We also have representatives of Henke Development, Brad Henke, Doug Fleener, who are both here in person, as well as Steve Henke and Betsy Garfield who are available on the Zoom call and all of us are available to answer any questions that you have.

Go to the next slide – Just, just very briefly, I think everyone is pretty, pretty well acquainted with the location but we are just south of Bridlewood and the emergency access drive that serves Hidden Pines just north of Interactive Academy and across the road, 421, from the Holliday Farms commercial section. It's approximately just under 24 acres in total acreage. The, the driving element of this proposal is the senior living facility which is just under 12 acres of that area that we outline as the subject parcel.

If you can go to the next slide – It's, it's intended to be a very high-end senior living community comprised of a number of different care options ranging from independent living to assisted living and memory care, altogether a total of 155 units in the proposal in, in totality. It includes a number of, of onsite amenities, both inside and outside, including multiple dining options inside, onsite therapy, daily transportation as you see with some of the other senior living facilities in Town, a salon as well as a therapy pool and spa. You may recall that in that list of amenities we previously included pickleball courts and that's one of the items that we've deleted in response to community feedback so that's no longer listed as, as one of our bullet points.

Go to the next slide – Very high-end architecture. The proposal is, is housed in an amendment to the Holliday Farm PUD. So, what we've done here is taken the Holliday Farm PUD and applied it to this 23+ acres across the street including building upon the architectural requirements that are in the Holliday Farm PUD.

We've also, in addition, it'll include all of the other standards that are applicable to developments within Holliday Farm so it also applies the landscape, landscaping requirements, the lighting requirements, etc. are equally applicable to this parcel, not on any lesser scale. And I should add when we first made the presentation, we had adopted the Town's essentially standards for an office complex for both landscaping and lighting and after meeting with community members in the vicinity, they preferred the standards set forth in Holliday Farm and, in fact, wanted to build on, on those standards and that's what we've done and I'll describe that in more detail as we go through the proposal.

Next slide – Once again, representative of the architectural quality of the proposal.

Next slide – And this gives you some flavor for the very high-end interior finishes that are contemplated in the senior living.

Go to the next slide – I'll talk about some of the more significant changes we've made to the proposal since we were here last. We were asked by community members to essentially shift and relocate the building onsite both south and to the west and we've done that resulting in a 30-foot shift south of the building and a 30-foot shift west of the building. What this allows us to do is a couple of important things: 1) We establish a minimum 90-foot building setback to our northern property line, to the eastern property line, as you can tell, the, the property line itself is not, not a straight line so the setback varies but it's no less than approximately 175 feet from the main senior living building, so not the parking facility. That's a little closer but from the main building to the property line is no less than 175 feet as you move, as you move north to south along that eastern property line.

Go to the next slide – This provides some better graphics, I think, illustrating that building relocation as well as the opportunity that the relocation provides for augmented landscaping along our northern perimeter and our eastern perimeter and so one of the items that Mr. Genco had mentioned that he had a list of was providing more detail around what our planned plantings would be on that northern property line and eastern property line and the idea is this, it's a, it's a very common sense idea is that we're working very hard to preserve a very significant portion of the tree stand that, that exists today between Hidden Pines and this parcel but during the winter months, many of those trees lose their leaves and neighbors can see through those woods. Obviously today they don't see anything on that parcel because there's nothing there but they further, further south residents of Hidden Pines have experience with the Interactive Academy building which they can see during the wintertime and so the idea is to provide additional area for buffering and screening where we can add plantings that will be, be robust through the winter season and provide additional screening and buffering from those properties from the building to the, to the west.

I'd like to just stay here for just a, a little bit. The senior living, as I said, comprises approximately half, give or take, of the total proposal which, as you can see, leaves some areas adjoining U.S. 421 as well as that, that L-shape, if you will, along our southern perimeter and what we're seeking to do with some modifications is to borrow the same uses that are applicable in the Holliday Farm

PUD immediately across the street and apply those and make them permissible on the east side of the street, street as well with some very important exceptions. One is, for example, there would not be any multi-family permitted on the east side of the street. In addition, you may have seen in the staff report that Mr. Kilmer noted a variety of kind of institutional-type uses that he was suggesting might be appropriate to delete including things like a Post Office and some public and kind of semi-public type uses. So what we're trying to do is match those uses across the street to the west with those important limitations. Interestingly, today the property is zoned SU-7 which is not, not a land use classification that we see very often. It's a special use classification that essentially it permits charitable and philanthropic land uses and land uses not unlike what's, well, exactly like really, what's at the Interactive Academy site itself. And so what we're seeking to do is to create really more commercial but neighborhood commercial uses that would be complimentary to the senior living facility and be, be available for, for that remaining balance of the property.

Let me mention just a couple other things as well. The northern part of the building is, so the area that's closest to Bridlewood, is a two-story building. The building on the southern end of the, of the senior living campus is identified as a three-story building. We originally had set the maximum height of that building at 65 feet for a couple of reasons. One, we don't have finalized plans for this actual building on this property yet and wanted to provide some flexibility but we also realized that, that height was concerning to neighbors and so we, we believe we can maintain that flexibility and reduce it to a maximum of 55 feet from the adjoining grade to the roof ridgeline. We, we would ask that it be, that things like chimneys and architectural features be allowed to extend above that 55 feet and have done that recently on some other proposals in Zionsville to establish the actual building height and not, not measure the actual building height to the tallest feature that may be extending from the roof.

Go to the next slide – And fast forward here a couple, couple – there you go. I wanted to also talk about in your packets you saw a, a letter from the Pathways Committee undoubtedly. One of the very significant topics of conversation relative to, relative to this proposal has been the opportunity that this new investment would create to provide resources to construct and complete kind of gaps in our existing perimeter pathways as they exist along 421 and so in kind of this multi-colored exhibit what we're showing there up at the very north is the Appaloosa Crossing multi-use path which is a path that Appaloosa Crossing is obligated to build to its southern property line and then in the yellow we pick up the Bridlewood kind of segment which is our northern neighbor. In red is the perimeter path for this actual parcel itself and then the green is the kind of the last leg, if you will, extending down in front of, of Interactive Academy. And so we are, we're very much interested in including these pathway segments as part of this proposal and are committed to doing that really subject to working out the financing mechanism for those with the Town and I think it's fair to say – I lost Mr. Genco, where'd he go? Oh, there he is – I, I think it's fair to say that the upshot of the discussions with the neighbors has been is that they want to make sure that that they have a seat at the table in those discussions with the Town and that that commitment is really made upfront so that they know that should this proposal be approved that that would be included as part of the undertaking by, by the developer at the site. And so we're very much engaged and working

through that and understand its importance to the neighbors as we work through the final details of this proposal.

Mention just a couple other things that are kind of unrelated to pathways but I wanted to mention them is that consistent with the Holliday Farm architecture, there's no franchise architecture permitted on the site. So where we are seeking permission to have a restaurant in front of or near the, near the senior living community there would not be any permitted franchise architecture. It would need to be compatible with the architecture both for Holliday Farm and for the senior living facility itself. The idea is that a coffee shop, a bakery, a neighborhood kind of grill would be something attractive to nearby residents as well as residents of the senior living community but it needs to be aesthetically compatible with the surrounding community and with the, with the development internally itself. One of the, one of the objectives that Henke Development has, of course, is that they're making a tremendous and have made a tremendous investment on the west side of U.S. 421 and want this area to be of the same very high quality architecturally and compatible from a land use standpoint as well. So, it, it not only adds a, adds a useful additional commercial uses but it also can be done in a way that's complimentary to the existing investment that's been made by Henke Development Group.

I think that, that provides a, an overview of the main items. Certainly we do have details to work through with Hidden Pines and with Bridlewood kind of in working in tandem with with one another we view it as a, a team effort among all those constituencies. I also saw some other letters in the packet, for example, from I believe Brittany Chase that seemed to very much coincide with the comments that we received from Hidden Pines and from Bridlewood and, and we're committed to continuing to work through those details as we go forward. Be happy to answer any questions that you have and appreciate your time this evening.

Jones So at this point do we want to get, because we skipped over Roger's comments, do we want to move to consider the continuance piece of it or?

Taylor Ask Mr. Genco if he has any comments.

Jones Ahh, yes. Mr. Genco, do you have any comments that you would like to add to this, to what's been presented? I'm sorry, I thought I'd let you do that.

Price Gentlemen in the work in the, if you could go back to the colored slide for Mr. Genco please. The landscape slide I think. Thank you.

Genco So just a couple of, I guess, reactions to that. I think Matt did a good job of summarizing some of our points. On this slide in particular so one of the issues we have is you notice the green in the back that's connected to our portion of the property near the lake. It kind of stops there. They're committing to do that all the way across so this map needs to get updated to, to depict that and I guess my only thought is can Matt agree to items 1 through 7 on the email from Saturday, October 14th that we sent to him?

Price Yeah, I, I don't think we, we don't have any problem with that whatsoever. I think as Mr. Genco said at the outset that that will be in the details. We need to get that incorporated in writing and circulated to your folks but yeah, I don't see any, any reason why we could not.

Genco Thank you.

Jones I guess at this point we will go ahead and hear Roger's comments.

Dale Yeah. Roger, do you have something to add from staff's perspective?

Kilmer Well I, I'm curious, are we still talking about a continuance or do you want my staff report?

Dale Maybe just highlight if there's some particular concerns you want mentioned because we will discuss this again next month.

Kilmer Very well. Many, many of the comments tonight, not all, but many of them dealt specifically with the proposed senior living facility such as its architecture and its placement on the site and things like that and many of those comments would, would definitely be attributable if we were discussing a development plan petition but tonight we're discussing a rezoning and the proposed development of 9+/- acres is less than half of the acreage that would be rezoned. So I want to make sure that the focus remains on the rezoning and not the development plan aspect of, of the senior living facility. To be clear, staff is not opposed to the senior living facility but, again, that's not the petition that's in front of us tonight.

One of the concerns that staff has – let me, let me eliminate a couple of the concerns staff has is what will be developed on the remaining acreage? Proposed uses within the new section of the Holliday Farms PUD are quite broad and should be narrowed. Staff, again, as I mentioned, staff is not opposed to the proposed development of the senior living facility at the site but is concerned about the unknown uses of the remaining acreage and how the creation of additional retail or commercial outlots could delay the development of the existing available outlots within Holliday Farms on, on the west side of Michigan Road. Approval of competing commercial lots. The Town went to considerable lengths to upgrade infrastructure anticipating returns through tax increment financing monies from the development of the commercial outlots in the central mixed-use block. To date, one commercial business has pursued and received approval for development within the central mixed-use block while 14 platted outlots remain available.

Staff's position is that the petition should receive the, the comments tonight but then be continued to the November 20th meeting. This continuance would allow for further discussion and refinement of the proposed PUD Ordinance, the opportunity to complete, to complete the staff review of a recently provided and updated traffic impact study. There are just a number of items that still need to be addressed within the Ordinance. Not major items but just make sure the terminology is carried through from page 1 to page 5 to page 7, things like that but, again, we need to remember this is a rezoning petition at this time. Thank you.

Jones So are we going to give any of the Council, Commission comments or should we just move to consider our continuance?

Franz I, I think we should give some comments because I have some additional. So I, I, I think they're asking for our comments so they can incorporate that into the PUD language.

Jones Okay. Dave, do you want to start?

Franz Yeah, Roger, you've got listed on here about seven items that you think should be removed from the permitted – I don't, personally, I don't think it goes far enough and I realize we're, we're talking about the PUD Ordinance itself but the thing about the, the senior living home, facility is the fact that it's probably low impact on traffic, more so than a residential subdivision, etc. but I take a look at the use table and there's a lot of things on here that are just going to drive the traffic up to much higher than what potentially a residential use would be. I take a look at a gas station, it's permitted under here. We've got one a mile up, a mile up the road. Do we need another one this close? Some of these other things – there's a daycare/kindergarten right across the street in Holliday Farms. Some, some of these things that are just higher traffic I think they should be removed. Then on transportation and communication uses you've got antenna – I mean, I realize they're accessory uses but antenna, collocated antenna, radio and/or television studio. I, I mean, do we really want to put that in front of an assisted living home where, where we're sitting there on, on Michigan Road? So I think there needs to be some additional work on this use table to limit either the least attractive or the higher traffic generating businesses.

Dale Anybody else?

Jones Anybody else?

Madrick I agree with him.

Grabianowski Amen.

Jones Yeah, I was just going to kind of back up exactly what Dave is saying. One of the comments that's rolled around in several of our meetings is the need to update our Comprehensive Plan because tied to this is what Dave is saying, we've got The Farm project that's back on track, they'll have a series of outlots to fill and we've got the 14 across the street that is already developed that currently we have nobody knocking on the door for, Appaloosa Trail has a few yet to fill in, so do we really need anymore? Secondly, as much as I appreciate all the character imagery, I want to make sure everybody in the room understands that whatever is currently proposed will not look like any of this imagery and that, I'm just getting kind of tired of seeing the same pictures over and over and the same promise but what I see here is a retirement center with four outlots and those outlots are being considered for fast food and gas stations and everything else which is: 1) Not really conveyed through the imagery; 2) It's not really in keeping with I think the direction people would like to see Michigan Road go.

The final item I got is I'm not particularly supportive of having the PUD for this parcel be tied to the Holliday Farm PUD. If we're going to have parcels that are being developed and they're requesting a PUD, it should be a standalone document with its own set of specifications. I'm going to remind everybody that the one project that did get built in the Holliday Farm outlots is a childcare center that the only reason the Town really had any say over what it looked like is because they needed a variance. I didn't really get enough time to prepare like I wanted to. I wanted to kind of go back through to make sure that what I'm saying is correct but I think the reason the building looks like it does is because the BZA had a say in what it looks like, not because it was held to some particularly high standard by the developer. So, given all that, I'm not particularly supportive of any of this until we get some better documentation and a little higher set of standards as well as make sure what is being proposed there are things we really actually have a need for and are not, as Roger is pointing out, undercutting what we've currently previously approved as well as what The Farm is trying to do down at their. What I'm seeing in here is kind of a consistent lowering of standards for what we're getting up and down Michigan Road and I'm not particularly supportive of it. Other than that, I got no opinion.

Taylor Thank you Larry.

Jones Do we want to discuss the continuance? Or does anybody else want to make any comments? Sharon? Sorry.

Walker I think you've covered about everything I had sticky notes on –

Jones All right –

Walker But, yeah, there's not enough in here to go ahead. I would vote for the continuance for sure.

Jones So we have a motion for continuance, right?

Taylor And a second.

Jones And a second.

Walker And a second.

Jones You want to take a roll call?

Dale Yep. Dave Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

Jones Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale The matter is continued. Do we need to announce the date and time?

Jones Yeah, so it's going to be continued to the November 20, 2023 Plan Commission meeting. So next up we have Stohler Roofing Office Building, 5898 South 700 Street. Also we have a continuance to the November 20, 2023 meeting requested by the petitioner. Do we need to make a motion to support that?

Taylor Yes.

Jones So, can we get a motion to support that continuance request by the petitioner?

Grabianowski I move that we approve the continuance request of Stohler Roofing.

Jones To the November 20th –

Grabianowski To the November 20th meeting.

Jones You're the only second we got.

Madrick Second. I was waiting for Sharon to do it.

Jones Oh, sorry.

Walker I was going to let you have a turn.

Jones All right, all right. We'll get to the next one.

Dale Roll call?

Jones Roll call.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

Jones Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Motion passes.

Jones So next up we have Fischer Homes/Summer Rezoning, they've – at 7860 South 850 East. The petitioner has submitted a letter of withdrawal so we just need to note that we are accepting that?

Taylor No, you just need to note it's been withdrawn.

Jones Ahh, okay. So with notice it's been withdrawn. All right so next up we have the Town of Zionsville. Lance Lantz is going to make a presentation regarding the Zone Improvement Plan Ordinance, sound right?

Lantz Correct. This evening you have for your consideration an Ordinance on which you will make a recommendation to the Town Council. So I'm Lance Lantz, Director of Public Works for the Town. This is the third of fourth, of four official steps by this Board and the Town Council to update the Road Impact Fee for the Town of Zionsville which has been in place since 2007. The last time I was with you back on August 21st we went through the Zone Improvement Plan, the methodology, the committee work that was done to come up with the recommendation and at their most recent meeting, the Town Council on October 2nd adopted a, a mirroring resolution and each of those serve to amend our Comprehensive Plan by incorporating the Zone Improvement Plan and so, as mentioned, you have tonight an Ordinance in front of you on which you will also have a public hearing. You had originally advertised this at your September 18th meeting and continued it because the Town Council had to take action on it.

In the simplest sense, this Ordinance basically rewrites all of Chapter 35, oh, excuse me – Chapter 53, Section 35 of the Code of Ordinances which houses the Road Impact Fee actual Ordinance portion of that and not just the Zone Improvement Plan. This Ordinance establishes, among other things, the new per trip fee at \$278.35 per trip. It basically reaffirms many of the things that have been in place since 2007 when the Town began collecting road impact fees. It does modernize it a bit. We have a change in governance, of course, we didn't have a Mayor in 2007 nor did we have a Public Works Department in 2007, so at this point I could go through this if you'd like but maybe I would like even more to stop talking and turn this back to you for discussions, considerations and questions and if you are so favorably disposed to make a positive recommendation, I would offer a couple of suggestions that I ran by your attorney prior to the meeting to make sure you incorporate in your motion.

Jones Well, okay. So, I –

- Taylor 40:18
- Jones Ah, okay. So this is something we do need to allow a little public hearing on. Is there anyone wishing to speak for or against said Ordinance? Any Commission members with questions or?
- Walker I think your report was pretty comprehensive when we got it before and very necessary and a good job was done.
- Lantz Thank you. We certainly did cover a lot in our last conversation so perhaps we can truncate matters this evening.
- Jones So then is there actually a motion in here, in our packet?
- Taylor No, but, but it would just be a motion to approve the Ordinance –
- Jones Okay.
- Taylor Is your action to take and that, that really is a recommendation to the Town Council.
- Franz So, so Dan, would we have to make that recommendation with the recommended changes that you and Lance have discussed?
- Taylor Yeah, the two changes are on page 2, Section 1, the repealer the correct Chapter number is –
- Lantz Would be Chapter 53, Section 35.
- Franz Okay.
- Taylor And then the other changes, the effective date because of the delay on page 12 should be April 23rd –
- Lantz Correct –
- Taylor Correct, 2024. It has, it's six months after adoption so the delay has caused that to be changed.
- Lantz And I would also make the recommendation that you strike the words “which is” there in that same Section 20 and replace it with the word “or” that way if the Town Council does not take action on this one week from now we don't have to come back because we have a date in there. We can say it's the 23rd or no sooner than six months after adoption by the Town Council. Because this is an Ordinance, this will be a two-step process for them. They have the option to suspend the rules and consider on first reading at their next meeting or they may introduce it and then take final action at a subsequent meeting. So let's not lock ourselves into a date and make sure there's some flexibility to allow the Council to manage their process.

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

Taylor So with that, I, I would recommend a motion that would incorporate the changes as noted by Mr. Lantz and I think they, they are changes which should be made.

Dale Those are three edits right? Is that right?

Taylor Yes.

Dale Three edits – one on page 2 and then two on page 12?

Lantz Correct.

Dale Okay, thank you.

Franz So there's a motion to approve those and then a motion to recommend?

Taylor No, you can just make a motion to recommend with the changes that Mr. –

Franz Okay.

Taylor Lantz has pointed out.

Franz All right.

Grabianowski I'll make a motion that we approve this, this Ordinance with the changes that have been pointed out for us.

Madrick Second.

Jones And a roll call vote.

Dale Roll call? David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale Motion passes.

Jones Sounds good. All right so next up we –

Lantz Thank you.

Taylor Thanks Lance.

Jones Yeah, thank you.

Franz Thank you.

Jones So next we have up is the Bradley, Bradley Ridge PUD Rezoning with parcels at 1120, 1310, 1550 South U.S. Highway 421 and 1555 South 950 East and 9625 East 100 South, approximate addresses. So we'll start with Roger first and get back on track.

Kilmer Thank you very much. Before I get into the staff report, I'd like to read a statement that was provided by both the counsel for the petitioner and also the counsel for an organized group of remonstrators. That being staff is aware that the petitioner and representatives of Save Rural Zionsville have been working to refine the proposal and those discussions are anticipated to continue. We, including staff, have discussed the procedural posture for the petition with both the petitioner and the representatives of Save Rural Zionsville and believe it is appropriate to go forward with the hearing so that the Plan Commission may ask questions and provide comments while permitting the petitioner to return to the Plan Commission next month with revisions. This would be with the understanding that the public hearing would remain open in November for testimony and public comment.

So if I could have IT turn my screen or project my screen onto the big screens please.

IT 45:54 inaudible off microphone

Kilmer Yes sir.

IT 47:01 inaudible off microphone

Kilmer You need me to move over there?

IT Yeah.

Kilmer As mentioned, the petition before us this evening is a rezoning of approximately 349 acres consisting of nine parcels from the Rural General Agriculture District, the Rural Single-Family Residential (R1) District and the Rural Single- and Two-Family Residential (R2) Districts and also being within the Rural Michigan Road Overlay to the PUD or Planned Unit Development District.

On the screen, you'll see I have the subject property outlined in black. It comes across on, extends from 100 South with the western border of the property being County Road 950 East all the way down to 200 South and over to the Eagle

Creek tributary which basically comes up and bisects the site but at this point here it, it, the parcel, subject property moves to the east and then back down to 200 South, continuing eastward then north up to Michigan Road and then back up again comprising almost 349 acres.

The property is currently governed by, as I mentioned, three different zoning districts. The majority of the property on the east side of Eagle Creek, this lighter green colored area, is zoned agricultural. The property on the west side of Eagle Creek, this darker green, is zoned R1 and then we have a thin area, this pink area, which is zoned R2. In rezonings one of the key factors that Plan Commission and Town Council will want to be aware of is what does the Comprehensive Plan call for? In this area, we're looking at, at the Area Comprehensive Plan Map that was adopted by Boone County and since our Comprehensive Plan has not been updated since, we still utilize this for those areas that were, were reorganized and adopted into our jurisdiction.

The area of Bradley Ridge is outlined here in a blue circle. It is identified as AG General. You do see, again, the Eagle Creek floodway going through the middle. Also within the Comprehensive Plan, in 2021 the, the Town adopted the Airport Area Strategic Land Use Plan. This, this is, this included a housing compatibility map and identifies areas surrounding the airport where, where residential development should be prohibited which is tier 1 and that is identified by this purplish or, or dark, darker blue area. This is tier 1 and, as you see, it does impact a portion of the northern part of the subject site. The remainder of the Bradley Ridge PUD area falls within tier, tier 4 which is, there are no limitations for residential development within tier 4.

The final map that I want to share with you from the Comprehensive Plan is from the Zionsville Strategic Trails Implementation Plan. This shows a proposed greenway following the pathway of Eagle Creek up and this area would be the, the Carpenter Nature Preserve and continues northward. The area of the Bradley Ridge PUD is again outlined here now in red and you'll see the, the pathway going right through the middle of that area. The proposal as submitted now does comply with this Strategic Trailway Plan. They are proposing, the petitioner is proposing to develop a 12-foot-wide recreation path through the middle of the development, again, bringing it into compliance with the Comprehensive Plan for trails.

The proposed development of, of a single-family residential subdivision would be a departure from the recommendation of agricultural uses in the Comprehensive Plan but the development would comply with the Airport Area Strategic Land Use Plan and 2016 Strategic Trails Implementation Plan which was, with the reference modifications to text in the Bradley Ridge PUD Ordinance. The project description, again, we're talking about rezoning 349 acres for the development of a mixed-use development of up to 290 family dwellings with areas for cultural entertainment uses and recreational uses included. As proposed, the Michigan Road Overlay would not apply to the use and development of the site. This site is bisected, as I mentioned earlier, by Eagle Creek running primarily north and south through the property.

This is the Use Block Plan for the Bradley Ridge PUD and the site would be divided essentially into two use blocks. The first use block is a residential lifestyle use block. That is identified by the lighter green area in this area and also the area on the west side of Eagle Creek. Within this residential use block area, it includes the Bradley Ridge clubhouse, pool and amenity area. The second use block that is, that is identified is the amenity and nature preserve use block and that is primarily the area that runs along Eagle Creek and is impacted greatly by the flood plain area. It is this darker green area. No residences are proposed for that area. The community and amenity nature preservation use block is intended to provide primarily outdoor areas of recreation, both passive and active, cultural entertainment uses and recreational uses identified within the Bradley Ridge PUD Ordinance's use table would also be permitted in this use block.

It's important to note that the PUD Ordinance does state in Section 11.9 the uses within the residential and lifestyle use block and community amenity nature preservation use block shall be connected to water and sewer. The letter from Hamilton Southeastern Utilities has confirmed this area is within their service jurisdiction. The development will be served with vehicular entries on U.S. Highway 421 (Michigan Road), one entry would be here. It would also be served by an entry off of County Road 200 South, it would be in this location and there would be a third point of access for emergency and vehicular use only on County Road 950 East. It is noted that County Roads 100 South along the north, northern edge of the PUD and 950 East are currently gravel roads and will not be improved as paved roads. The petitioner acknowledges that roadway improvements are items still to be discussed and finalized with the Town, Boone County Highway and INDOT.

A couple of items for interest – the proposed PUD is not consistent with the future land use designation of the Comprehensive Plan as it recommends agricultural use. Staff believes the proposal is consistent with the conservation of property values in the immediate area, however, the extension of utilities to the site will likely attract further development to this area. Staff's position is that the petition should be heard tonight to receive comments from the Plan Commission and the public and then continued to the November 20, 2023 Plan Commission meeting. This continuance would allow for the refinement of text within the proposed PUD Ordinance, allow the petitioner to further address items noted within the comment letters including further roadway improvement discussions and address comments provided by the Plan Commission and the public from the hearing. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Dale I have a question Roger – the Zionsville Comprehensive Plan was amended to include Boone County, a section of Boone County's Comp Plan, is that correct?

Kilmer The original Comprehensive Plan that we have, the, the base part of it, was initially adopted in 2002/2003. Since then it has gone through some amendments of different types, one being the, the Airport Land Use Study that I referenced, but there have been different updates to different sections of the Comprehensive Plan since its initial, since its original adoption. The area, those areas that, that were reorganized and now are underneath the jurisdiction of the Town of Zionsville. Those areas where our Comprehensive Plan did not update to

incorporate those, those areas, the Town has chosen to essentially adopt and, and, and go by the guidance of the Boone County Comprehensive Plan for those areas at that time. Again, they have not been updated yet. I know that the Town's goal is to hopefully start that update, updating process as soon as next year but right now this is the best that we have to go on for guidance.

Dale So the Town did adopt the Boone County Comp Plan for this area?

Kilmer For the, for this area, yes.

Dale Thank you.

Madrick Roger, I have a question. On, when I was reading yesterday, on page 3 staff did a calculation that said it was kind of estimated on if it was, how many single-family dwellings there would be if they followed the zoning that's there which sounded like 156 homes. Is that correct?

Kilmer I –

Madrick Could you just expand a little bit on what you can, I guess, on how you came up with that?

Kilmer This, this is a very delicate portion of the report that I need to make very clear – it is not an absolute because many, there are many variables that go into this calculation, amount of flood plain that's involved. When, when you start talking about three different zoning classifications on the property currently, one of those, and, and the largest portion of the site is agricultural. Well, in agricultural you're not allowed to have a major residential subdivision. So that would mean it would be limited to possibly multiple minor subdivisions or do we rezone it to an R1 or an R2 to come up with that number? Again, there are many variables that go into that number so please do not take it as an absolute and, again, the, the also going back to the acreage – that is something that was not surveyed, it was determined off of the mapping from our GIS system which I'm sure there's a plus or minus involved in that as to its accuracy, but there, there are just many different factors that go into that and staff through multiple efforts that's the number that we arrived at.

Madrick Okay.

Jones But is it safe to say that the 156 was arrived at taking the acreage of the R1 that's existing, taking the acreage of the R2 and then taking the agricultural and, without subtracting out for roads or any other things, just kind of, is that where the number was based off of? Just houses per acre or?

Kilmer For, for the sections, for the areas that are zoned R1 and R2, those calculations are straightforward. That's easy to do.

Jones Okay –

Kilmer It's when you get to the AG district which, again, is a majority of the site –

Jones Uh huh –

Kilmer But then we also have to subtract out flood plain areas –

Jones Okay –

Kilmer So, again, I'm, we estimated, I believe, it was 115 acres of, of the site was going to be impacted by flood plain so that reduces numbers down. That, that changes numbers greatly –

Jones Uh huh –

Kilmer But, again, also trying to factor in how could residential be developed on a piece that is currently agriculturally zoned? Again, not, not permitting major residential subdivisions but it would permit minor residential subdivisions which are three lots or less and, unfortunately, there are ways that the Ordinance could be manipulated where multiple minor subdivisions could be developed on that parent parcel. And, and so that's where staff made mention that there would need to be multiple zoning approvals, that's what, what I'm referring to is the petitioner would have to come through over and over and over again to get minor subdivisions approved for this large agricultural piece of ground.

Jones And then you need multiple curb cuts and multiple – and then there's utilities –

Kilmer Again, many different approvals would be required for, for that.

Jones Got it.

Madrick Thank you.

Jones All right. Should we request any presentation from the petitioner?

Price Thank you Mr. Jones and members of the Plan Commission. Matt Price here on behalf of Henke Development Group. I'd like to make a presentation concerning Bradley Ridge this evening and, and show the revisions that we've made to the plan since our initial presentation a couple of months ago. I do want to reiterate something that Mr. Kilmer said at, at the outset of his comments and is that counsel for Save Rural Zionsville and myself crafted the language that he read at the beginning of the proposal where we requested that the, if it's your will, that the hearing remain open to the November meeting to allow additional time for public comment and, and having just received the staff report ourselves on Friday morning, it would also provide additional time for the petitioner to respond to a certain of the statements that are made in the, in the staff report that are somewhat surprising and I think have some omissions that need to be addressed as the Plan Commission deliberates about this proposal but I did want to reiterate that.

If I could ask for the presentation to be uploaded. First of all, let me just start off with kind of an overview of where we started and where we are today with the revisions that have been made after consultation and meetings with community members including representatives from Save Rural Zionsville.

If you can go to the first slide please – This is the initial Use Block Plan that was presented to the Plan Commission back on July 17th and you’ll see that it, it shows the centrally located amenity area, it shows the perimeter pathways where the project fronts the perimeter street system. It does not show a trail going through the center of the property adjacent to Eagle Creek and this proposal was for a maximum of 410 total dwelling units. We made substantial revision to the proposal since this time and I want to outline the major, the major items that have been incorporated to date as well as items that are still under discussion but agreed upon.

If you go to the next slide – First off, we’ve agreed to a reduction in the total number, number of dwellings from the originally proposed 410, which included 60 townhouses, to a total of 296 single-family homes only. It would not include any townhouse proposal. So the makeup of that 290 is 250 single-family homes on the east side of Eagle Creek and a maximum of 40 single-family homes on the west side of Eagle Creek. We did add over one mile of public trail system that would be located on the west side of, of Eagle Creek and as that footnote and as Roger’s comments mentioned, that is as called for by the Strategic Trails Implementation Plan.

We’ve also agreed to limit the number of access points as Roger explained off of U.S. 421, off of County Road 200 and to make the access point off of County 950 for emergency access only and that does require some ingenuity by the developer which is that in order to use that County Road 950 access point for emergency only, there will be a requirement to build a bridge over Eagle Creek. That is part of the proposal that we’re, that we’re moving forward with in connection with this project.

We’ve also made clear that, again, with the pickleball courts that they’ll be on the east side of Eagle Creek and they’ll either be inside a building or if they’re outside, they’ll be screened by noise attenuating plantings so spruce trees and evergreen trees to attenuate the noise. Another major point of discussion was the property along 421 has a, has a significant row of very prominent, tall pine trees and those, there’s a commitment contained in the PUD as revised that would preserve those pine trees and we’ve provided for and enhanced a greenbelt buffer throughout the entire project between proposed home locations and any existing home site today. So we’ve built that into the PUD upfront.

We also have a number of items that are still being discussed that are not part of the PUD that you have in front of you but there are very recent discussions that we’re, we’re working on. We’ve actually incorporated them in for exchange with representatives of Save Rural Zionsville but given the timeliness of those materials, we did not submit those to the Town yet but I can go through those as well.

Go to the next slide – These are other items that we’ve talked about, some of which will be incorporated and have been incorporated into the PUD that the, the parties have exchanged, others of which will probably be better suited for individualized commitments but one of the items that Save Rural Zionsville has come up with is a concept of an Eagle Creek Zone within which there would be

no tree removal and we're proposing a 50-foot setback on each side of Eagle Creek measured from the top of bank where, from which no trees would be removed. That would be only subject to the, the items necessary to build the bridge, for example. In other words, if the tree removal was necessary to carry out another commitment in the PUD, that would be a basis for that.

We've also agreed to essentially a no structure zone in the southwest corner of the property. That will just be left undisturbed either for plantings of wildflowers, could be for crops but, but no structures permitted except for utilities.

We've added a substantial number of provisions regarding increased limitations on lighting. We received a number of comments in, in that particular area and we've worked through and added that detail in several places including providing for no lighting at the County Road 950 entrance and don't see any reason why we could not do that. That's consistent with other emergency access locations that we've seen around Town.

Late last week we received a request about whether it would be possible to relocate the 950 entrance a little further north, I think 100 feet was mentioned in the correspondence, and we have agreed to that as well. And then we've talked about with regard to limiting or preventing construction traffic on County Road 950, basically a protocol that would be followed by the developer with regard to signage and supervision that would assure that since we're going to the lengths we are to prevent construction traffic on 950, that we would have a protocol in place in the form of a commitment that would assure that additional steps were being taken so that that, that was, so it had teeth to it as we move forward.

We also discussed a number of covenants. What we did was we exchanged with Save Rural Zionsville the covenants that are the homeowner covenants applicable to Holliday Farm and counsel for Save Rural Zionsville had gone through their, the individual covenants and suggested a number of places where they would like to see some items augmented and I'll give you an example – one of, one of the provisions is adding a covenant that would prohibit the homeowner from removing a tree from the property without the consent of the controlling developer, the idea being that one of the overarching objectives of the project is to, is to limit tree removal to preserve as many trees as possible and this would be a covenant to assure that in the post-development phase and, and when it's occupied that that would, the spirit of that commitment would continue.

We've also done a number of revisions to the, to the use table where we clarified some things about where certain uses would be located including, for example, we've added, we have provisions for a restaurant and potentially a wine bar. The idea though is for those to be in the clubhouse and restricted to residents and their guests. It's not the intention and we made it clear in the, in the revisions that those uses would be not open to the public generally at all. That's an example of the further clarifications we've made to the, to the use table.

Go to the next slide – So this is the, the updated Concept Plan as you have it in your packets today. Just kind of going around the horn a little bit, start in the northwest corner we've removed any dwellings from the, the tier 1 designation that covers the property by virtue of the Airport Study. So that area has been

specifically identified on the Concept Plan. We've continued to delineate the Bradley Ridge amenity area and nature preserve use block which is the, the darker shaded green. As I mentioned, there is the southwest corner no structure zone which is really that area kind of in the very southwest corner where you see that pond in the southwest corner. That would be where there are no above ground structures except for utility locations to be there. And on that entire side of the property west of Eagle Creek, that's 150 acres and we would be limited to 40 total single-family homes. The, the gold kind of meandering trail that you see is the, that is the, the Eagle Creek trail, if you will, over a mile in length that would serve as a very important linkage between County Road 200 and, and hopefully in the future extend all the way to the Nature Preserve further north making it a very important public amenity right through the center of the project.

Then on the east side in kind of the lighter green is the remainder of our, the residential use block and, again, on the east side which is currently, as, as Roger mentioned, currently zoned agricultural, there'd be a maximum of 250 single-family homes so the townhouse use block has been eliminated from this area. The beige area is the clubhouse and pool area where I mentioned the restaurant use and amenities for residents of the community would be located. That, that's an overview of the, of the Concept Plan.

I did want to speak to a couple of the other items that were mentioned, in particular, relative to the Comprehensive Plan if we could keep going. Next slide and advance once again – That's the, that's kind of the tier 1 zone that's out of the Airport Study and, again, we've delineated that as being an area where there will not be any residential dwellings.

Go to the next slide – This is a page from the proposed Future Land Use Map. I, I want to clarify that I do not believe that the Town of Zionsville has adopted the Boone County Comprehensive Plan. I, I think what Zionsville did was adopt its own Comprehensive Plan relative to areas that were reorganized and then from that going forward they've amended or the Town has amended the Comprehensive Plan to include such items as the Future Land Use Map that's contained in the Airport Study where the Town spent over a year reviewing these land uses, reviewing the tier 1 zone designation and incorporating these plans into our Comprehensive Plan. I attended every one of those meetings over the course of a year and participated in that dialogue and Henke Development participated in that process as well.

In the entire area, this is why it's important for the deliberations tonight and going forward, that entire area is in what's called the estate conservation and residential area. It's not referred to as an agricultural area and, in fact, what the area specifically contemplates is future residential development and what it notes in that plan is that once utilities are extended to that area, it would justify densities ranging from or, excuse me, lot sizes ranging from 0.6 acres per lot to 1 acre per lot. And so, 0.6 acres is about 1.7 homes per acre. Obviously, a 1-acre lot would be one home per acre which would be around 350 homesites on a 350-acre plot as we have here and, and it's not, it's not done to, to, to necessarily raise densities in the area but what was, what was observed was is that this area is ideal for residential development because of its aesthetics it's going to be highly desirable. It is equipped with the, the Eagle Creek corridor making it, making the

properties very suitable for a conservation subdivision, a subdivision where you could reduce the size of the lots below what the rather large lot standards are today and preserve more of the greenspace and public or more of the greenspace and natural features that really define the property and that's exactly what we've, we've done here. We have nearly 45% of the total land area is open space. It includes the, the entire Bradley Ridge preserve area and what we've done is shrink the lot sizes, hold the total number of lots at 290 and provide for maximizing the preservation of greenspace for the project and so in that regard we believe we are, we are completely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for this area in its most recent iteration which I think recognizes the, the future likelihood that these properties would be used for residential purposes. In fact, I think it's exactly why the tier 1 designation was necessary as kind of an overlay on that because it was anticipated that the area would be developed for residential uses and there needed to be some provision taken for removing those dwellings from areas that were in the east-west, the future east-west runway flyover area.

We are, again, as I, as I mentioned, we were, we received the staff report on, on Friday. It was the first time I had seen any kind of a calculation indicating that only 156 homes could be built on 350 acres and I, I can say we disagree with that notion as you might expect and our colleagues representing Save Rural Zionsville came up with a very different number as well employing their own expert review. My analysis of how you get to 156 just on kind of the back of the napkin level analysis at this point, but the only way I think you get to 156 is if you say there is absolutely no development utilizing any portion of the flood plain. Even just including that flood plain as part of the lot area, let alone whether you're using it as a building area or not and so I think it, I think that misuse of the flood plain are not perhaps fully realizing how that flood plain could be utilized in creating a, a functional lot distorts and, and reduces the overall number of lots that you would otherwise see for this area.

Be that as it may, I think the Comprehensive Plan indicates that it is supporting densities at a higher level than certainly what the current zoning would permit or, or, or even that it would be desirable to have future development with those large lot sizes for the very reason that the Comprehensive Plan points out which is that the large lot, large lot sizes cause the greenspace to be eaten up into lots and, and that's not what we want to see. What we want to see is the preservation of, of the greenspace. And so we believe we've reached a, a very sensible kind of baseline number with the representatives of Save Rural Zionsville with regard to the 290. We think it sets a, a very important precedent going forward which is that the density is significantly less than one unit an acre on a 350-acre parcel and that the land area that has the most sensitive aesthetic and natural features, 150 acres, is limited to only 40 homes. We think that sets an excellent precedent going forward for the Town as, as future proposals in the coming years will be identified and reviewed.

Mr. Henke and, and Betsy Garfield are available on the Zoom as are Brad and Doug. We're happy to answer any questions that you have and appreciate your time this evening. Thank you.

Jones

Any Commission members with questions or should we go ahead and get –

Walker I have written as fast as my little hand will go. I need to see all of this in writing in an orderly fashion. My notes are not that good.

Jones And the other question is do we want to get remonstrators and others so –

Walker Yeah, they need to.

Jones Yeah.

Grabianowski Yeah.

Jones So we thought we might request Mr. – is it Ridolfo?

Taylor Ridolfo.

Jones Ridolfo if you would like to speak first and then if there's any other members or participants that would like to have, make statements that they then could follow up but just, as usual, try to keep it something new.

Wright Hi. My name is Christy Wright and I'm, I'm representing Save Rural Zionsville speaking on behalf of Tony Ridolfo today. He had to leave to be with an ailing family member. So thank you all. Let me tell you my address. My address is 9301 East 180 South and I'm here today speaking on behalf of Save Rural Zionsville as we, as we just mentioned.

We have been working along with members of our group. We have more than 300 residents who are signed up with us. We've been working with the developer and his counsel on this project and believe we're very close to completing our discussions. We've also been meeting with Town Council and just last week we met with three members including the President of Town Council and they asked that we continue to work with the developer over the next few weeks to see if we can reach an agreement on a project that our collective group can get behind. We hope that at the next meeting we'll stand before you and say that we support the project but we ask that you hold open public comments until November so that we can lodge any concerns we have about the project at the November meeting if our discussions with the developer fall through.

I'd also like to just add one additional point of clarification related to the, to the density number and we'd just like to say that unofficial conversations with Plan Commission staff and calculations by Save Rural Zionsville's engineer indicate that depending on the interpretation of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, between 156 and 269 lots could be allowed with current zoning. Until the latest staff report was posted, we were unaware that a final determination had been made. Thank you.

Borman Good evening. My name is Terri Borman. I live at 2714 South 1200 East in Zionsville and I've lived there for over 30 years. While I know they're working through several concerns with the proposed Bradley Ridge PUD, my specific concern is with regards to providing sewers to the development. There is currently no sewers available to the area. The proposed PUD, as mentioned by Roger Kilmer, is in the Hamilton Southeastern Utilities service district. I have

talked to them and they do not currently have pipeline or infrastructure to this whole entire service area. They have been in discussions with TriCo Utilities and Citizens Energy Group to provide sewer lines to their service area. My understanding is that if Hamilton Southeastern Utilities selects TriCo Utility to provide the pipeline, the proposed sewer route will once again be through my property and, in fact, looking at the presentation tonight from Mr. Price they show a, a sanitary sewer connection just south of the airport and if that's the one they're using there is no connection there. The connection there will be once they go through my property.

As presented to the Plan Commission last year in regarding to the Silverthorne subdivision, the TriCo Utilities sewer route to the Bradley Ridge PUD would require them to use eminent domain against my property and other neighboring properties for a permanent sewer easement to install a 12-inch main sewer line to service the PUD. The proposed route across my property which is approximately 600 feet long and 30 to 40 feet wide will essentially cause me to lose almost half of my mature woods. The woods are my buffer to the subdivision that used to be farmland to the west of me and provides both privacy, light and noise buffers. I'm requesting that the Henke Development Group make a commitment that any sewer infrastructure needed to the Bradley Ridge PUD does not require eminent domain to be imposed against my property or any other property. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jones 1:27:240 is there someone online that would like to speak?

Frye There we go. My, my name is Bill Frye. I'm the President of the Hamilton County Airport Authority and I'm speaking for the airport which is at 11329 East State Road 32. I wanted to join you all in person tonight but you can tell I've got laryngitis and so I'll try and make this brief. I, I wanted to bring up the Airport Land Use Study that we did jointly with Zionsville a couple years ago and that, it designated the area that's under question which is currently agricultural, as a state conservation residential district and the report states the intent is for this area to remain low density estate residential with a heavy emphasis on preservation of tree canopy and environmental resources. So I just want to make sure that it doesn't sound to me like a PUD meets that criteria. So I just wanted to make that statement.

Jones Okay, thank you much. Do you have anybody else out there who wants to speak?

Running Hi, my name is Jeff Running. I live at 3597 Sugar Pine Lane in Zionsville and I have been looking with increasing alarm at developments like Appaloosa Crossing and the development we talked about tonight north of Interactive Academy and now this proposal and it seems to me you're, it's development for development sake and there doesn't seem to be any objective good to it, especially in the current election cycle you hear a lot of people talking about sustainable growth and as a retired biologist, I'm here to tell you there is no such thing as sustainable growth. I look, there seems to be no objective reason to turn Zionsville into another Carmel and another area just go up to 151st and Shelbourne and see what the future of Zionsville is like. I don't see any benefit to this development other than money in someone's pocket, either in Henke's pocket or in the, the pocket of the Town of Zionsville in the property taxes. This

Board and the people in general seem to give no value to the, to the nature itself to wildlife space itself. There is an inherent value in that wild space that no one seems to be considering and there is a big cost to destroying it because the development will destroy that space as a wildlife habitat.

People seem to think that in order to be a better Zionsville you need to be a bigger Zionsville which doesn't make any sense to me. I think most of the people here who live in Zionsville would disagree with the fact that a bigger Zionsville is a better Zionsville. I think if you took a poll you'd find that most people think that a bigger Zionsville is a worse Zionsville. There is, as a biologist, I know in the history of the Earth there has been five mass extinctions. We're going through a sixth mass extinction right now. This one is man made and the reason the sixth mass extinction is occurring is not because of climate change it's because of habitat destruction and habitat destruction occurs a million times around the world every day and it does it at the hands of Boards like this and people on the Board like this who are responsible for that habitat destruction. So I highly recommend that you forward a unfavorable recommendation to, to the Town Council for this piece of property. Mr. Price was going on and on bragging about the preservation of greenspace. If you want to preserve the greenspace, don't develop it at all. You could preserve a lot of greenspace simply by not developing it. Thank you.

Jones Any other comments? Do we move to questions/comments from the Commission members?

Taylor 1:32:52

Jones Is there any comments from Commission members or?

Madrick I have, I just have one question – so when I look at the pedestrian 1:33:10 work accessibility for the Strategic Trails Implementation Plan, obviously, anything parks wise is open in accessibility to anyone and I went through it yesterday afternoon and did control finds this morning trying to figure out and it looks like you certainly have language that gated would be allowed but it doesn't really say whether it is or it isn't. I'm just perplexed at how you can have this trail going through there, I mean, are people supposed to knock on the gate and ask permission to go through or what?

Price No, it's a very good question. The, the, the PUD does permit gated entrances for vehicular access but the trail is open to the public.

Madrick So it would have a different entrance that –

Price Yeah, the, the, the trail goes through right through the, the center of the development and we would have –

Madrick Well I saw it kind of go along –

Price Yeah –

Madrick 200 on the side and I wondered –

Price Right. We, so we would, we also, we have the obligation under the Ordinance to also have a perimeter pathway so you could access the perimeter pathway and get on the, the greenway through the center of the project.

Madrick So that's bikes, walkers, golf carts?

Price Correct. Limited to those three things.

Madrick Thank you.

Jones 1:34:43 inaudible off microphone

Taylor 1:34:48 inaudible off microphone

Franz This is Dave. I just want to get a clarification from Roger. I don't think you've made a definitive statement as to it's exactly 156 sites that could be built on this. I mean, that's based upon your current interpretation, is that correct?

Kilmer That is correct. It is not a definitive number.

Franz I just wanted that for clarification.

Jones So my general concern with this is, it's not really a 359-acre development but it's something that affects more like 1,000 acres. The core concern here is that once we kinda and if a project like this gets approved the connection to the utilities cause problems on both ends – one problem with just what is the route, how's it get there, who does it affect and two, what's the net effect of then having sewers and utilities in these areas to the balance of surrounding properties?

I'm, I'm going back to my comments earlier about our Comprehensive Plan. We're even sitting here right now and having you tell us what our Comprehensive Plan is – is it in the documents that we go through and see online, is it something else that you provided that was created by the Airport Authority, is it adopting something that Boone County did? What exactly is it? Plus, what we do have – oh and then finally there's actually what the land is zoned which, once again, Zionsville didn't really have any control over. So it all kind of moves back to the simple fact that we are dealing with a round of information that is 20+ years old.

I had a fine afternoon of reading, of reading the 20-year-old Comprehensive Plan plus I went through and read the sewer update development plan and for anybody in the audience it's, it's some, it's some fine, interesting stuff but it does get back to the issue of if we are going to at some point ever move forward with developing these properties, how are the utilities going to be brought in there, how's it going to get phased in, where's it all going to go?

I'm known for saying you don't own the view. If you acquire a piece of property you, you need to do your own personal due diligence to understand what's around you. Just because you like the view today doesn't mean it needs to stay. But when it comes to the zoning of the property around you, I do think you have

a belief or you do have a, a certain amount of right to expect that that zoning should stay for some set or set, set period of time and, hence, that's what a Comprehensive Plan does. It allows everybody to have the voice in, in what is the future development of this area and the plan that we have is, is pretty old.

\ Before the meeting we have a little pre-meeting and, and one of the comments I brought up to Roger and he, he kind of read it back in is that there's a line in there that says, it's under requirements for rezoning – Item 5 Responsible Development and Growth. It says “Planned, orderly development of property is a key component in the conservation of property values.” So, in other words, the only way to conserve something is to change it which goes back to the individual who just got up and spoke about biology. Secondly, it says “Staff believes that the proposal is consistent with the conservation of property values in the immediate area. However, the extension of utilities to the site will likely attract further development to the area.” So, in other words, to preserve and conserve the values of the property in the area, we need to change things but if we change it, we don't really know the full extent of what we're going to get and how that'll affect the values of what we're trying to conserve.

It's a loopy kind of statement and it's the kind of statement that's created by the simple fact that as, as much as we cite Carmel and Fishers and everybody else who we don't want to become, at least when it comes to Carmel they've got a plan. You may not like Brainard's plan, you may not believe in it, you may see some holes in it but from the Mayor's office through the staff, through their Council people, through everybody else, there's a plan over there and as a developer when you come before Carmel, you're told right off whether or not you're, you're meeting the plan. The core issue we have here in Zionsville is that we don't have a plan. Myself, I might as well be Aaron Burr and maybe I'm just not in the room where it happens but I think that the gist of it is the Town of Zionsville needs to update their Comprehensive Plan. They need to have a plan and then they need to elect some leadership that's going to implement that plan. Without it you get what the individual said before is it's left to us up here to make these decisions and it's left to our staff to try to interpret what is wanted when the staff itself isn't given a direction. So, I guess there's a general motion out there that there's a request to continue this and if we wanted to do that somebody needs to motion for same. If not, I'll make a motion.

Grabianowski I move that Docket Number 2023-28-Z, a Petition for Zone Map Change to rezone 349+/- acres consisting of nine parcels from Rural General Agriculture, Rural Single-Family Residential and Rural Single- and Two-Family Residential Districts within the Rural Michigan Road Overlay to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) District with recommendation being certified to the Town Council for adoption or rejection be continued to the November 20, 2023 Plan Commission meeting.

Madrick Second.

Jones Roll call.

Dale Roll call. Cindy Madrick?

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

Madrick Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Motion carries.

Price Thank you.

Jones Okay, so up next we have Henke Development/Holliday Farms Section 10, Dartmoor Court. Petition for Approval of a Primary Plat – should we put these two together or do them separately? Is that all right?

Taylor Yeah.

Jones I think we're going to put together Docket Number 2023-42-PPA along with Docket 2023-43-DPA so we get a single presentation. Prefer to have motions separately on each to keep it, keep it straight? Matt, is that you again?

Taylor Roger's doing it.

Jones Oh, Roger's doing it. All right.

Kilmer As mentioned, we have two companion petitions to be heard at the same time. There is a Primary Plat Amendment and Development Plan Amendment. I'm sorry, I have the wrong screen up. One moment – there we go. And this is for Section 9, a portion of Section 9 of Holliday Farms which will be known as Section 10. The petition is for the approval of a Primary Plat Amendment and the related Development Plan Approval to subdivide 2.708 acres into seven single family lots. There are four waivers of the Subdivision Control Ordinance are also requested as part of the Primary Plat Approval. Those four waivers are for design speed standards, street blade standards, design and construction standards for typical residential cross section and design and construction standards for driveway spacing from intersections. These same four waivers have been requested for each of the previous residential sections of Holliday Farms and have been granted.

To orient you to where we are looking at, on the, on the map on the screen you see this is the area of Holliday Farms and specifically we are talking about this small area of that portion. It is the extreme northeastern corner of the development. I'll move on to the next slide. This is the zoning map that shows the area in question is part of the PUD. Immediately to the east of the site, first of all, Michigan Road is creating the frontage of the area but then on the east side of Michigan Road you have Bridlewood Court and then to the south we have the area of, that we discussed earlier this evening for the proposed rezoning for Holliday Farms. To the south we have a number of the different residential areas of Holliday Farms but also the commercial section and then to the north we have residential R2 districts again to the north. This is the final section of Holliday Farms that would be platted and developed for single-family home, single-family lots.

Now to give you a better idea of, of where within Holliday Farms we're talking, again, this is the, the overall area. We're talking about this very small section where the, the hand is right now and to blow that up, again, here is the entirety of Holliday Farms. We are talking about just this very small area that is shaded up in the far northeast corner of the, of the development. It would consist of seven residential lots, three along the north side of this extension of Dartmoor Court and four lots along the south side of that extension. Again, everything to the west of this area has already been platted for single-family lots as well as those lots to the south. This remaining area had been platted as a Block A of Section 9 and so what they're wanting to do is take Block A and turn it into seven residential lots. There is at the end of this street extension of Dartmoor Court, it's currently being shown as a dead end and I know that the Fire Department has already had discussions with the petitioner about replacing this dead end with an appropriate turnaround to accommodate their fire apparatus. That has, that discussion and design has been taken place and we believe we have arrived at, at the design that will work for there but that is one of the remaining comments within the staff, staff report as something that does need to be finalized.

Again, this is the last section of Holliday Farms to be platted for residential use. There are really no unique features or items to raise yellow flags or red flags on this. It's just the completion of the overall development. So staff is in a position for a favorable recommendation for a conditional approval of the Primary Plat Amendment and the Development Plan for the area to be known as Section 10 in Holliday Farms. The reason why it's conditional, it's still subject to the resolution of the remaining staff comments. Again, a lot of the staff comments are figuratively speaking crossing T's and dotting I's on items. So I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

Jones So with the creation of that turnaround are they going to lose that berm from Michigan Road?

Kilmer No. The, the way, the design that has been proposed is actually if you would envision a Y at the end of this road where they'd be able to pull forward and then back up into the opposite leg of the Y and then go ahead and, and pull out. To say it won't impact that berm, if it does it would be minimally impacting that berm.

Jones And I was also looking just unrelated but to the additional lots directly to the south that wrap the old farmhouse so we've approved all those as well, correct?

Kilmer That is correct.

Jones Okay. Basically this little corner up through here is just going to be all single-family homes when it's all said and done wrapped around the existing farmstead for lack of a better term.

Kilmer The farmstead is actually to the south. It, it is not even on this drawing.

Jones Correct.

Kilmer It's, it's further south.

Jones No, I'm looking at some of the other documents you have here. It's just –

Kilmer I can go back to the overall –

Jones That one.

Kilmer Here if you look on the screen, again, the hand is on top of the area we're talking about tonight.

Jones Correct.

Kilmer The historic homestead is down here.

Jones And have they come up with a use for that yet?

Kilmer We do know of someone that is looking to convert that use. I don't know if I'm at liberty to say right now so I'm going to pause and not say that.

Jones Okay.

Henke I can comment to that.

Kilmer I'll let you do that. Any other questions for me?

Jones No.

Kilmer All right.

Jones Any comments from the audience?

Taylor The petitioner.

Jones Oh, I'm sorry – the petitioner.

Henke Yeah, Brad Henke, Henke Development Group, 781 Old Ashbury Road, Westfield, Indiana. Thanks, Roger. Appreciate you going through all that. To

Larry's comment earlier, that is just the continuation of what we're taking through last time. We didn't quite have the drawings done in time so we weren't able to add it last time but they are the similar size lots what we're doing to the south. Those will be all custom homes in the million to \$2 million dollar range in that area.

Regarding the old farmhouse, we're working with a local resident. Really excited, Tracey Garontakos. She has started a new brokerage. She was with Encore Sotheby's called The Agency and so she has kept the historic charm to it and renovated the inside. It's really neat if you get a chance to walk through. They kept all the original floors and just, just finished that project there. They're putting the tile down in the kitchen now and it'll really be a beautiful project. And south of that on lot, I don't have it in front of me, I believe it's Lot R, just to the south of their building they are working to create a really neat courtyard gateway for the Village Center there building two or three barns that would give it a really historic look and feel that complement the, the brick farmhouse there and I, I, I believe and she'll, she'll be here soon to go through her project but I believe she has a med spa and a couple other like a heated yoga, some really neat uses that would complement that, that entire area and be very high quality. Happy to answer any questions I can too.

Jones I guess next is there anybody in the audience who for or against this who would like to speak? Anybody online? No? Question Sharon?

Walker No, thank you.

Jones Anyone else? All right then should we move to a motion?

Walker Before I make the motion I want to make sure I understand that we can put them both together with the same verbiage that I have on the, on the first one?

Jones I was going to suggest we do them both just independently.

Taylor Yeah, we need to do them separately. We need to –

Walker Okay.

Taylor The waivers, yeah, we need to vote on the waivers first on the plat on the plat amendment. It's a little trickier.

Walker Okay.

Taylor You can approve all four waivers at once in one motion if you would choose to.

Walker That's what I was going to ask. 1:52:59 that but I wanted to make sure I did it right so you didn't have to have me do it again.

Taylor You're doing great. Keep going.

Walker Okay. All right. Here's – oh dear. I move that Docket 2023-43-DPA, Petition for the Plan Amendment approval to provide for the development of seven single-

family lots on 2.3 acres platted in Section 10 including the waivers as listed in the Findings of Fact be conditionally approved subject to the resolution of the items noted within the comment letters, Exhibit 5A and 5B, based on the Findings as presented. Did I get it all in there?

Taylor Yeah, I think we need to make a motion just on the waivers first.

Walker All right, waivers first.

Taylor Just on the plat case. Avoid the DPA for a minute. So we have to, yeah, we need a motion on waivers first –

Walker Okay.

Taylor Just the waivers on the plat.

Walker Then I would make the motion that we approve the waivers as listed in the Findings in the Development Plan.

Taylor No, the plat.

Walker The plat.

Taylor There you go.

Walker That get it?

Taylor Yes.

Grabianowski Second.

Jones Roll call please.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

- Madrick Aye.
- Walker Now I go back to, to the one?
- Taylor Now just the plat approval.
- Walker Okay. So I'm not combining them like we said? All right. I can do that. That makes more sense to me. Okay. I move that Docket 2023-43, -42 because that's that plat –
- Taylor Right.
- Walker Let me start over.
- Taylor Correct.
- Walker All right. I move that Docket 2023-42-PPA, a Petition for Approval of the Primary Plat Amendment subdivide 2.708+/- acres previously platted as Block A, Section 9 into seven single-family lots being zoned Planned Unit Development, the Holliday Farms PUD, be conditionally approved subject to the resolutions of the items noted within the comment letters, Exhibit 5A and 5B, based on the Findings of Fact as presented with waivers. As presented and a period.
- Jones Should we read those in? Go ahead and read the four in.
- Walker Okay, now I can do the next –
- Jones No, it's just the, the rest of the motion.
- Grabianowski The specific, specific waivers.
- Madrick The four.
- Jones It's items one through four right there on –
- Walker Okay, I'm, I'm, I must be lost because I'm not understanding what you're telling me.
- Taylor I don't think she needs to. That's fine.
- Walker I was going to say, I thought I covered that.
- Jones We got it, all right.
- Taylor It's fine.
- Jones Is there a second?
- Grabianowski Second.
- Jones Roll vote.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Motion carries.

Jones All right, next up we have Larson Design Group –

Dale Excuse me –

Jones What?

Franz The DPA.

Taylor Yeah.

Walker Now I get to go back and to the DPA don't I?

Taylor Yes.

Jones All right.

Walker Okay, Larry, are we ready?

Jones Yep, go ahead.

Walker Okay. I move that Docket Number 2023-43-DPA, a Petition for the Development Plan Amendment approval to provide for the development of seven single-family lots on 2.708 acres +/- be platted as Section 10 of Holliday Farms being in the PUD, Planned Unit Development Zoning District be conditionally approved subject to the resolutions of the items noted within the comment letters, Exhibit 5A and 5B, based on the Findings as presented.

Jones All right. Roll call vote.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Jones Aye.

Dale Motion passes.

Jones All right. We all good so far? All right so then Larson Design Group/FedEx Gateway Building Expansion, 10301 Bennett Parkway. I'm lost when he walks over there.

Kilmer The petition before you is for approval of a Development Plan Amendment to provide for the expansion of an existing gateway building for new security screening equipment for the FedEx facility on Bennett Parkway. To orient you as to the location of the site, on the screen I have the overall site outlined in black and to help you, 106th Street is to the north. Bennett Parkway extends running north-south along the west side of the subject property and the specific area for the building addition is located here to the south of the main building and I've tried to blow that up down here in the lower left hand, lower right hand portion of the, of the map. This white building that you see is the existing building and the proposed building addition is going to be immediately to the east of that.

This is the zoning map which shows the entire site is zoned I-2 Urban Industrial. That is also consistent with what's to the north and to the east of the site. To the southwest you have SU-7 which this is Hoosier Village but, again, the, the site of the building addition is internal to the overall FedEx property itself.

Here is a site plan, again, showing the, the location of the proposed building addition. I'm going to go to the next slide to zoom in a little bit tighter. Again, this white block that you see is the existing building. What they're proposing to add is this grayed portion. It is almost the same size, just slightly smaller in square footage and, again, the, the purpose of this, the gateway building provides security screening for all incoming and out, and outgoing vehicles to the FedEx facility. The proposal is to expand the, the existing building almost doubling the existing facility size with a 2,350 square foot addition. This site or this drawing is

also – I’m sorry. I was going to go to the landscape plan. I took that one out. The landscape plan that has been, has been submitted is compliant with the requirements.

To give you an idea of what the building will look like – on this first drawing this is the south building elevation and this lighter area is the existing building and this darker area is the proposed new construction. All the materials are to match the existing in color and in pattern. We have the lower two-thirds of the exterior walls will be a precast wall with a red brick pattern to match the existing building. The remaining upper third will be a precast wall matching the texture and color of the existing building. There will be no roof mounted mechanical equipment on top of the building. It is all ground mounted so we don’t have to worry about screening of that. That, that is the south elevation. As we look at the north elevation, again, they’ve utilized the same drawing style where the darker area is the building addition and I believe it just measures a total of I believe it’s 18 feet tall. This, this lighter area is the existing structure and then we have both the, the west elevation and the east elevation.

Information for the lighting on the building has been provided. They are wall packs as shown, however, the, the petitioner did not note within these, these cut sheets as to what intensities. They, they just did not circle or identify specifically what the types of lighting will be so that is one of the items we’ve asked them to clarify which is one of the reasons why we are recommending a conditional approval of this Development Plan Amendment. There are truly just some minor items that need to be clarified for this. We think it will be taken care of in, in one round of revisions and then we’ll be ready to move forward to a pre-construction conference and the release of building permits for this development should it be approved. Staff is in, in a position for a favorable recommendation of the conditional approval. I’ll be glad to answer any questions you might have. And I believe the petitioner is online via Zoom.

Jones I’d just be kind of interested to know how they inspect the vehicles from that kind of building.

Kilmer Pardon me?

Jones I just think it’s interesting that they’re inspecting all the vehicles coming and going from the property from a building that isn’t adjacent to the drive but it might be some technology I don’t understand.

Kilmer Well if, this, the site plan might answer your question if I’m understanding your question –

Jones Uh huh –

Kilmer The, the main drive into the, the site is through this avenue or through, through this pathway –

Jones Uh huh –

Kilmer And it runs immediately adjacent to the security buildings. So any, any vehicular traffic in or out of the site is going to have to go through this area.

Jones Hmm, all right.

Roman But I can, I can elaborate on that. My name is Brad Roman with Larson Design Group. We have set up this design in working with FedEx Ground. The new expansion is for workers of the warehouse in and out so it's really the, the traffic, the truck traffic in and out to the warehouse does get scanned via cameras of that nature but the expansion is really to expand their security equipment. So right now it's a very small area. I think it's two metal detectors, one in, one out. They're bringing in x-ray machines, turnstiles, metal detectors so that workers of the warehouse are scanned going into the facility and then as well as they come out of the facility. So it's really for the pedestrian traffic into and out of that warehouse.

Jones Yeah, that's makes a little more sense from –

Madrick Yeah, that does make more sense.

Jones Were looking at it so. Okay. Any other Commission member questions? Is there anybody in the audience who would like to speak for or against? Okay. You going to make another motion Sharon?

Walker I'm going to do this because it's pretty straightforward here.

Jones Here we go.

Walker I move that Petition 2023-41-DPA, a Development Plan Amendment to provide for the expansion of an existing gateway building for new security screening equipment being in the Urban General Industrial (I-2) District be conditionally approved based upon the Findings of Fact as presented with the conditions as noted in the staff report and subject to the resolution of the comments within the attached comment letter, Exhibit 5.

Jones Second. Roll call vote please.

Dale Cindy Madrick?

Madrick Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Mary Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

Dale Larry Jones?

Zionsville Plan Commission
October 16, 2023

Jones Aye.

Dale Sharon Walker?

Walker Aye.

Dale Motion passes.

Kilmer Thank you.

Roman Thank you.

Jones Thank you. What else we got? Something else?

Dale Café Patachou.

Jones Café Patachou, yes. Café Patachou.

Kilmer This is a Minor Development Plan Amendment. We're just informing you of administrative approval of this change. Again, Café Patachou received Development Plan Approval a number of months ago, maybe even in 2022. I'm speaking without my notes so please forgive me but they came in and wanted to add an awning over one, the outdoor seating area of their facility and it did qualify as a Minor Development Plan Amendment so staff has, it's our obligation to report to you that this was approved administratively. Here's another rendering of what that looks like so if you go by and see an awning there and don't remember it, hopefully now you do.

Jones There we go.

Kilmer That is the extent of, of Café Patachou Minor DPA.

Jones Okay, okay.

Dale This does not require a vote is that correct?

Jones Correct.

Taylor Yeah.

Dale Okay.

Jones It's just for information purposes.

Kilmer Yes.

Jones All right, thank you Roger. Last item we have is the 2024 Plan Commission schedule.

Kilmer Yes at last month's meeting we presented a draft to you and that was subject to approval of the holidays by the Town Council. We did find that the holidays that

are now being proposed by the Town Council did affect one or two dates on that calendar. Just a matter of, of one of the dates was a filing on a Monday. There's now a holiday on that Monday so that filing deadline will be moved to the next day on Tuesday. The Town Council though will not officially adopt the holiday schedule until their November, I believe their second November meeting and so this will be coming back to you for final approval once they finally adopt the official holiday schedule for 2024.

Grabianowski So I had noticed that, that we're meeting on Juneteenth isn't really June 20th, it's the third Monday unless they're going to decide that we don't need to celebrate Juneteenth at Zionsville which I think would be stupid.

Kilmer So, we're going to need to wait to see what, what is formally adopted.

Grabianowski Okay.

Jones You got it? All right. Anything else?

Grabianowski I move we adjourn.

Jones So moved.

Franz Thank, thank you Larry. I appreciate it.