



**ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**

**Brownsburg Town Hall  
61 North Green Street  
Brownsburg, Indiana 46112**

**Monday, May 23, 2022**

The Brownsburg Advisory Plan Commission was convened at 6:00 PM with a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance. A roll call was taken; where upon determination of quorum was found.

Members Present: Steve Fletcher, Jeff Humphreys, Richard Miller, Shawn Pabst, Brett Scowden and Matt Simpson

Members Absent: Troy Austin

Also Present: Jenna Wertman, AICP- Senior Planner, Maggie Smith- Legal Counsel, and Heather Wetzel- Administrative Assistant

**C. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES**

1. April 25, 2022- Regular Meeting

**Motion:** Matt Simpson made a motion to **APPROVE** the April 25, 2022 regular meeting minutes, seconded by Jeff Humphreys, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

**D. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT AND REPORTS OF DETERMINATION**

1. PSDP-22-2 Brownsburg Fire Territory Training Center DPR
2. PSDP-22-5 Eagle Creek Logistics Park DPR
3. PCPP-01-22-1988 Two West Primary Plat
4. PCPP-22-4 Northfield Greens Primary Plat
5. PCPP-22-5 Ronald Reagan Logistics Park At I-74, Phase 2

**Motion:** Matt Simpson made a motion to **APPROVE** the Findings of Fact and Reports of Determination for PSDP-22-2, PSDP-22-5, PCPP-01-22-1988, PCPP-22-4 and PCPP-22-5, seconded by Richard Miller, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

**E. HEARING OF REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES**

1. PCMA-10-21-1956 W. Wynne Farms PD Amendment

A request for a zoning map amendment, to amend Ordinance 2004-01 Wynne Farms PUD Ordinance the West Wynne Farms PD Parcel R, for the purpose of to permit multi-family uses for the purpose of future development.

Parcels: 32-07-26-105-002.000-016, 32-07-26-105-006.000-016, 32-07-26-105-004.000-016

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING**

Represented By: Russell Brown, Clark Quinn Moses Scott & Grah, LLP

Staff asked for a continuance to June 27, 2022 to allow the applicant more time to make revisions. This would require a suspension of the Rules.

**Motion:** Richard Miller made a motion to **SUSPEND** Rules of Procedure 6(D), seconded by Matt Simpson, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

**Motion:** Richard Miller made a motion to **CONTINUE** PCMA-10-21-1956, seconded by Matt Simpson, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR PCMA-10-21-1956 OPENED, RECESSED AND CONTINUED TO JUNE 27, 2022 AT 6 P.M.**

**F. DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL REQUESTS**

1. PSDP-22-3 Park 136 Acorn Storage DPR *(Cont. From April)*

A request for development plan review approval of 5 self-storage buildings with associated parking, in the Creekside Commons Planned Development (PD) District, on approximately 4.55 acres, located SW of the INTS of US HWY 136 and N CR 900 E.

Parcels: 32-07-13-400-002.000-016

Represented By: Jordan Corbin, Holladay Properties

Jenna Wertman presented the case on behalf of Lauren Gillingham who was on vacation. Ms. Wertman reviewed the criteria for approval and said staff was recommending approval with conditions. The 4.4 acre site was located in Creekside Commons at the SW corner of 136 & 900. They were dedicating right-of-way for future intersection improvements. The request satisfied the PD and the UDO and was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as this area called for Corridor Commercial and was a use allowed under the PD.

There would be a main climate-controlled storage building on the northwest side with some longer storage unit buildings to the south. There was an area that would be used for vehicle storage until a future phase of additional buildings. There was a fence, an existing berm with landscaping and landscaping along Main St. Three feet of masonry required on all elevations facing residential uses.

Staff was recommending approval with the following conditions:

- (1) Final approval from INDOT for ROW improvements on 136.
- (2) ~~The architectural renderings will be updated to show masonry on all required facades (COMPLETED).~~
- (3) The submission of fence details showing that the fence is completely opaque.
- (4) ~~Submittal of a photometric plan showing illumination levels at the property line (including lighting fixture cut-sheets). (COMPLETED)~~
- (5) The stamped approval of the Development Plan by the Director of Development Services.
- (6) The approval of the Findings of Fact and Report of Determination by the Plan Commission.

Brett Scowden asked if there was any façade break. Ms. Wertman said there was discussion about some faux windows. Applicant representative Jordan Corbin, Holladay Properties stated they would have those windows. Richard Miller confirmed with staff that would be added as a condition.

Mr. Scowden asked about the May 3<sup>rd</sup> TECH response #2 regarding "the HGL must remain below the crown of the pipe for the 10-year storm event" and their response that it was unachievable. Mr. Corbin said the site was mostly flat and they were building it up from east to west, but as the pond stages during each significant storm event, the backwater makes its way into the pipe system. By the time you made it to the upstream end, the crown of the pipes would be below that.

Mr. Scowden asked about item #7, "Verify that building elevations meet the requirements of Ch. 151.21 K.3" and how this was also achievable for a storage facility. Mr. Corbin said that was part of the ongoing stormwater review.

**Motion:** Matt Simpson made a motion to **APPROVE** PSDP-22-3, subject to and conditioned upon Staff recommendations as amended to remove the completed items and the inclusion of faux windows, seconded by Shawn Pabst, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed /0 Abstained.

2. PSDP-22-4 Park 136 Industrial DPR

A request for development plan review approval of a 62,400 sq. ft. building with associated parking, in the Creekside Commons Planned Development (PD) District, on approximately 6.80 acres, located SW of the INTS of US HWY 136 and N CR 900 E.

Parcels: 32-07-13-400-002.000-016

Represented By: Jordan Corbin, Holladay Properties

Ms. Wertman reviewed the development plan review process and said they were recommending approval of the development plan with conditions. The site was Lot 2 of Park 136 which was 6.7 acres. This was for a small industrial warehouse. It satisfied the Creekside Commercial PD and the UDO. It was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as this was Corridor Commercial.

She reviewed the site plan and said the truck dock areas would be to the west and would not face 136 or 900. There was drainage closest to 900. She reviewed the screening, multiuse and drive aisles. The elevations for the building met UDO standards with decorative precast panels, location of entrances and variations in colors. There were some height variations along the roof line.

Staff was recommending approval with the following conditions:

- (1) Final approval from INDOT for ROW improvements on 136.
- ~~(2) Submittal of lighting fixture cut-sheets. (COMPLETED)~~
- (3) The stamped approval of the Development Plan by the Director of Development Services.
- (4) The approval of the Findings of Fact and Report of Determination by the Plan Commission.

Matt Simpson asked about the recommendation for bringing trucks into the facility. Mr. Corbin said they were coordinating with INDOT on getting approval for the access. The main entrance would be off 136.

**Motion:** Richard Miller made a motion to **APPROVE** PSDP-22-4, subject to and conditioned upon Staff recommendations as amended to remove the completed items, seconded by Shawn Pabst, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

## G. OLD BUSINESS

1. None

## H. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. \*PCMA-22-1 Westbranch Rezone To PD

A request for a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property from the General Agriculture (AG) district to the High Density Single-family Residential (R3) district to allow for future mixed-use development, on approximately 31.19 acres, located at the southwest corner of E US Hwy 136 and CR 600 E.

Parcels: 32-07-04-400-011.000-016

## **ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING**

Represented By: Jon Dobosiewicz, Nelson & Frankenberger

### 2. \*PCCZ-22-1 Westbranch Conditional Rezone To PD

A request for a Conditional Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property from the Hendricks County Agriculture Residential (HC AGR) district to the Planned Development (PD) district to allow for future mixed- use development, on approximately 33.17 acres, located immediately adjacent to the southwest corner of E US Hwy 136 and CR 600 E.

Parcels: 32-07-04-400-005.000-015

## **ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING**

Represented By: Jon Dobosiewicz, Nelson & Frankenberger

\*Discussion was held on both cases.

### **ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING OPENED FOR PCMA-22-1 AND PCCZ-22-1 AT 6:20 P.M.**

Jenna Wertman said this was a request for a standard rezone and a conditional rezone, which was done in conjunction with annexation. The Westbranch PD would be located west of the intersection of Northfield Drive and 136. It would be a mixed-use development with single-family detached homes for rent and a commercial node. The proposal had changed since the last hearing; the large lot residential area would stay in Hendricks County so they could use septic systems. TECH members generally commented on utilities, entrances and Planned Development standards. The original proposal was introduced at Town Council where they expressed a desire to see commercial included, did not want the plans to be reduced, and desired buffering or larger lots on the southern boundary. They generally offered positive feedback. The single-family area was modeled after TR zoning and the commercial node modeled after NC zoning. The residential area would consist of traditional homes with smaller side yards, predominantly with rear-loaded garages with some front-loaded garages with a limit on the front-loaded units. The NC district would have higher commercial zoning and architecture. Staff felt it met the Comprehensive Plan and the current conditions and structures in the district. The applicant felt their project would provide a mix of commercial and higher intensity residential that would create a buffer from the industrial across the street. It was the most desirable land use as the Comprehensive Plan desired a commercial node in this area. The applicant provided a fiscal analysis on what the project would bring to the community. Staff felt they met all five criteria. Ms. Wertman noted that Article 4 of the UDO states that PDs should generally align and build off a standard zoning district. Staff felt the applicant made a reasonable effort to balance this requirement with creating a unique concept. Some of the uses would follow more with the NC district but pulled in the higher architecture from C1 and C2. Staff recommended a Favorable Recommendation and recommended that a traffic study will be completed and submitted for review with the Planned Development Detailed Site Plan.

Matt Simpson asked about the minimum lot size and minimum lot width. Ms. Wertman said those were in the Neighborhood Commercial area but not in the TR as it was meant to be developed as one lot based on the product.

Jeff Humphreys asked if they were coordinating the access from the north side development to make sure those lined up. Ms. Wertman said the north side industrial would not enter on 136.

David Leazenby, co-founder of Onyx+East and Senior Vice President of Land Acquisition and Development came forward. He said the company was headquartered in Indianapolis with offices Indianapolis, Columbus, Ohio, and Tampa, Florida. They build single-family detached, townhomes and condominiums, and duplexes (for-rent and for-sale). They were attracted to communities that were investing in their downtowns where they could provide new forms of development and

walkable locations. They were also doing projects in Noblesville, Westfield, and Whitestone. Brandon Bart, Onyx+East Director of Land Acquisition and Development had a presentation for the Commission. He showed an array of different land uses kind of surrounding the intersection with residential, park, agriculture, estate residential and future industrial projects. He felt it was a unique spot for a transition between very high intensity and very low intensity land uses. The Comprehensive Plan labeled the majority of the site as Local Commercial surrounded by single-family detached. The proposal was primarily residential with a component of Neighborhood Commercial at the intersection, which they since increased after the Town Council feedback. Mr. Bart said the site constraints included a regional gas easement and transmission gas line that cut through most of the property. There were topography changes. The annexation line follows the natural creek. There was a preserve area on the southwest corner with woodlands they would maintain as open space. There were limited access easements close to the intersection along Northfield Drive and natural areas along 136.

The single-family residential area proposal was for 488 homes. They were three- to four-bedroom and ranged from 1,600 to 2,100 sq. ft. They were slab on grade homes with no basements. There were public streets throughout the project and then private alleys. Most of the units were alley-fed garages. The design of the homes were attractive with high quality materials including HardiPlank, siding, and masonry. Having the rear-load garage on most of the product gave a very walkable, pedestrian friendly front-porch layout. There were minimal side yard setbacks between the units but they met state code. Outdoor patios gave private outdoor space.

Mr. Bart said there was ample open space with natural areas. The existing vegetation west of the proposed homes would be maintained. There were detention ponds and large open spaces for park space. There would be a community pool with a clubhouse and bathrooms. The public streets with public sidewalks creates a walkable environment for residents as well as the community.

There was a lot of parking because they created right-of-way for protected on-street parking. There were 145 on-street spaces and 376 garage spaces. The units along the perimeter with the front load garage had full length driveways. The interior units that are alley fed did not have full length driveways but guest parking was in front of the unit on the on-street parking. Therefore they had about 3.42 parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Bart said the typical tenants had a family income of about \$107,000 a year. The average rents for the units was about \$2,200 a month with a range from \$2,000 to \$2,500 based on bedrooms and size. They submitted an economic analysis study as part of their application showing an overall annual tax benefit of about \$1.2 million a year.

They were aware of the residential community to the south and tried to design the site with buffers along that Southern perimeter. There were about 10 houses immediately adjacent to that neighborhood to the south of us but they have mitigated that with substantial setbacks and increased landscaping along that perimeter in addition to a 5' landscape with tree plantings above that on that South perimeter. As a result of feedback from the Town Council, they increased the Neighborhood Commercial size by about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre in width which allowed more flexibility with the layout. The Neighborhood Commercial area was designed to attract a more walkable commercial neighborhood tenant. It would potentially be something like a family office, restaurants or cafe. They were anticipating 2 or 3 different neighborhood commercial buildings. There was ample space for parking and development for future commercial uses.

Mr. Bart told the Commission that the Estate lots were no longer part of the PD or annexation but was still part of the plan for the entire development. Those custom homes would go through Hendricks County planning due to utility availability and cost.

Richard Miller asked if the public roads would be maintained by the Town. Mr. Bart said that was correct and the private alleys would be privately maintained. Shawn Pabst asked if the snowplowing would be done by the HOA and Mr. Bart said the owners of the project could decide that but their intention was to utilize the public roadways and Brownsburg services. Mr. Pabst asked if the property maintenance for the lawn and such would be handled through the company and learned that was correct. Mr. Humphreys asked if there was an HOA. Mr. Bart said it wasn't an HOA as they did not sell it, they would maintain ownership and be responsible for maintenance.

Matt Simpson asked what would happen in the future if they decided to sell, if they would sell each lot or as a whole. Mr. Leazenby said it was their intent to maintain and own it for the long term. If it were ever sold, it would come with the approved standards in place.

Brett Scowden asked if the applicant had done this type of project anywhere else. Mr. Bart said the product has been built on a scattered basis throughout downtown Indianapolis. The project quantity and size has not been done. They were starting construction on an approved project in Noblesville this summer.

Mr. Scowden asked how many children they were projecting and Mr. Leazenby said they would anticipate half a school-aged child per unit/house. Mr. Scowden said that their 94 projection differed from the school's 188 number.

Mr. Scowden asked Mr. Simpson if this proposal was responsible development and growth as the Town Council was looking to balance residential versus commercial. Mr. Simpson said it did have 2% instead of single-family. It was an area considered more commercial instead of residential. It was right at the edge of the Town so it was not traditional infill. He felt it was on the line.

Mr. Scowden asked the applicant how the TR zoning applied when it was typically applied to existing Old Town residential neighborhood developments. Mr. Bart said he felt it fit with the concept site plan, product architecture and livability of the units and how it promoted walkability seen in a traditional neighborhood.

Cindy Hohman, 15 Tyler Ct., felt TR should only be used for existing lots and not any new ones. They also traditionally had garages between the homes. The houses were too close together and it was a fire hazard according the Fire Department. This would worsen water pressure issues. The traffic study had not been done yet. There was no playground for children. The front yard setback was too small and the driveway was too short with the front loaded garages.

David Weyant, PO Box 513, felt the PD was not unique and the project could be separated into one commercial entity and the other residential. Water pressure was an issue. The small side yard setback would result in fires. The 6' driveway for the rear loaded units was not long enough and there was not enough parking. There was not a trailhead and trail access. He asked what percentage of the development they would maintain.

Tianna Upton, 1586 Red Sunset Dr., was concerned Onyx had never developed a large rental community. There was no on-site leasing or management office and all rentals would be done online through a property management company Onyx had never worked with and who had a poor Better Business Bureau rating. She felt poor management and oversight would negatively impact surrounding areas. There were too many questions and concerns that would devalue adjacent homes which went against Criterion 4.

Mark Upton, 1586 Red Sunset Dr., felt water pressure needed to be addressed. He was also concerned with the 20' setback on the front driveways and the lack of a playground.

The applicant appeared to address concerns. He had been to TECH and water pressure had not

been an issue. Mr. Bart went over parking in the community. The smaller driveway aprons in the alleys were not meant to be driveways. Mr. Leazenby said this type of development was a response to the current trend of large companies buying single-family homes and renting them out and those tenants are not maintaining the property very well. This development is purpose built for rent, but it was professionally managed. He said he could not speak to the management company concerns. The residents of West Branch would be primarily young couples getting their first home. Buying a home is very difficult in today's economy. It was no different than starter homes 10 and 20 years ago, but was designed with more management and designed with plenty of amenities. Mr. Bart added their engineers had reviewed a copy of the flow test and found there was no issue with the flow test. The 8' front yard setback concern did not reflect that the right-of-way of the public streets and public sidewalks was much wider than the pavement of the road. The setback of the home was from the end of the right-of-way past the sidewalk. It's just 8' in the setbacks for the front yard because of the front porch extending beyond the facade of the building.

Mr. Simpson asked vetting of the management company. Mr. Leazenby said they took a lot of time trying to find a group that had the experience and knowledge to do this on a large scale. Pretium was the largest owner/operator of single-family rental housing in the country and Progress is a subsidiary of Pretium.

Mr. Simpson said he liked the way this was set up and felt it was unique. However he did not know if he liked the location as it was meant to be a commercial area. He felt they should at least have commercial all along the 136 area. He would also like similar lot sizes on the south side abutting the neighborhood. He said TR zoning was supposed to have a 20' front yard setback and felt they should have that. He felt TR was not meant for a new addition.

Mr. Pabst agreed with Mr. Simpson and wanted more commercial. He felt this might be a good compromise as it was not all residential. He felt the inclusion of the estate lots was what made it unique and wished those were still included and were on utilities versus well and septic.

Mr. Scowden asked why this was not brought in as two separate projects, one for commercial and one residential. Mr. Bart said they considered that but felt this was the best route for rezoning. At the time, the estate lots were included as a third land use component. There were no zoning classifications that identically matched the proposed product and they felt PD zoning encouraged mixed land use components. Both the residential and commercial had nuances they wanted to put together in a PD and make it a cohesive project.

Mr. Scowden asked staff if there was any other residential that had a zero lot width or one that was N/A. Ms. Wertman said this was being done as one large lot so it did not plat the same as other residential developments.

Mr. Scowden asked about the traffic study and how it applied to the Town since 136 was under the state. Ms. Wertman said they would have to get approval from the state.

Mr. Scowden asked if the Fire Department had a response about the distance between buildings. Mr. Bart said the FD was not comfortable with 10' but it was state code for building separation. He noted past PD's had been approved in Brownsburg with minimal set side yard setbacks. Mr. Scowden asked staff is there was anything with 5'. Ms. Wertman said Greystone was 6 or 6 ½' and Fairview West was close as well. Harris Point was 5' as well. Mr. Pabst said the building materials helped offset that concern with the masonry.

Mr. Leazenby said they researched with commercial developers to see how much commercial space was needed in the market. They also wanted it to complement the residential. It was a balance between the commercial and residential; however if the Commission desired more commercial,

they could ask for a continuance and revisit that study and see if they could add more.

Mr. Pabst said there was the question about additional commercial and splitting the estate lots out took out the uniqueness and felt those needed to be added back in. He liked the product and the commercial node. He did not think the residents would want full commercial there.

Mr. Miller agreed that he liked the product but was concerned with the current conditions and character of the area. It was a very difficult site to balance industrial on one side and larger residential on the south side. He understood the concerns with the lot sizes and setbacks. He was concerned that additional commercial would result in large parking lights in residents' backyards. It was a tough site to meet a lot of different criteria.

Mr. Humphreys asked staff about the water flow. Ms. Wertman referenced the Water Department's TECH response that a water main extension would more than likely be required along SR 136 to the west of Northfield Dr. They would need to see a detailed water distribution plan.

Mr. Fletcher liked the product and mix of uses and said it was better than a warehouse.

Mr. Scowden suggested the applicant request a continuance for both cases as he felt they did not currently meet the criteria for approval and Mr. Leazenby agreed to the continuance.

**Motion:** Brett Scowden made a motion to **CONTINUE** PCMA-22-2 and PCCZ-22-1, seconded by Richard Miller, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING FOR PCMA-22-1 RECESSED AND CONTINUED TO JUNE 27, 2022 AT 6 P. M.**

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING FOR PCCZ-22-1 RECESSED AND CONTINUED TO JUNE 27, 2022 AT 6 P. M.**

3. PCMA-22-2 Auburn Ridge Rezone To R3

A request for a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property from the General Agriculture (AG) district to the High Density Single-family Residential (R3) district to allow for future residential development, on approximately 99.734 acres, located West of and adjacent to CR. 575 East, North of CR. 450 North, East of CR 500 East and South of the Enclave at Summer Ridge.

Parcels: 32-07-16-100-003.000-016; 32-07-16-200-011.000-016; 32-07-09-400-012.000-016; 32-07-09-400-023.000-016; 32-07-09-400-022.000-016; 32-07-09-300-012.000-016; 32-07-16-100-007.000-016; 32-07-16-100-002.000-016; 32-07-16-200-002.000-016

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING**

Represented By: Richard Henderson, Premier Land Company II, LLC

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:30 P.M.**

Jenna Wertman said Auburn Ridge was a rezone request for R3 zoning. It was currently zoned agriculture. The 100 acre site was located west of the intersection of CR 575 East and CR 500 North, south of Summer Ridge. They wished to develop a 170 lot detached residential subdivision which would be approximately 1.7 dwelling units per acre. This project had been modified from a previous submission; the acreage and total number of homes was reduced, lot sizes were changed to match some of the surrounding subdivisions and amenities have been included. TECH members provided general comments regarding utility and road infrastructure, and drainage. More comments would come forth during platting and final construction plans. This project was introduced to Town Council in April and Councilmen commented on potential future impacts to traffic and intersections and they appreciated the changes made to the amenities, site layout and additional buffering.

Ms. Wertman showed a location map and conceptual site plan highlighting the areas set aside for open space and amenities, where the lot lines match better along Summer Ridge and the reduction in the number of lots. Staff felt the proposal met the criteria for the rezone.

Applicant representative Jonathan Isaacs, M/I Homes, reviewed the surrounding area and pointed out where they would extend Tilden Rd/550 which was called for in the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan. He said they have talked with the County Highway Engineer regarding that as well as an intersection to the east. He reviewed the traffic paths and to the community and the two connection points in Summer Ridge may be used by those residents to get to Tilden. Some traffic from the traffic report was attributable to the schools. Mr. Isaacs said Councilmen Simpson and Lacey had concerns about the intersection of CR 575 and 500. They were asked to take a closer look at and work toward a solution. They updated the traffic study and the recommendations did not see any need for turn lanes at Tilden and 550 at the main entrance area but the traffic engineer and Highway Engineer stated the "T" intersection warranted improvements even without the development and asked for their participation in unnamed future improvements. Mr. Isaacs said they would work on how to contribute funds for those road improvements.

Mr. Isaacs said the site design had been through several renditions. It used to be much larger, there were site constraints including creeks and wooded areas to preserve, and there was a pipeline. He said there was a remonstrance letter about floodplain protection but said the site did not have a floodplain located on it. He showed the location of the pond locations and outlet. The amenities include Pickleball, playground, picnic shelter, and Dog Park. He showed the street layout and said one of the significant changes from a previous version were the streets by Tilden which were now cul-de-sacs rather than a looped road. There were walking trails throughout the neighborhood. The road would be a Type 2 Collector Street which was 36' of pavement with 2' shoulders. There was a 14' walking trail on one side and 5' on the other. At the primary plat stage they would ask for a deviation to make that a 12' trail instead of a 14' trail.

He spoke to how they would match the adjoining existing developments. Summer Ridge had 80' lot widths which was equivalent to R3 and they had relatively all ranch houses in the lower section. M/I Homes would match those lot sizes and everything north of the East/West roadway would have 80' lots that match lot line for lot line along Summer Ridge in both directions. They would use all ranch housing. There were three homes adjoining in Tilden Terrace and there would be a 50' buffer along the homes. There would be a 20' buffer adjacent to the vacant farm field to the south. Those home would be the Prestige series. Mr. Isaacs said the price points of the ranches would start in the low \$400,000 and the Prestige would run into the low \$500,000. He said they had a neighborhood meeting in February and there was a lot of concern about the amenities in Summer Ridge including their basketball court. He said M/I does not build basketball courts any longer but would have pickleball. He was happy to answer any questions.

Richard Miller received confirmation there was no pool planned for the development.

Brett Scowden asked how many children they were projecting and Mr. Isaacs said the typical average was indeed 0.5 school aged children per dwelling unit. Matt Simpson said he believed that 25% of Brownsburg's population was school aged children.

Mr. Scowden saw the Wastewater Department noted a need for sanitary infrastructure improvements. Richard Henderson, Premier Land Company, said there were two different lift stations that service this parcel, on the north and south ends of Summer Ridge. There was some question on the north side of Summer Ridge if there were improvements necessary for the second lift station. As they move forward to the detailed design stage they would work with the utility department regarding what potential needs or improvements were necessary. He did note the lift

stations were originally sized to accommodate this 100 acre parcel.

Mr. Scowden noted the Growth Area Plan highlights the area as infill. Ms. Wertman said it did not necessarily limit infill to a vacant pocket that was mostly developed around it. It did say to stay within the Town boundaries first and prioritize that in as many areas as you can.

Mr. Scowden asked Councilman Simpson if this was responsible development and growth. Mr. Simpson said it was R3 and not PD. He found it hard to call it infill when the entrance of the addition was onto a County road. There was a lot of infrastructure that needed to be done and he would like to see that addressed before building permits. Mr. Scowden asked if the applicant could address that. Mr. Isaacs said CHP was there for sanitary at the stub street with the lift station close. Water was also available at both stub streets and would be Citizens Water. From discussions with them there was capacity and pressure. As far as being an infill site, the site was within the Town boundaries and has utility services at the boundaries and the ability to extend and service the parcel. As far as road infrastructure, the Thoroughfare Plan called for a Collector Street being extended east and west. This project would provide those infrastructure improvements by constructing a 3-lane roadway. This would extend and provide additional infrastructure.

Mr. Simpson asked about the entrance and the homeowner's driveway. Mr. Isaacs said they had one meeting with them and there was not a resolution at this time. They wanted to get through zoning first. They had a number of different things they could do for the entrance.

Mr. Scowden asked about the buffer for Tilden Terrace and that the applicant disagreed that these were incompatible districts. It was zoned Hendricks County AG which staff felt most closely met Brownsburg's RE or R1 zoning district and the applicant's TECH response stated they felt the County AG designation more closely related to the Brownsburg AG zoning which was a compatible district. Ms. Wertman said she did not work on this project and it was probably a discussion the Plan Commission needed to have whether it related more to a RE or something else and what buffering was most appropriate. Mr. Scowden had concerns and felt the existing lots were more RE vs AG. Mr. Henderson they said had multiple meetings with the Tilden Terrace neighbors and hoped he had their support now with the 50' buffer and supplementing the tree line with additional plantings. He said they were considered Agricultural Residential in the County and felt residential and residential should be compatible uses with one another. Shawn Pabst felt they should exercise caution when determining the County's zoning. He felt they had done a good job working with the neighbors to accommodate their concerns.

Mr. Scowden said there were written comments received that were in the packet. Ms. Wertman reviewed the communications that came in after the packets had gone out. There was a letter from the Hendricks County Engineer who was in agreement with parts of it and where they may need some improvements. They noted there needed to be some solution with the driveway on the corner. They would like a proportionate share of the future costs to come from the developers due to needed improvements. Richard Powlen objects to the development and had questions and some concerns about the drainage and some previous flooding that has happened in the area. He mentioned stormwater requirements and general observation of traffic near the intersection of Green and Main. Matt Schubert opposes the zoning. They just recently purchased a home on Falcon Way and did not know about this. They also had concerns about dust during construction. Staff got an email from Deana Moore said they did not agree with the developer's proposal for their driveway the first time and had not had additional discussions.

***At this time the Plan Commission took a 10 minute recess.***

Upon reconvening, Mr. Sowden reviewed the rules of procedure for public comments.

Billie Goosnell, 765 Hummingbird Dr., spoke for a group from Summer Ridge and was allotted 5 minutes to speak. He said the request had not changed from the previous proposal last September where it was given a unanimous unfavorable recommendation. He felt the project did not meet the neighborhood compatibility guidelines set forth by the Brownsburg UDO. They were worried the amenities were not adequate and residents would come use the Summer Ridge amenities. He felt the infrastructure was inadequate to support any R3 development and said that was reflected in the TECH report. He felt the intersection concerns should be addressed before zoning was granted. He felt they did not meet the criteria for a favorable recommendation. Property values would be affected in an adverse manner, it was not compatible with current conditions and character, the development was not context sensitive, and was not the most appropriate use for the land. The Future Land Use Map designated this land Parks and Open Space. He felt it should be R2 or R1 development.

Deana Moore, 5765 E CR 500 N, said one of Mr. Henderson's group approached them during the break and she felt that was an appropriate time to do that as they have had a year to reach out to them. She did not oppose them extending 500/Tilden but did not want it to affect her property. She felt a roundabout would be better or roadway improvements made on their own property. She did not want changes to her driveway alignment.

Emily Symmonds, 5964 Autumn Tr., spoke on behalf of her parents at 1760 Falcon Way. She said the plans submitted by the developer do not meet the requirements for a major collector cross-section. It should be potentially a three lane road but at a minimum right-of-way must be 80'. She felt that should be a condition for the rezone and the builder should pay for it. That was not reflected in the traffic study. She said it would result in more traffic going through Summer Ridge to get to CR 500 along with using CR 600 and CR 575 which already need improvement for the existing traffic. She noted the TECH report said sanitary infrastructure improvement was needed and said the builder should pay. Both the road improvements and sewer upgrade needed to be conditions of the conditions of the rezone and not decided at the DPR.

Joe Szentivanyi, 4965 E CR 575 E, was concerned about safety and the road. It was already unsafe and not able to handle additional traffic. A 3-way stop would not work.

John Byers, 673 Hummingbird Dr., said 600 and Tilden was a nightmare early in the morning with school buses and teenage drivers. He did not want construction traffic to go down Hummingbird or Kingfisher. He felt there needed to be a moratorium on building as they were growing too fast and Brownsburg infrastructure could not keep up. He felt it would burden the schools.

Phoebe Byers, 673 Hummingbird Dr., wanted to know when buffering would be addressed. She had not seen the traffic studies. She felt people would come through the neighborhoods when traffic backed up with the additional volume. She disagreed with the estimated 0.5 child per house.

David Weyant, PO Box 513, felt the applicant's time limits were being exceeded. He felt the limits on the public were limiting participation. The concern over the resident's driveway changes should have been addressed before tonight. He noted that Ben Lacey specifically said there was not any money to pay for infrastructure and developers would be responsible. Chris Worley suggested at the last Town Council meeting that there might be need for a moratorium on building.

Gary Avery, 579 Kingfisher Dr., felt this should not be rezoned at this time. He wanted to keep the area agriculture until the right project came along.

Eric Cottongim, 9 Raccoon Ct., spoke in favor and said his father's farm was one of the parcels in the development. Unlike the previous developer, MI has been willing to listen to the others and address concerns. His father wanted to sell the farm and make arrangements for his children. Mr.

Cottingim felt this was a good development and there was a shortage of homes everywhere.

Ken McGee, 309 E. College Ave., said this was the third or fourth developer and the first time he had spoken in favor. The Town needed infrastructure and this was a needed step. He felt many of the comments would be addressed at the development plan stage. He asked for support.

Jonathan Isaacs appeared to address the concerns. He felt they were a compatible use with Summer Ridge as they had the same overall density. Sewer infrastructure would be adequate as the sewer lift station was built and designed to serve this area. He said there were homes that were backing up to one another but there was also plenty of open space throughout the development. He felt they had a similar layout with Summer Ridge with designing open space around the development; 30% of their project is open space, roughly 30 acres. He said they were happy to sit down with Deana More and discuss the driveway location. They did talk with the County Highway Engineer who recommended the driveway be relocated as it was in a dangerous place in that intersection. He said the intersection improvements would result in a three-way intersection which was much safer than a curve in the road. This was supported by the traffic engineer and the County Engineer. Mr. Henderson said there was a buffer yard provided on the south side of Summer Ridge, was natural tree ridge. There was a 20' common area to preserve existing trees and maintain the same visual settings that are there today.

Mr. Pabst said he had some concerns with the intersection but it was a County road. Any wastewater improvements would be paid for by the developer. He said the lift stations were designed for capacity to be increased over time and were placed strategically at the deepest point for a reason. He said landowners had the right to sell. He felt the process was working and the developer had made efforts to satisfy a majority of the group. The road would be a main road eventually. He felt the floodplain would restrict the road from being much wider heading to the east end of town. He said amenities change over years and pools and such were expensive to maintain and had liability. He was fine with the amenities offered.

Mr. Simpson had concerns with the infrastructure issues, specifically dumping traffic onto a County road and with the entrance. He did not know if they answered the road width 80' requirement. Mr. Henderson said they were proposing a 70' right-of-way and within that 70' right-of-way there were 40' back-to-back, three 12' lanes and curbs on the other side. One side of the street would have a 12' pathway and the other side would have a 5' walk.

Mr. Miller said traffic was the primary concern but with the approval of the Hendricks County Engineer he believed they would meet the level of safety required. The other intersections downstream need improvements already. He wanted to make sure the intersection was safe.

Mr. Pabst and the Commission discussed the road and the possibility of right-of-way needed for a roundabout. Staff said that the width would be determined at the platting stage and anything other than 80' would require a waiver. Mr. Isaacs said the County Engineer asked for a roundabout and asked for adequate right-of-way be dedicated on their site to assist that in the future.

The applicant, Commission and Staff discussed the road width and determined it was a Major Collector road and any deviation from 80' would require a waiver. The Commission would review that request as part of the primary plat. They also needed to determine if the road was a Collector 1 or a Collector 2 as the Thoroughfare Plan does not separate them. The Commission could include a recommendation for an 80' right-of-way width if they wished.

Mr. Miller said the recommendations should include that the layout plan/concept be similar to what was presented as well as the condition for the right-of-way dedication for the roundabout.

Mr. Simpson said he would have liked to have gotten the letter from the County Engineer before

the meeting. Ms. Wertman Staff only got it today as well.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 9:07 P.M.**

**Motion:** Shawn Pabst made a motion to send a **FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION** of PCMA-22-2, subject to and conditioned upon Staff recommendations as well as dedication of the right-of-way for a potential roundabout, the 80' right away, a similar layout as presented, and buffer yards may not be decreased and all of the applicant commitments, seconded by Richard Miller, motion **FAILED** 3 In Favor (Fletcher/Miller/Pabst)/3 Opposed (Humphreys/Scowden/Simpson)/0 Abstained.

The Plan Commission therefore sent no recommendation to Town Council for PCMA-22-2.

**I. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. PCCZ-22-2 Garner Conditional Rezone To PD

A request for a Conditional Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property from the Hendricks County Residential (HC RB) district to the Planned Development (PD) district to allow for future residential development, on approximately 38 acres, located at 7210 N County Road 800 E.

Parcels: 32-02-35-300-002.000-001

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING**

Represented By: Robyn Crawford, PulteGroup

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 9:10 P.M.**

Jenna Wertman said this was a Conditional Rezone to rezone property from Hendricks County Agriculture to a single-family residential Planned Development. The site was located at the NW corner of 700 N/800 E. It would be a 65-lot detached residential subdivision on approximately 38 acres which was about 1.7 units per acre. It would have ranch and two story homes. There were two access points proposed, one on CR 700 and one at the intersection of 725 & 800. A conceptual design was in the packet and the applicant has provided an updated one for this evening. PD zoning is sought to allow some flexibility due to site characteristics including a wooded area and the site being bisected by an existing legal drain. TECH members generally commented on utility and road infrastructure, Fire Department access, and similar. This was introduced in May to the Town Council, the Councilmen commented on site characteristics, location, school bus stops, roadway design, expected homeowner market and they noted a desire to preserve more of the wooded area. The applicant then revised the plan which the Commissioners would see later. She showed an aerial of the site which was rectangular with the drain cutting right through it. She showed the concept plan that was in the packet and said the applicant would talk the changes but the area down to the south and the access point lines up with the street across from it. The drainage areas were on either side of the legal drain. There was not a connection with a road but there was a walking trail to keep the two sections of the neighborhood connected. The other entrance would be off of the intersection of the county roads. There were preserved wooded areas.

Ms. Wertman noted Jodi Dickey's Staff report went over the Findings and criteria. The Future Land Use map noted this area as residential. It met current conditions as it was surrounded by larger lot single-family residential. South of the site was a PD with 7,000 sq. ft. lots. It was the most desirable use as residential was one of the few realistic uses for the property and would also conserve property values. It was responsible development and growth as it was within the secondary growth area on the Growth Areas Plan in the Comp Plan. The utilities are there or will be. Road and intersection improvements needed would be installed or a fiscal contribution made in conjunction with the development, to be approved by Town Council.

Shawn Pabst was concerned the trail along CR 800 did not go across the seller's property and said it needed to connect.

Applicant Representative David Compton, Vice President of Land Acquisition for Pulte Homes of Indiana, appeared and said Pulte had been involved in Summer Ridge since about 2002, they have since built in Hession Fields, Greystone, Belle Arbor and most recently in Promenade. The Garner property was before the Commission with another builder. It was approximately 38 acres and was a unique site. Pulte considered it an infill site as it was surrounded on all four sides by development. The site was almost four times deep as wide that that created a functional problem and made it harder to lay out streets. Also, the Mary Gibbs Drain cuts diagonally across the middle of the property with an arm of the drain on the west side of the property. There was a little over 5 acres of woodlands on the north side of the property that they were trying to save as much of that as possible. He showed the surrounding communities. He felt they improved on the previous site plan. He tried to address the previous concerns including the entrance and intersection. The old plan had 61 lots and this plan has 62. The average lot size is 10,500 square feet and the R3 standard was 9,000 square feet. The old plan had one product whereas this has two products. They have two-stories on the north side on 44 lots. Their market studies show that that ranch style homes are underserved in Brownsburg and those were on the south side on 18 lots. Pulte has had great success at Greystone for ranch style homes. The areas are connected via a walking trail that will go across the creek for connectivity within the neighborhoods. He showed the layouts and what had changed, increasing open space, changing the street layouts and increasing tree preservation. He reviewed the location and impact of the Mary Gibbs legal drain. His team has been working on drainage calculations along with the County to improve the drainage. They would have amenities including park benches, playground and have considered a small dog park.

The ranches on the south side would be 66' wide and every lot able to have a three car garage. The homes would be 2,062 sq. ft. or if they had an optional lofts they would be approximately 400-600 sq. ft. bigger. The average sales price would be \$350,000 - \$450,000. The 2-story homes ranged from 2,300 to 3,300 sq. ft. These homes had extra garage space such as a tandem garage. This type of home was used in Greystone. The price range was \$475,000 and \$550,000.

Mr. Compton addressed CR 800 and said there was legitimate concern that that road would have construction traffic. They would work with Town Council to agree to rebuild that road to their intersection if needed. He felt the proposal provided a better quality than what was presented before; there was more open space, more trees, with higher property values and was a good infill development. He was happy to address any questions.

Jeff Humphreys asked about the intersection at 725 and 800. Steve Fairmont with A&F Engineering said it would be a 4-way stop and there was a private drive that would have to tie into it also. He described the results of the traffic study which determines how efficient the intersection would be and that the intersection will work as a level of service A in the future with the development. Shawn Pabst received clarification that the peak AM and PM hours did not mean all day.

Brett Scowden asked how many children they were anticipating and learned it was 62.

Mr. Scowden asked Councilman Simpson if this was responsible growth and development. Mr. Simpson said it was a PD and he was not a fan but felt it was good infill development. He felt the new design was better than what he saw at the Town Council meeting as it preserved more land and trees and allowed for bus maneuverability. He wondered why they would not connect the bottom to the top because that caused an issue with the kids having to walk to the bus stop. Otherwise he felt it was a good design.

Mr. Scowden wondered why they did not do straight zoning as there were two distinct entrances and two distinct housing styles. He asked what made this unique other than the legal drain separating these two areas. Mr. Compton said you could not separate them and should look at the project as a whole. The site was four times as deep as wide. They wanted to preserve the trees. Buyers wanted more open space and smaller lots and less yardwork. The site has many unique characteristics that did not lend itself to straight zoning.

Mr. Scowden asked what utilities were already there and learned it was water and that sewer was in the process of being bid. Mr. Pabst said the design was completed and bidding will be shortly ahead of the road project which lets in October.

Mr. Scowden referenced the Brownsburg Housing Study and asked how many single-family homes it proposed back in 2016. Staff said they had already approved 1,956 of the 2,100 cited.

Mr. Scowden asked how the proposal would be beneficial to the entire town. Mr. Compton said the walking trail connection, sidewalks on both sides of the street, perimeter paths and connections to 800 and 700 (they would get with the seller to get a connection down on 800).

Mr. Scowden asked about the architectural standards for front façades and corner definitions. Mr. Compton said there were additional corner lot requirements. Pulte's architecture has evolved and they use many different architectural styles which provides for an interesting neighborhood.

Mr. Scowden asked about the elevations with front loaded garages and window requirements. Mr. Compton said that would break up the long plane.

Mr. Scowden pointed out a typo in the landscaping and trees for corner lots.

Mr. Scowden asked why their sign standards should be different than anybody else's. Mr. Compton said their set of standards reflected common practice in the industry, especially Central Indiana.

Mr. Pabst said the walk on the southern portion to the bus stop would be 100' and currently his own children were required to 230' to the bus stop so he had no issue with that.

Richard Miller was concentrating on the characteristics of the area and the density of the development compared to the density of the adjacent homeowners. He said the school bus only stops in two locations in his neighborhood and the kids have to walk a distance to those as well.

Mr. Scowden noted Mr. Miller was an engineer and asked if he had any concerns with the intersection by the north entrance. Mr. Miller said he was not a traffic engineer by trade but by going off the traffic counts, he did not see a huge issue but said he had not driven down there.

Cindy Hohman, 15 Tyler Ct., felt these were R4 lot standards which did not exist. There were larger adjacent lots that would have 4-5 homes in their backyards. She asked if they were only doing 50% masonry on the front. She felt this did not meet Criteria 2 due to the very large lots adjacent to these smaller lots and Criteria 5 as it was not responsible development or growth.

David Weyant, PO Box 513, said information was provided that was not in the packet. He said the PD should have been reviewed as aggressively as Westbridge and felt they needed consistency. He asked how the drainage concerns would be mitigated as Beacon Point had flooding problems. He said the language regarding the developer's contribution to the road should be clearer. He objected to the public speaking format as it limited the public's ability to speak.

Mike Starkey, 9225 E CR 700 N, was concerned about the second entrance and the intersection as well as traffic impact to the road. He had a fence along the property and wanted to make sure that would stay. He wanted more buffering properties along the lots. He was concerned about drainage and said they did not have Drainage Board approval yet. He felt the site was best suited

for a park or community center.

Jean Perrault, 8345 E CR 725 N, said there were 12 housing additions east of 267 on 700 as well as 10 businesses on 700 and the area was compressed. There should be a moratorium on housing additions as 16 new housing additions were approved last year alone; that was too much traffic.

Steve Ostermeier, 7095 N CR 800 E, was not opposed to the development or product but opposed the design intersections, most specifically the entrance off the curve 800 E and 725 N. He felt this was done to eliminate the need to construct a culvert over the legal drain. He said CR 800 E, 725 N, 850 E and 750 N were classified as local roads and were narrow and not in good condition. He felt the developers should bear the cost of repairing and repaving the roads as they deteriorated. He wanted the original design with a single entrance off 700 N, which was being reconstructed as a minor arterial and would be able to handle the additional traffic. He felt the development should be delayed until such time that the 700 N project was completed.

Mr. Scowden said traffic issues and the entrance had been discussed and asked future speakers to address other topics.

Mike Robertson, 7365 N CR 850 E, said he thought the County Engineer was sending a message to the Plan Commission to only allow the entrance off 700. Drainage was another concern and the design was just now being looked at by Joe Miller with Banning.

Josh Bex, 7345 N CR 850 E, felt the road was too busy to have a bus stop there. He did not want R3 next to R1. He said if they put sewers at the north end of development, those would have to go underneath the legal drain and did not know it that was possible because of the easement. He felt the developer was dumping traffic onto all the county roads and only talking about fixing 800.

Abby Warner, 8270 E CR 725 N, felt they should not put a neighborhood on this property and there were other things that could go there. It was awkward and dangerous.

Mr. Compton came forward to address the concerns. He said the homes to the west were well and septic and were required to have bigger lots. The Town's lots had sanitary sewer and that was why they were smaller. This plan was only one lot more than the last plan from a prior builder. There would be no homes without masonry on them. He said Pulte did not develop Beacon Point and the drainage problem was not created by Pulte. He said they worked with Dave Gaston on Belle Arbor and Greystone, they hired Banning Engineering who was providing the report in front of the County Drainage Board. He said drainage was not done as part of zoning and but they were committed to follow all the county ordinances. He said he would like to speak with Mr. Starkey and would exchange contact information. They had left a 20' landscape buffer along his driveway and had no intentions of taking out the fence, they could talk about additional landscaping along his driveway. Mr. Compton said their overall density was 1.64 units per acre, which was on the low end. The Comprehensive Plan proposed the land to be residential. He said Pulte would make a per lot contribution to the reconstruction of 700. Mr. Compton said they looked at the original plan and ended up saving more trees with a better land plan.

Mr. Fletcher asked why they did not connect the two areas versus having just the trail. Mr. Compton said they felt it would be inefficient for the neighborhood and would be a long term cost to the Town. If the Plan Commission desired they could re-evaluate the North-South connection. Ms. Wertman said that Mr. Gaston liked that this proposal did not cross the drain.

Mr. Simpson asked what the side setback was for the new section of Greystone was and learned it was 8 ft.

Mr. Simpson said he was not in favor of the Town forcing traffic out onto a County road therefore

he would be in favor of one entrance.

Mr. Pabst asked staff what information was required at the rezoning level and if that included a conceptual plan. Ms. Wertman said they were typically provided but they were not a requirement. He asked if a traffic study was required and learned it was not. It also fell below the threshold of 100 lots which required a traffic study. Mr. Pabst noted the applicant had already given a preliminary traffic study, a conceptual layout which they would revisit and said the Commission had more information than needed to make a decision.

Mr. Pabst wondered if both the County Engineer and the Drainage Engineer had concerns, which took precedence. He questioned the impact of the development to the construction on 700 and rather they beat up 700 now versus the brand new road.

Mr. Pabst said if people wanted a park, they could always donate land. He felt the Garner's had a right to sell. He felt he had enough information to make a decision. The applicant was willing to make the commitments desired which included revisiting connecting over the legal drain, they will rehabilitate CR 800 to the entrance and they would make a contribution equal to what they did at Belle Arbor to the 700 reconstruction.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 10:22 P.M.**

**Motion:** Shawn Pabst made a motion to send a **FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION** of PCCZ-22-2 to Town Council, subject to and conditioned upon Staff recommendations as amended above, seconded by Richard Miller, motion **FAILED** 2 In Favor (Pabst/Fletcher)/4 (Opposed (Humphreys/Miller/Scowden/Simpson) /0 Abstained.

Mr. Scowden asked if there was an additional motion. They discussed granting a continuance.

**Motion:** Steve Fletcher made a motion to **CONTINUE** PCCZ-22-2, subject to and conditioned upon Staff recommendations as amended above, seconded by Richard Miller, motion passed 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained.

This continuance would allow time for the applicant to go before the Drainage Board and explore the possibility of connecting over the legal drain.

**ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED, RECESSED AND CONTINUED TO JUNE 27, 2021 AT 6 P.M.**

**J. COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

1. Report from Director of Development Services

Jenna Wertman spoke for the Director. She said Lauren Gillingham provided information on the housing and building permits in Brownsburg. She said the UDO discussions had started with the Steering Committee and would be before the Plan Commission soon.

**K. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

1. None

**L. ADMINISTRATIVE FILINGS**

1. PSDP-22-10 Former Kroger Remodel DPR Amend.
2. PSDP-22-11 First Merchants Bank ATM Kiosk DPR Amend.
3. CPSP-22-9 Talon Woods Final Plat
4. CPSP-22-10 Creekside Commons Shoppes Lot 3 Final Plat

**M. CASES FILED FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 1. PSDP-22-10                      Creekside Commons Big Red Liquors DPR
- 2. PCCZ-22-3                      Seven Brew Cond. Rezone To NC
- 3. PSDP-22-12                      Talon Woods DPR
- 4. PSDP-22-13                      Ronald Reagan Logistics Park @ I74 - Phase 2 - Building 1 DPR

**N. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** Shawn Pabst made a motion to **ADJOURN**, motion carried 6 In Favor/0 Opposed/0 Abstained. 10:32 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brett Scowden, President

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jodi Dickey, AICP, Administrator