Mr. Smith: Good evening everyone. If we could call the meeting to order, this would be the Plainfield Plan Commission for May 6, 2019.

ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Mr. Smith: I would ask the Plan Commission Secretary to call the roll please, to determine a quorum.

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- here
Mr. McPhail- here
Mr. Brandgard- here
Mr. Smith- here
Mr. Kirchoff- here
Mr. Slavens- here

Mr. Bahr indicated that he was not going to be available tonight, but we do have a quorum to move forward.

Mr. Smith: Thank you

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Smith: If you would, join me in the Pledge of Allegiance please.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Smith: We have minutes from our April 1st meeting. These are somewhat abbreviated compared to the usual transcript that we have because there was a break down in the recording system. I believe members of the Commission have had opportunity to review the summary version available to us. Are there any questions?

Mr. Slavens: On page 4, there is a motion by Mr. Slavens and then a second by Mr. Slavens, so I don’t know if you need to go back and correct that at all but...

Mr. Smith: Oops

Mr. Slavens: I just wanted to highlight that.
Mr. Smith: Concerning the Pepper Construction project, does anybody remember?

Mr. Klinger: We have notes for that, we should be able to go back and correct that.

Mr. Smith: They can correct it. Thank you very much. Do I have a motion or were there any other questions?

Mr. Kirchoff: I move we approve as amended.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second. All in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Smith: Thank you

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Smith: The meeting this evening does contain some public hearings on several items. So, I would at this time ask our Town Attorney, Mr. Daniel to administer the Oath of Testimony, please.

Mr. Daniel: Anyone expecting to testify before this Commission please stand and raise your right hand.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Smith: These proceedings are recorded, assuming the machine works correctly tonight...

1. The proceedings are recorded for public record purposes; please come to the podium, located in the front of the Meeting Room, give your name and address and make your presentation.
2. Please make presentations as concise as possible; try to limit your comments to no more than five (5) minutes and avoid repetition of points made by previous speakers. Each speaker will be allowed to speak only once.
3. If possible, please designate a spokesperson for groups supporting or opposing same positions.
4. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the speakers’ sheet provided by the Plan Commission Secretary to ensure the official record reflects your appropriate name and address.

With that preliminary, we'll move into the agenda. First up would be CP-19-048. Scott, would you care to come forward and summarize this for us please?
Mr. Singleton: Yes, good evening. The CP-19-048 I believe is what you would call a resolution to amend the Comprehensive Plan, the Town’s Comprehensive Plan with the Thoroughfare Plan portion that we’ve had underway for the past year. Last meeting of course, we had the public hearing. We had comments come in for over a two week period plus the meeting. Chris Hamm with HWC is here to summarize those comments, we’re told which have been provided to you all directly. And then to kind of review some final tweaks and changes that have gone into the Plan and then we would ask that if you’re prepared to vote, to go ahead and vote on that Resolution, approving that portion of the Plan to be amended into the Comprehensive Plan. With that, I’ll hand it over to Chris Hamm with HWC.

Mr. Smith: Thank you. While Chris comes forward, I’ll make a note for the record that since the public hearing was held on April 1st, the Commission did receive two emails... in the form of letters... well, they’re letters in the form of emails, one from Nicholas Welty and another from Sally Longoria with some additional comments. We’ve had a chance to read and review those already.

Mr. Hamm: Good evening Commission members. For the record my name is Chris Hamm, Senior Planner with HWC Engineering. I’m going to try and keep my comments brief; I know I gave you a pretty thorough outline of the Plan at your last meeting but there are just a handful of things that I’d like to share with you this evening. Some comments that we’ve received from the public and some amendments and adjustments that we’ve made to the Plan, which I think are reflected in the draft that you’ve had to review for a couple of weeks. But I just want to go over those briefly and then answer any questions that you might have this evening. With me tonight is Dean Munn from Convergence Planning, the technical side of the planning. So, if things get too far in the weeds, I’m going to call in some relief pitching as part of that conversation. But hopefully I can manage it moving forward. As Scott had mentioned, we received public comment prior to your last Plan Commission meeting and obviously there was a lot of public comment at the last Plan Commission meeting itself. I just wanted to highlight some of the key topic areas that were brought up during the early engagement as well as the meeting last time. Really, they kind of summarize into about six categories. The first was around implementation timeline. I hope I clarified in the meeting last time, but I certainly want to state that this is a purposefully long-term plan. The roads and projects that are identified in this Plan will take decades to implement over time and certainly the growth patterns and nature of activities inside the community will have an awful lot to do with how those get prioritized over time, and those priorities might change from what's inside the Plan today. That isn’t to say that there aren’t projects that are ongoing that have been discussed inside of the Plan because certainly there are, and projects that need to be done in a shorter period of time because there are those as well. Particularly as you get into some of those areas south by I-70 and southwest of Town, that’s going to be dictated by the continued growth and development of the community itself as those projects are needed. So, I think it’s important to understand the document is a long-term plan on purpose for that perspective. There was a lot of discussion about the interchange at the last meeting. Yes, the plan does address the interchange;
recommends the interchange and its related connector between US 40 and I-70 as part of this project. This was not initiated, this concept was not initiated by this Plan, this has been discussed within the Town for years, it’s inside of your Comprehensive Plan as part of that conversation. So, we’ve taken it a step forward to really look at it and assess the impacts of that interchange from an economic development perspective, from a traffic perspective, from an economic analysis perspective and certainly we believe it is a good thing for the Town moving forward in the long run and will provide some tremendous benefit. That doesn’t mean it doesn’t have its issues to move forward with as well, but we think those can be mitigated and addressed appropriately. So, it’s obviously a recommendation of our plan to move forward. The land use conversations are the same issues. There was a lot of conversation about not wanting the interchange, probably because they don’t want industrial around that interchange. What I’ll tell you is, we used your Comprehensive Plan land use map as the basis for projecting development growth patterns inside the community. We didn’t create or initiate those discussions. Those are standing policy for the Town; you might have tweaked it here and there a little bit based on taking out some flood plain ground and other things but for the most part it’s reflective of your Comprehensive Plan. Obviously if the Comprehensive Plan and land use map were to change over time, then that would need to be reflected inside of an update of your Transportation Plan. We feel like the Transportation Plan is a fair reflection of long-term land use planning for the community moving forward. Environmental impacts have been a discussion, those are factored in too. When you go into the economic impact chapter, Dean’s analysis factors in certain environmental impacts into the analysis and a cost benefit ratio analysis as part of the discussion. That isn’t everything, and obviously as projects move forward there will need to be environmental assessments done of impacts to wetlands in that area or other pieces and parts of that. So, I don’t want to indicate that the Plan absolves those issues moving forward but as each project moves forward there will need to be an individual analysis done as part of those. Jurisdictional considerations were part of the conversations that we’d heard from folks. Obviously, your Comprehensive Plan appropriately looks outside the existing Town boundaries for future growth and plans land uses for those areas. We’ve tried to adjust the geographic area of the Thoroughfare Plan to be consistent with that area that has existing land use planning in place and has been predicted and projected as part of the community’s long-term growth plan. And then the last conversations were the impacts of the projects themselves. Specifically, whether they would bring additional regional traffic into the Town. I would tell you that there’s an awful lot of regional traffic projected into the future in this area. Absent of having other ways and methodologies to be able to get through Town, such as the new interchange, or the connector between US 40 and I-70, they will find other routes to move forward with. Specifically, SR 267 and Ronald Reagan, to get from US 40 to I-70. It’s important to understand the interchange and the proposed connector do not resolve all of those issues moving forward, which is why there are a host of recommended projects inside of the Plan, including looking at the existing SR 267 interchange and thinking about what that might look like in the future in collaboration with a future interchange at I-70. So, it’s not intended to be one or the other, it’s a broad mix of processes to really find the best solution for the Town
moving forward and hopefully the Plan reflects that. The draft that you have in front of you has a handful of... I won’t go through all of the details of it, but you’ll notice the executive summary has been changed significantly. We tried to pare that down and make it a more concise reflection of the actual findings of the plan so hopefully you’ll see that. We’ve added a table on page 66 which more clearly delineates the projects that were inside of preferred scenario 1 and preferred scenario 2. I know there was some confusion with some folks that we had spoken with the public about what was in and out of that. So, hopefully that clarifies that. We’ve expanded the sections with regards to key considerations to talk about some of these issues: land use, the interchange and things in more detail in the plan, providing some justification and hopefully a better understanding of those issues moving forward. We’ve adjusted the cross sections of the graphics in the Plan itself. There were some conversations about on-street and off-street bicycle lanes and pathways and hopefully we’ve clarified some of that. We still leave the possibility that either/or might be chosen into the future but certainly provide the flexibility to go either direction with those. And then lastly, the largest area of tweaking was really on the Thoroughfare Map itself, which you’ll find on page 7 of your Plan. There we’ve upgraded and downgraded some of the road classifications based on feedback that we had received from the public and in some cases simply some areas that when you looked at it again, it needed some adjustment. We’ve included another road project at Stanley and the connection of that as an east/west connector alternative, which is discussed in the plan but wasn’t reflected on the Thoroughfare Plan map. We thought it was appropriate to do that. We’ve removed a couple of roads from the Thoroughfare Plan, specifically County Road 750, east of SR 267 and the southeastern part of the Town. That was an area that we had a lot of feedback and comment on from the public during our last discussion. Going back and looking at that, that makes some sense. There are other ways to kind of manage that issue. So, we’ve made some adjustments based on that feedback as well, but hopefully what you find in front of you is the final version of the draft that’s reflective of public feedback as best as we could do and still be reflective of the long-term best needs from a Transportation perspective for the Town. I’m happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. Smith: Any questions at this point? No? All right, anything further Scott?

Mr. Singleton: Nothing else to offer.

Mr. Smith: All righty, I think this is great work. I think it’s a tremendous amount of work. We know that this has been in the works for more than a year and it takes a very, very long view. Some things are short-term/immediate, we know we need right away. Other things, years and years, 15-20 years or more down the road.

Mr. Kirchoff: I guess I look to Mel... Mel, the process here is, we consider tonight, and does it go to the Town Council or what is the next step? How do we go about this?
Mr. Daniel: Well, the Resolution, certifying it for the Town Council and the Town Council will then pass a Resolution that amends our Ordinance and adds this as a part of the... as a traffic study to our Ordinance.

Mr. Kirchoff: To the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Daniel: Yes, so when this goes to the Town Council there will be another Resolution for the Town Council.

Mr. Kirchoff: Right, okay.

Mr. Smith: Is there any other discussion about it from the Commission members?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, Mr. President, I just want to comment that a great deal of work has gone into this plan, we've had a great deal of public input and response to that and I think it's time to move forward and adopt the Plan.

Mr. Smith: I'm open for a motion. Is that a motion?

Mr. McPhail: Yes, I would make a motion. I move that the Plan Commission of the Town of Plainfield, Indiana approve Plan Commission Resolution 2019-01 to approve the Thoroughfare Plan as an amendment to the Transportation Mobility section of the 2016 Plainfield Comprehensive Plan and certify to the Plainfield Town Council that the Thoroughfare Plan as an amendment to the 2106 Comprehensive Plan with a favorable recommendation to adopt said amendment.

Mr. Slavens: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second. Would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes  
Mr. McPhail- yes  
Mr. Brandgard- yes  
Mr. Smith- yes  
Mr. Kirchoff- yes  
Mr. Slavens- yes

Resolution No. 2019-01 also known as CP-19-048 is approved.

Mr. Smith: Thank you. Great deal of work, I appreciate everyone who worked on that. Next up on the agenda would be RZ-19-041, known as Jekel/Johnson. This is a zone map change and also a Primary Plat approval. Mr. Jones, would you give us an introduction please?
Mr. Jones: Yes, just by brief explanation of where this is generally located: it’s on County Road 300 South, also known as Township Line Road, just east of the entrance into the Settlement and south of the Settlement properties along Township Line Road. The request is in fact for what amounts to a Minor Plat. There are two pieces of property that are in existence at the location currently. There is the Johnson parcel and what is known as Minor Plat No. 9, which the County approved several years ago. The applicant is desiring to take part of Minor Plat No. 9 and include it into the Johnson parcel, and thus create Lot 1 and Lot 2 of what is to be known as the Johnson Plat. Just a matter of clarification: on the staff report it was identified that Lot 1 is the smaller of the two lots, it’s actually Lot 2 is the smaller of the two lots, Lot 1 is the larger. The acreage sizes will be clarified as well because during the review we found some glitches with some surveys that were overlapping and the original acreage of these two parcels was a little bit in conflict, so we got that sorted out. The applicant can clarify that when they come up. Lastly, with the rezone, this is currently zone AG. It was annexed into the Town. The Town Council passed the annexation in December of 2018 and it was brought in under an Agricultural piece under default of the Ordinance. They are here this evening to request the R2 as well as the plat, the R2 zoning category. It comes as close to meeting the lot sizes that they would be as platted. As a result, the R2 requires a 40-foot setback. Years ago, the barn that you see there, I believe this was maybe all one parcel and that barn was there for a number of years and it got parceled off, as I said, in Minor Plat No. 9 and that parcel. Well, in about 2000 the Town did some improvements to Township Line Road and extended the right-of-way, purchased right-of-way into the property and as a result the barn sits within 5 feet of the existing right-of-way. The Ordinance does allow for, when acquisitions such as that by the governmental entity, it allows the building or structure to remain in a non-conforming status, but it does allow it to remain. The Plat will likely still have a 40-foot setback on it, but this stipulation would allow the barn to remain without zoning problems. The applicant is here this evening and available for any questions.

Mr. Smith: Would the applicant care to say anything? Your name and your address please.

Ms. Ferrell: I am Leigh Ann Ferrell, I’m here on behalf of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Jekel, 7965 E 106th Street, Fishers, Indiana. Terry pretty much explained the rezone part; I can speak on behalf of the Primary Plat which is the next one.

Mr. Smith: Go ahead

Ms. Ferrell: Are you ready?

Mr. Smith: Oh yeah, we’ll do it all together here.

Ms. Ferrell: Currently Mr. Jekel and Mr. Johnson live on the same piece of property, which is Lot 1, Minor Plat No. 9. Mr. Jekel lives in the house to the west and Mr. Johnson lives in the barn. Mr. Johnson also owns the deeded property to the left. Mr. Johnson has made the barn his residence so after the Plat you’ll see it is then divided into Lot 1 and Lot 2 where Mr. Johnson, the small piece of property which is .623 acres, will then be combined into the Johnson
property or parcel which will be Lot 2. Lot 1, the Jekel property will then be 1.25 acres. That’s it, do you have any questions?

Mr. Kirchoff: What about, how is the access going to work?

Ms. Ferrell: They have a shared driveway. The driveway goes up the middle and then splits off.

Mr. Smith: There’s a big fence down the middle of that driveway is there not?

Ms. Ferrell: Yes

Mr. Smith: And so, they share the same driveway but there’s a fence, one for the house and one for the barn? Well half of it goes... I’m not being clear, am I?

Ms. Ferrell: Okay, so Mr. Johnson said the driveway is not shared. It looks like he has a little bit of a driveway and then on Lot 1 on the other side of the fence is Mr. Jekel’s.

Mr. Johnson: If I could explain...

Mr. Smith: Your name please?

Mr. Johnson: I’m sorry, James Johnson.

Mr. Smith: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Johnson: The driveway is not shared. To the west of the barn, basically where you see all of that dirt, that’s where we put in the sewer line, we had to tap into the area north of it, but that’s where the driveway is going in, just to the left of the barn where you see that lighter colored area.

Mr. Smith: So, you’re putting in a new driveway?

Mr. Johnson: Yes

Mr. Smith: To the west side if the barn?

Mr. Johnson: Yes

Mr. Smith: Where do utilities come from?

Mr. Johnson: The sewer, originally, I attempted to tap into Plainfield, but I guess there was too much on that, so I tapped into... I don’t recall, it’s a private sewer company...

Mr. Smith: Okay

Mr. Johnson: Conservancy South or...?

Mr. Smith: Yeah, West Central Conservancy District.

Mr. Johnson: The water, there were already existing taps right in front of the barn, or just a little bit to the west of the barn.
Mr. Smith: Okay, I just want to be sure that you have utilities.
Mr. Johnson: Yes, absolutely.
Mr. Smith: Good
Mr. Johnson: Can I answer anything else while I’m here?
Mr. Smith: Any other questions at this point in time?
Ms. Ferrell: I also have the Plat if you needed to see how that would be platted out.
Mr. Smith: Go ahead. Is there anything else we need to know?
Ms. Ferrell: No
Mr. Smith: Okay. Any further discussion, any questions from the Commission members? This will require two motions...
Mr. Phillip: Public hearing
Mr. McPhail: Public hearing first.
Mr. Smith: Well yes, you’re so right about that. Thank you for reminding me. This is listed for a public hearing this evening so at this time I will open the floor. If there are any comments from the public concerning this particular Jekel/Johnson petition.
Ms. Pedigo: I’m Edda Mae Pedigo, Plainfield Indiana. I received a registered letter and in reading the registered letter, it says 125 North Center Street and 108 West Main Street. Sir, I’ve lived on Mill Street all my life until I was married but I could not find 125 North Center Street. Is it the green lot that’s behind Timothy’s where the parking lot is?
Mr. Klinger: Yes, it is, but that’s not the case that’s in front of us at the moment.
Ms. Pedigo: Huh?
Mr. Smith: You came up at the wrong time.
Ms. Pedigo: I did? I thought it was the PP...
Mr. Smith: That’s not the one we’re hearing at the moment.
Ms. Pedigo: Oh, I’m sorry
Mr. Smith: Could I ask you to stand by a few minutes...?
Ms. Pedigo: Huh?
Mr. Smith: If you would, stand by a few minutes and we’ll call you when it’s the right time. Thank you. Anyone else concerning the Jekel/Johnson petition? Hearing none, I’ll close that
portion of the public hearing and turn back to the Commission if there’s any questions, comments or we’re ready for a motion.

Mr. Slavens: Mr. President, I move that the Plainfield Plan Commission certify the Zone Map amendment request RZ-19-041. Zone Map amendment as filed by Randy Jekel and James Johnson requesting rezoning of approximately 1.9 acres from AG/Agriculture to R2/Single Family Residential with a favorable recommendation subject to the certification of the Town Council.

Mr. Smith: Thank you

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second. Would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens- yes

RZ-19-041 is approved.

Mr. Smith: And another motion?

Mr. Slavens: And to continue, I move that PP-19-061 Primary Plat petition filed by Randy Jekel and James Johnson be approved subject to the following:

1. Adequate provisions have been made for regulation of minimum lot width, minimum lot depth and minimum lot area.
2. Adequate provisions have been made for the widths, grades, curves and coordination of subdivisions public ways with current and planned public ways; and
3. Adequate provisions have been made for the extension of water, sewer, and other municipal services.

Mr. Phillip: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second. Would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
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Mr. Smith: Thank you. All right, next on the agenda for public hearing this evening would be DP-19-040, Axis Architecture, concerning a new downtown parking garage.

Mr. Berg: Good evening, before I get too far into this let me note that on page 2 there is an error. The trash enclosure is not shown northwest of the building, that was there from a previous staff report. My understanding is that the trash enclosure is still something that is being worked on at this point, so you can disregard that. We’re looking at this site here which is known as 125 North Center Street. Town Hall is here, Main Street, Center, right here is the elevation of what it is going to look like, what it’s proposed to look like. 250 parking spaces, replacing about 70-80 which are currently at the site. I know that Mr. Brian Tuohy is here. So, I’ll turn that over to Mr. Tuohy right now.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Tuohy, good evening.

Mr. Tuohy: Good evening Mr. President, members of the Plan Commission. My name is Brian Tuohy, my address is 50 South Meridian. Thank you for hearing our case this evening. Here with me is my client Greg Martz from GM Development. Also, Dave Lahey from Butler, Fairman and Brad King from Butler Fairman and Chris Hagen from Axis Architects. Again, thanks for your time this evening. This case involves, it’s not a rezoning which is kind of your typical kind of work, it is seeking Architectural and Site Design approval in the Town Center District and Eric’s explanation was spot on. It’s a 0.8-acre site and as Eric said, it’s been a parking lot for as long as I can remember. As you can see, it’s partially improved with asphalt but there's also a grass area right here and it probably doesn’t have an exact address because it sits between Center Street and Vine Street and it’s just north of Vine Street. A little tighter look at it, you can see there's paved parking here and here, this is this grass area and it’s surrounded by North Center Street, North Vine Street and then some right-of-way on the north and also on the south. The businesses that front on US 40 and some businesses that don’t front on US 40 are located to the south, here’s Town Hall. So, on three sides, the west side, the south side and the east side there's primarily commercial, governmental or institutional kind of uses and this is right in the center of the redevelopment area. The proposed use is to take this surface parking lot and turn it into a structured parking building, which I’ll show you here in a minute. It would be sort of a mixed use, it would have both indoor parking and it would have about 8,100 square feet of retail on both the east and the west side. So, it’s not just a parking structure, there will be some businesses in this structure. This is looking east, so I’m standing on Center Street looking east from actually the parking lot of the Town Hall. Here I’m looking southeast, here’s the Side Door Lounge over here, the Vineyard Church is over here. This is looking straight east from the
parking lot of Town Hall. There’s an outdoor area, I believe it’s for smoking, a smoking area for Side Door Lounge, and this is one of those right-of-ways I was speaking of, located between the lot and the Side Door Lounge. Here’s another alley/ right-of-way, I’m not sure what you call it, so this is looking north of Main Street. The church is on this side, which would be the east side and the Treasures Record Store is on the west side, I believe, at the back. There’s Rock Bottom Treasures, you can see, so now I’m looking south. I just came and walked up that alley and turned the camera to look to the south. Here is looking straight west towards Town Hall. In the Conceptual Downtown Redevelopment Plan this area is Number 6, this site is called Number 6. It calls for contemplated use of mixed development/garage and we propose a structured parking garage on this area. So, here it is right here, and it seems to me to be a very logical place for a parking structure. Not only is it replacing an existing parking area, but all the things that are contemplated going around this area; you’ve got your Town Hall, you’ve got your Cultural Arts Center, some Gateway improvements over here, a theater. This to me looks to be kind of the commercial hub of the redevelopment area and the proposal is to have this public parking structure sort of off Main Street to provide parking for citizens and people that are coming to those businesses. My understanding is that there was some surveying done and what it looks like to me is consistent in all the different plans, three different plans for the redevelopment, all of them on that site call for surface/garage parking. Our proposal is for garage parking. In your context design document, when the feedback was analyzed, the supporting feedback called for more parking and the concerns were, we need more parking and that’s what this proposal is about, members of the Plan Commission. So, let’s talk for a minute about the building. And I know you have a very extensive agenda tonight and I’ve been encouraged to make this a briefer presentation than normal, so I’ll do that. This building would have about 250 spaces, it would be about 106,000 square feet. It’s just under 40 feet tall, 39 and a few inches to the top of that stair area, which is the tallest part of the structure. I mentioned the retail, so there’s retail here on Center Street and then there’s a mirror of that, it’s smaller, over on Vine Street. So, there’s about 8,100 square feet of Retail space, which you would divide that up about 5,400 is shown here on Center and about 2,700 on Vine Street. What kind of uses might that be? Well, we’re not asking for any kind of variances or rezoning so they would be the kind of retail uses that are allowed under your Town Center Ordinance. So, it would be things like flower shops, barber shops, insurance agencies, office uses, perhaps a dry cleaning drop off. Those are the kinds of uses that the developer believes would fit on this site and in this area. You’ll note that the structure is brick, it’s brick on three sides and partially on the south side. The rendering is a little misleading because as you recall from a photograph a minute ago, there’s only a right-of-way between the Side Door and that building, so as you’re driving north on Center or south, your eye is going to catch mostly brick, that goes in about 31 feet there and I think 39 feet over on Vine Street. So, the only part that is visible would be to a person walking down that right-of-way north of the Side Door Lounge. So, this would be the view looking across to this facility from Town Hall. This would be the view on Vine Street. Again, here’s the retail area. You will be able to enter the parking facility from both Vine Street and Center Street, but you can’t go through the parking facility, you can’t drive from Vine Street to
Center Street, nor can you drive from Center Street to Vine Street, but there are two entrances and exits on each side. Here's another rendering of the east elevation, so that's the rendering over on Vine Street and this rendering would be the rendering of the elevation that you would see standing in the parking lot of the Town Hall. This is to show that there's brick all along the north side of the building, so that would be the area that is right adjacent to the two residential homes on the other side of that right-of-way and this is what I was speaking of on the south side, the brick comes and wraps around 31 and 39 feet to present a... and I'll show you why, an architecturally consistent image... this is a floor plan showing the entry again, off of Center Street, here's an entry off of Vine Street, again, they do not connect through. So, here's the layout, there's also additional improvements proposed in connection with this in addition with just the building. There is an undefined area, I'm not sure what to call it, between the Side Door and the buildings that face here on Main Street and there's some HVAC equipment in there. Our proposal would be to relocate that HVAC equipment over into this area and move the... I think it's an outdoor smoking area, over into a concrete patio right here and then that would allow people who want to smoke, they won't be on this right-of-way here, they'll be back behind this building and then we'll put a landscaped area in here. Eventually, hopefully, there would be a pedestrian path along the north side between this building and the two homes to the north. In this area here, this would allow for vehicular traffic along here and then sidewalks in this area right here, and then sidewalks along the whole southern border and you can see, then there would be landscaping along here and a landscaping strip along this area here also. The last rendering of the side facing Center Street, so the idea of the architects was to mimic and compliment the buildings along Main Street. So, these are the buildings that are on Main Street, on the north side of Main. So again, you can see here's the rendering of this, those windows and that brick compliments and mimics these buildings here. So, to get us oriented, the structure would be directly behind these buildings. You can see the second story with the windows, those windows are very closely approximated to the windows we showed in this rendering. In summary, members of the Plan Commission, at least to the facts of the petition, there's about 250 spaces, about 106,000 square feet, it's just under 40 feet to the top of the staircase, about 28 feet to the top of the parapet walls that would face Center Street and Vine Street, there's 8,100 square feet of retail space in total with the larger portion of that on Center Street. It represents an investment of about $7 million on this site. The three sides of the building that are the most visible, the east and west and north, have brick across the whole elevations of that and the brick has some articulation and fenestration to it so it's not just a blank brick wall that you're looking at. The staff has reviewed this, I believe the land use makes common sense, it's compliant with the Town Center District. This is actually a permitted use in your zoning, a parking structure. I think it used to be in a different manner, you would get it through an accessory use or a variance but now under your new ordinance, it's actually a permitted use in your Town Center District and the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Revitalization Plan call for this use on this site. The plans were reviewed for compliance with the Town Center and the Gateway Corridor Development Standards and it's my understanding that they comply. The staff has asked for three conditions which my client is in agreement with.
One, to substantially comply with the plans that we’ve shown you. Two, come up with a landscape plan along the north side of the building, which I think would have to be approved by Eric Berg and your staff. Then three, work out the vacation of the applicable easements and right-of-ways and alleys with your Town Council. There are some that actually go through the site, there are some that border the site, and so that would be a chore for the Town Council, is how I believe that should sort itself out. With that, we would answer any questions you might have, and we greatly appreciate your time this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, any questions at this point? All righty, this is listed for public hearing, so if Ms. Pedigo is still here, this would be the time. The floor is open for public comment concerning the parking garage project.

Ms. Semler: My name is Linda Semler, I live at 134 North Center Street. I am not a governmental entity nor a commercial entity as is led to believe that that’s all that’s around the parking garage. Out home was built in 1861 and one of the things we’re interested in is that the outside of buildings match, as you mentioned with the fenestration and that’s wonderful. We’re very pleased with what Axis has done, I wanted to say that off the top, okay. A couple of suggestions we made at the last meeting though, I don’t see being implemented. One of them was the use of awnings. In the varied pictures that you showed, there are awnings on those commercial buildings downtown. For the people who live across the street from the parking garage, for the businesses underneath there, it’s a matter of privacy for them, so we wondered about the addition of awnings where the commercial dry cleaners, restaurants, whatever that is up towards the door where there’s the tower where you go in and out of the stairs. If we could have that added into the design, it would facilitate privacy for those of us who live in the surrounding area. It would also make it look more the same, it would be more of a continuous look with the Bike Shop and the Side Door and the things that are on US 40. The signage also looks very industrial, rather than historic. Many of us who bought in this area bought because it was a historic district and we live in historic homes. So, we would like, if at all possible, to somehow make that a fluid design for the surrounding homes. The last thing that I’m concerned about, and we know we’ve mentioned this before, is what’s going to happen if we have the performing arts center with 600 seats there, 250 parking spaces and we already can’t get up and down North Center Street, turning off of US 40, turning onto Center, having that in and out there that close to US 40. At rush hour now, if you’re going southbound on North Center Street, it’s backed up past our house clear to the next alley. So, that’s going to be kind of a tricky thing, and I guess one of the questions the residents have, because we’re going to need to turn in there to get to our homes, is what the alternatives are going to be because that’s really congested already and I know you’re planning a performing arts center and when you have that venue there, its going to be a lot of traffic in a very small area and because it is so close to US 40, people won’t be able to turn off of US 40 to get up Center Street. We already see this as a problem with just 80 spaces there.

Mr. Smith: Do you have parking garages with those houses?
Ms. Semler: No, we have to park down alleys. I mean we don’t have driveways like you do in a subdivision, so we park down the alleys and have to come out there. So, I guess what I’m speaking to is what we can do from the outside to make it fit just a little bit more. And as I said, we’re very happy with what Axis has tried to do; the color of the brick, the curvature of the second story windows, that’s spot on, okay, that’s very helpful for us but we’d like to see a little bit more. For instance, the Prewitt Theater; the signage on that, the font that’s used, that’s more historic, this is more industrial or commercial. We’re just asking that it doesn’t devalue our historic homes by looking like it’s been plunked in. Also, what are we going to do there with the increased traffic in that very, very short distance between US 40. And I know you guys have probably looked at this before, but we asked that question last time when we had the smaller meeting, and I don’t think it was adequately answered before us. Even thinking when you said you can’t get from Vine to center and vise versa... can you enter from Center Street and exit to Vine within the way the building is designed? No, right? It’s two halves?

Mr. Tuohy: The vehicular traffic cannot pass through so...

Ms. Semler: Cannot pass through the structure, so I guess what we’re saying, at certain times of day, would it be wiser to close the things on Center Street and only have the Vine part open? The problem is going to be the amount of cars in that little area that we’re already having trouble with. And I’m sure somebody has looked at that and done a traffic study but we watch it every single night and without that structure there now, it’s already problematic.

Mr. Kirchoff: And you address again, please?

Ms. Semler: 134, we’re the large, big blue house with the wrought iron fence.

Mr. Kirchoff: North Center?

Ms. Semler: North Center, yeah. And my neighbor just to the south of us also had, she’s more directly across from the garage even than we are, so it’s not all commercial or governmental entities there. And we are very grateful for what you’re trying to do with the lighting also, so that it’s not shining into the residences. So, it’s not that we don’t think you’re making an effort, we’re very pleased with that part, but we do have other concerns.

Mr. Smith: All right, thank you Ms. Semler. Is there anyone else to speak about the parking structure?

Ms. Semler: Is Ms. Pedigo here yet?

Mr. Smith: Ms. Pedigo has not come back yet. Ms. Semler, did you give us your, write your name and address please.

Mr. Ridgeway: Hi, my name is Robert Ridgeway, I live at 139 North Center Street which is the second house just north of where the proposed structure is, the large green house. It was also built in 1869, historical home. The question/concern that I have is it looks like the top level of the structure is going to be open, is that correct?
Mr. Tuohy: Yes

Mr. Ridgeway: We have bedrooms on the second story of our home, and we have concerns of headlights coming through and hitting us in the windows at all hours of the night. I would like to propose for some sort of wall or something being up there so that we wouldn’t be blinded by headlights all night long. I agree with my neighbor that I would like the historic value of our homes to be taken into consideration when this is put in because I agree, it just looks too industrial to me. It looks like you’re throwing something into a historical neighborhood. It’s not just a few historical homes, it’s a historical neighborhood. In my personal opinion, it just doesn’t look like it fits there. Another question; are you charging for parking there or is it, is it still free to the public or...?

Mr. Smith: I think there’s a discussion between the developer and the Town Council and that’s probably all I know.

Mr. Ridgeway: Okay, that’s another concern I have, it’s something that’s given to the Town right now and to me, if you’re going to charge, you’re taking away from the communities.

Mr. Smith: That’s an issue for the Council, I think they’re still discussing.

Mr. Ridgeway: Okay, that’s all I’ve got, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else at this point?

Mr. Garver: Dave Garver, Indianapolis, Indiana. I've got like three major questions that I... I know the structure is going in and I think basically it’s a fine idea but there’s some concerns I have, and I hope somebody is addressing them. One of them mimics the parking because... I’m making reference to... you know, there’s a parking garage and the buildings, there’s an alleyway and then south of the parking garage is those small commercial buildings along there between the parking garage and Washington Street to the south of the new structure... we used to have on-street parking and we lost the on-street parking. Then we have that off-street parking, which is the open asphalt lots and now they’re putting a parking garage up. That was one of my main concerns; the free parking because you know, you have tenants there, they need someplace to park and then if you’ve got customers coming in there, they don’t... that’s been asked before about the free parking, but it’s never really been addressed, but that to me, is a problem for these businesses along there. Like I said, we lost our on-street parking, now we’re losing that lot, so there should be some kind of accommodation for the tenants there and also customers coming in there so they can have some kind of parking. I can understand when the art center is on, but other times there should be some type of accommodation. Also, those structures are actually lower than that alleyway. That alleyway has been built up and built up so there’s a drainage problem there for those buildings, for those structures and I hope that’s being addressed, French drains or something because all of that water will be running towards those buildings and that needs to be addressed. Also, the trash. What are the businesses along
there going to be able to do with the trash? I don’t think that that’s been addressed properly yet either. That’s pretty much my concern. Appreciate it, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Garver. Mr. Garver, do you own a business or a property there?

Mr. Garver: Yes

Mr. Smith: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else concerning the parking structure?

Ms. O’Hair: The people have been really nice to me. My name is Mary O’Hair and I live at 130 North Vine and I’m obviously right behind the new parking garage. They have been working with me and they have been wonderful, that’s not the issue. It’s just, it hasn’t been mentioned yet; what really more is the process, the timeline? What are we looking at? When is this thing going to start? And when it does start, the construction, is it going to be 24/7? I hope not since I live there. Do they have any timeframes and how long will it take? That kind of thing, just general information. Is that available on the website?

Mr. Smith: We will ask the petitioner here in just a moment and ask them to respond to your question. Is there anyone else concerning the parking structure?

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, she left.

Mr. Brandgard: She left.

Mr. Smith: Well, I understand. That happens sometimes when we have many items; people get confused about the correct procedure. Hearing no more comments, I will close that portion of the public hearing and ask Mr. Tuohy if you’d care to come forward and respond to the questions and comments.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you, Mr. President. If I may, I’ll respond in order of the folks that spoke. The first woman, our neighbor, appreciate her saying that the architecture matched. She had a suggestion about using awnings in front of our windows. We might respectfully disagree with her on this basis, I think this is a good example; what we anticipate is the front door to this site... and she’s just up the street... is underneath this covered porch area. So, we would respectfully suggest that that is better than an awning. It allows people a covered area to enter the retail shops that would be in this area. Now, if someone does actually want a front door on this site, we’d be wiling to consider an awning. Maybe leave that up to the planning staff’s approval to see if they would approve that, but we respectfully think that this building with this covered entryway is an improvement over an awning. As to the signage, I would respectfully suggest that we just leave the approval of the signage up to the staff. We’re fine with historical signage. That right there is similar to what you see on the buildings along main street. We can have Eric Berg and his team direct us in that, but we’re not married to the signage that’s shown here, so we would suggest that the approval be conditioned on signage being approved by the Plainfield Planning Staff.
Mr. Klinger: Typically, signage would be approved through a separate ILP process, so that would come later and then obviously, if you have retailers who occupy the spaces, they will also come back with their own petitions for signage.

Mr. Tuohy: Right, the insurance agency is going to want one sign and the dry cleaner is going to want a different sign. So yes, that would be my response to that. Mr. Ridgeway who lives, I believe he said two doors north, I think that Mr. Ridgeway’s house is right up here in this area. To the right, right there? Okay, so between Mr. Ridgeway’s house and this structure, there’s another structure and I’m advised that the knee wall is 42 inches tall for just that purpose of keeping headlights from shining out into that area. So, there is some distance there and... I mean if some person brings a monster truck in there and it’s way above that knee wall, then yes, you may see some light but it’s going to be minimal and if that becomes a problem, we can probably address it in those windows but we don’t really want to cover that up. The last gentleman spoke about the street parking and the loss of that and also, I think, whether the parking would be at no charge. From my client’s perspective, that’s fine. What I’ve understood is, the Town may want to have some differing times when there may be some charge for parking while events are on at the performing center and perhaps not have that charge on a normal customer business time. But again, I think that’s up to the Town Council to set that policy. There is some additional parking behind the bank to the south... and I think this kind of gets to the last person’s question about the timing of this... and that is that if all would go well, the construction would start at the end of this month/first of June and then the structure would be finished about one year from the time it starts. So, next spring/early summer. As to the trash, he was right, I did not address that. The plan is to have the trash stored indoors in a room that will be accessed off the alley right here. So, the trash dumpsters would be in there. I apologize for not addressing that, but that’s the plan. And then as to the drainage plan for the structure; we’re fortunate to have an engineer here tonight and I will let him address that question. Thank you.

Mr. Lahey: Good evening, I’m David Lahey with Butler, Fairman & Seufert, the site designer for this project. My address is 1826 North German Church Road, Indianapolis, Indiana. With respect to the drainage concern; for the most part the comments are accurate, there are drainage issues along the south side of the structure. We are addressing that within the site plan by ensuring that the pavement adjacent to these structures will be lower, thus allowing for drainage to come off of those sites into the alleyway. Once it’s in the alleyway it will for the most part, be conveyed to the east and discharged out into Vine where there are sufficient drainage features in existence including permeable pavers in the parking areas currently on Vine. A small portion will drain to the west near the Side Door property. That portion does drain in a similar fashion, lower than the adjoining properties forcing the water onto the new improved alley that will be lower than it is now and then discharging out into Center Street.

Mr. Smith: You don’t see putting a storm sewer or anything under the alley there?
Mr. Lahey: We don’t anticipate the need for a storm Sewer but that can be addressed under the ILP process with staff as we work together with them on those details.

Mr. Smith: Are there any other questions from the Commission members at this point? Observations, anything like that? So, the trash from the retail buildings, you’re going to have a dumpster or something of that sort in a room that accesses off of the south side alley?

Mr. Lahey: Yes, the building has been designed to accommodate up to two 4-yard roll out dumpsters in the area south of the building. We do understand that the Town is pursuing other options in terms of innovation of trash, but we are able to accommodate the existing situation within the structure until that decision can be made.

Mr. Smith: And where are you putting the HVAC?

Mr. Lahey: So, the upper level of the garage. In any parking structure there are places where cars can’t park anyway because of the angles and we would put those in those spaces.

Mr. Smith: Right, very good.

Mr. Kirchoff: I would ask Scott, there was concern about traffic flow, have we done a traffic analysis at all?

Mr. Singleton: For the garage? We have not done any specific traffic analysis. We don’t see this as obviously generating any new trips, it’s only going to support other development that might generate new trips in the future. But during the downtown concept plan, we of course focused on how we were going to be able to move traffic through the downtown. Obviously, we’ve got heavy restrictions on what we can and can’t do. The purpose of a traffic study is of course to one, tell us how bad it is, which it’s bad today. So, we don’t need to kind of confirm what we already know, which is at certain times of day it’s hard to move through downtown. Then the second purpose of the study would be what improvements would we want to implement to make it better? We’ve looked at that through the concept plan, those are focused on using Krewson as an east/west connection to help distribute traffic. So, in this case if you talk about the CAC coming online in the future, you’re probably talking about more of an operational event traffic planning where you’re pushing traffic out a certain direction that makes sense, at certain times of day and during events. But Krewson is looked at as a future east/west connector as part of the downtown planning. Lincoln also, so those allow you to get access to East Street, Avon Avenue, Center Street and then potentially a new light at either West or Mill Street over time. That really is the best approach we could come up with as far as trying to distribute traffic as this thing grows out. But it’s also going to get replaced with walkable traffic, bicycle traffic as people move down and take those types of trips as opposed to cars as traffic gets worse. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Kirchoff: Have you met with Public Safety to talk about the traffic flow...?
Mr. Lahey: Yes, we have met with Public Safety as we oriented the structure and located the structure. Along those same lines, the anticipated or the spoken of peak usage of the structure relative to a potential Cultural Arts Center, those hours of usage would be after the traditional rush hour. Near the end, but after traditional rush hour. Public Safety anticipates that the structure will be loaded at a gradual period heading up to an event and that most of the users would be coming either from the west or the north. With respect to the function of the structure, we would imagine if there is a fee associated with that event, that we would be receiving those fees up within the structure. We would not be taking tickets at the entrance here on Center, so people would be encouraged to get off of Center, get up onto the structure and then we would conduct that transaction up in the structure. Then on event exit, to the extent that Public Safety or other organization is involved in the event exit, which is more of a concentrated exercise, that that event exit would likely be directed to the north, and then, as Scott referred to, Krewson improvements would be available at that time so the intent is, if there is improvement with respect to the Cultural Arts Center, that Krewson would come into existence prior to the opening of that Arts Center.

Mr. Kirchoff: Thanks, David

Mr. Smith: There’s… are we going to bury the utilities? I’m talking about on the north side of the building, bury the utilities, I think there's some wooden poles there and so forth now. Are we going to get all of that cleaned up during construction?

Mr. Lahey: Yes, the primary culprit, for lack of a better term, is Duke overhead power on the south side of the structure. We are finishing up some of the final paperwork to enable Duke to… and we understand that they have already scheduled crews, but they will schedule the crews and that will be an early action, for them to bury the overhead power. There are also communication lines that are already buried that will go underneath the structure in a north/south fashion. Those will remain under the structure. Both GM Development, their contractor, the Town in the future and the utility are satisfied with leaving those communication lines under the structure. There is a minor existing communication line also on the poles on the south side; those will gradually, during the construction of the project be made underground. There's not an immediate OSHA issue with the communication lines. The immediate issue in terms of constructability of the structure was the Duke equipment overhead.

Mr. Smith: Very good, very good, thank you. Any other questions from…?

Mr. Kirchoff: Somebody might want to talk about, with losing the existing parking, what kind of plans do you have Kent, to provide other alternatives?

Mr. McPhail: Well, during the construction of this structure there will be the location of the current fire station on Main Street, the Chamber of Commerce building; it will be demolished and that will provide parking. We have leased several spots on the south side of US 40 from
First National Bank, and we will actually have more parking spaces than we currently have today available. I don’t remember the numbers but it’s like 35 more or something like that.

Mr. Smith: That’s important to the businesses and Residents nearby who like the free parking on the surface lot.

Mr. McPhail: You might have to walk as far as you do at Walmart.

Mr. Smith: Any other questions/comments from the Commission at this point?

Mr. Phillip: So, you're implying Kent, that any development that would happen on the current property with the Town Hall and the fire station/old Chamber building won't begin until after this parking structure is completed.

Mr. McPhail: That is correct, yes.

Mr. Phillip: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Smith: There's a deliberate sequencing here.

Mr. Phillip: I like that we’re coordinated.

Mr. Smith: Yes, yes. All right, unless there's any other questions/comments, I’m ready for a motion.

Mr. Phillip: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-19-040 as filed by GM Development requesting Architectural and Site Design Review of a 250 +/- space parking structure on an approximately 0.8 acre parcel zoned TC (Town Center) within a Gateway Corridor located at 125 North Center Street finding that:

1. The Development Plan complies with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans dated April 19, 2019.
2. A landscape plan showing a Plant Unit Value of 1 on the north side is submitted with the Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit.
3. Vacation of applicable easement(s) and alley(s) by the Plainfield Town Council.
Mr. Slavens: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens- yes

DP-19-040 is approved.

Mr. Smith: Thank you. Next up on the agenda will be DHL Spec Building, that would be DP-19-053.

Mr. Berg: so what we’re looking at here, DP-19-053, Architectural Site Design Review for a 208,000 square foot Warehouse Distribution Building on 22.1 acres. Airtech Parkway, Reagan Parkway is over here, you see a little bit of Clover Drive over here. Roughly over here is about where the mall is, if you’re not familiar with the area. That area was going to be, at one point, thought of as an extension of this building here but it appears that’s not in the cards anymore. Since we are running late, I will turn this over at this point to the applicant, if there are no questions for me.

Mr. Smith: Thank you

Mr. Winslow: Good evening members of the Commission, my name is Nathan Winslow, I’m with American Structurepoint, I’m the Civil Engineer on this project. I’m located at 7260 Shadeland Station in Indianapolis. With me tonight are members of the design team as well as the owner/the developer on this project, DHL. To keep things concise, Eric did a very nice job of presenting the project. Again, we’re looking at about a 208,000 square foot industrial building and it is currently zoned appropriately for that use. As he mentioned, that particular property was originally designed to be an extension of the current building to the east. Obviously, that’s not occurring. This has been parceled off, we are developing it as a stand-alone facility. To kind of highlight a couple of key items on this exhibit because I think it helps illustrates some of the challenges with the site; as you can see, the building itself is kind of in the dark grey/black outline there. To the west of the building there’s a large transmission line easement with IPL, about 180 feet in width. So, that severely limits what we can do, obviously we can't go vertical within that location which is a big part of the orientation of the building with the loading docks facing the street frontage. We are requesting a development incentive for that purpose. The orientation with those loading docks facing that direction, we are allowed to put trailer parking
within that easement. However, if we flip the building and put the building more on the west, there is no more room to put trailer parking on the east side. That’s the rationale behind this orientation. As you can see from the color relief on this, everything that’s shaded in green is at the finished floor elevation of the building or lower. Everything that is shaded in orange or yellow is a mound that exists on site, it’s above the finished floor elevation. So, this site is being somewhat master planned. There are large berms out along Airtech Parkway which really do an excellent job of shielding the site in conformance with the development incentive. As you can see on the right-hand side of this exhibit, we’ve cut a couple of sections through some key areas of the site. The top one at the north end, you can see from Airtech Parkway and the elevation, operation of the vehicles behind there, you won’t be able to see the vehicles and semis at all, it’s a very concealed area. Likewise, the same scenario exists on the south side of the site. In the middle, there’s a drainage swale that conveys run-off from Airtech Parkway and the property to the west of Airtech Parkway. We’re maintaining that existing drainage swale. Unfortunately, because of the easement we can’t really berm any further within that Duke easement, maintaining drainage conditions. Even so, we are maintaining a high level of protection and shielding of those semis and that truck court. Also because of the transmission line, there are two large transmission poles kind of at the center of the building where you see that little bump out. That limits what operations can take place at the center of the facility. You won’t be able to have the coming and going of loading docks within that center portion. There's just not enough room in that truck court to maneuver a vehicle. So, even that area being the most visible, you will not have those consistent operations throughout. We’ll go through a couple of photos here to help illustrate what exists. I know it’s a little difficult to see on this, we’ve kind of highlighted where the berms are out there on the site. You can see where those transmission poles are, that little bump out as well. At the southwest corner of the property there’s a large cluster of trees. Going out there I personally counted over fifty trees at that corner, it’s very dense. Obviously, this photo doesn’t really do it a justice of how well it’s shielding the view of the site from that entrance. Obviously, once the trees are in full bloom, you’re not going to see anything from that corner. Again, at the south side, showing that south berm, you can barely see the building that currently exists to the east from that view. Again, I apologize, it’s pretty dark on this picture to see. Going further, the top photo is from on top of that berm. You can kind of see where that drainage swale cuts through between those two berms, but those are pretty sizeable berms. Both of them approximately extend 10 feet higher than Airtech Parkway itself. By the time you get down to the truck court in the back you’re almost... the truck court sits about 15 feet lower than the top of that berm. So, there’s a pretty sizeable amount of shielding going on. Again, taking a few photos of some of the existing vegetation along Airtech; there’s a nice consistent, evenly spaced row of trees out there. Where the drainage swale cuts through, kind of in the center of the site, there are some large coniferous trees which obviously, are going to provide even better shielding year-round. I think that was the intent of those being placed there initially. Again, here’s a little bit better view of where that drainage swale cuts through. You can see the existing access drive kind of off to the right a little bit that serves the building to the east. We will be maintaining that access drive,
there's an access easement allowing for continued access to our neighbor to the east. So, that will be maintained and shared. We're not adding any new curb cuts onto Airtech Parkway. Again, here's another view kind of just to the north of that large cluster of trees on the corner. Again, you can barely see anything beyond there. Yet another nice angle view of where those berms exist. This is the north berm, it's obviously much higher, a little closer to the road than the south berm, providing even better shielding. You can't see anything beyond that. Again, just another angle to help convey the point; some vegetation; again, there's kind of our middle lapse in the berm allowing for adequate drainage through the site. Then looking at the site plan as I mentioned, we are maintaining an access easement along the south to convey traffic to the existing facility. Working with the city engineering and the development plan review committee we've also organized or arranged our access to the north. There is a private drive that serves both the building to the east and the two buildings to the north. That access drive will be maintained, we will be adding our curb cut onto that, so again, we're not adding another curb cut to Airtech. I think that adds to efficiency. That drive will outlet, I believe it's a right-turn only onto Ronald Reagan. If anybody needed to go north, they would have to go to Airtech and either go north or south to gain access. As you can see, the transmission poles there are just to the left of the building in the center. So, on this exhibit along the south end of the building right here is where we're considering a location for a trash enclosure per recommendations of DRC. They didn't want it out in the front yard. We don't intend to seek a variance for that. Should the tenant want or need a trash enclosure, we're currently looking at a location near the south end of the building, providing garbage truck access to that. A typical section of a trash enclosure, we're probably looking for a compactor for a building of this size. It will be screened on all sides; we'll adjust landscaping as necessary to meet all of the code ordinances. With that, I'll conclude my presentation. Happy to answer any questions, as well as any members of the development team.

Mr. Smith: This is listed for a public hearing so at this time I’ll ask if there's anyone from the public who wants to comment concerning the DHL Supply Chain Spec Building. Hearing none, we'll close that portion of the public hearing and turn back to members of the Commission if there's any questions/comments. It’s too bad we have trailer parking pointed toward Airtech, but there is...

Mr. McPhail: But you won't be able to see it.

Mr. Smith: I think there's a tremendous amount of screening there between the mounds and the...you have 15, 10-15 feet of mounds plus the trees, so...

Mr. Phillip: It’s a difficult piece of property and they’ve done a good job with it.

Mr. McPhail: Yes, they have.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, with the power line, it is a difficult site. Any further questions/comments? Are we ready for a motion? Actually, there will be two motions in this case.
Mr. Slavens: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Development Incentive as filed by Exel, Inc., dba DHL Supply Chain finding that:

1. The required Front Yard or required front Bufferyard is effectively screened with a Plant Unit Value which exceeds the standard for such Yard by adding a Plant Unit Value of 4.0 to the total Plant Unit Value otherwise required by this Ordinance or other Development Incentive; or
2. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Smith: Thank you

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger:                    Mr. Phillip- yes
                                    Mr. McPhail- yes
                                    Mr. Brandgard- yes
                                    Mr. Smith- yes
                                    Mr. Kirchoff- yes
                                    Mr. Slavens- yes

The development incentives for DP-19-053 is approved.

Mr. Smith: And we need another motion for the Architectural and Site Design Review.

Mr. Phillip: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-19-053 as filed by Exel, Inc., dba DHL Supply Chain requesting Architectural and Site Design Review of an amendment to the original development plan to add an exterior equipment enclosure on a 19.4 acre parcel zoned I2 (Office/Warehouse Distribution) within a Gateway Corridor at 845 Airtech Parkway. Finding that:

1. The Development Plan complies with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans dated April 19, 2019.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Berg: That should be 401 Airtech Parkway.

Mr. Smith: 401 is the corrected address, not 845 but 401. The second agrees to the correction?

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, second.

Mr. Smith: Let’s call the roll please.

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes

Mr. McPhail- yes

Mr. Brandgard- yes

Mr. Smith- yes

Mr. Kirchoff- yes

Mr. Slavens- yes

DP-19-053 is approved.

Mr. Smith: Good luck. Does anyone need a break, or do we keep going?

Mr. Klinger: Let’s just get through it at this point, right.

Mr. Smith: Okay, okay. Next up, DP-17-018B – Gateway Building 5, Architectural Site Design Review.

Mr. Berg: Okay, this is an amendment to the Gateway 5 HSA building. You probably remember, Airtech was extended to the south from Stafford. They’re looking to add an exterior unit here, a tank and a vaporizer for their business. Typically, we’ve had something that’s gone above what the level of the screening, I believe we’ve brought those back in the past. Unlike say, Niagara which had the tanks that were either taller than the structure or were in the front yard, this is in the, basically the side yard about… I can’t remember exactly how far that is, I’m sure the engineer will, but it’s a considerable distance from Stafford. So, as I said, it does not require a variance or anything like that, we’re just looking to make sure that this is in accordance with what the Plan Commission would like.

Mr. Klinger: Is this 845 Airtech, is that...?
Mr. Smith: Would the petitioner care to come forward and tell us...

Mr. McIntos: I’m Ron McIntos with LifeNet Health and my address is 1864 Concert Drive, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23453. I’m present tonight as a follow on to the April 2nd Plan Commission session that we had relative to recommendations of approval with conditions related to our rear yard equipment enclosure. We have revised and amended our initial plan to capture the resubmittal comments relative to the 4/2 meeting on a 426 sheet A100 and we request your continued favorable approval based on the updated plan.

Mr. Smith: What you’re putting there is a liquified natural gas storage tank or...?

Mr. McIntos: Actually, one of the items there is an ln2 liquid nitrogen tank for freezing. Our storage containers are ln2 based.

Mr. Smith: And a compressor and a generator, stand by generator?

Mr. McIntos: That’s correct, full back up for our facility and there will be space back there for a dumpster and so forth like that as well.

Mr. Smith: And as I recall from the DRC meeting, it was explained well then, this is critical because your merchandise must remain frozen.

Mr. McIntos: -80°C, yes, would be 192°F below zero.

Mr. Smith: Yes, interesting business story actually in the background here. Any questions at this moment? No? This is listed for a public hearing so I would open the floor for any public comments concerning DP-17-018B – Indiana Gateway Building 5. Hearing none, I’ll close that portion of the hearing and turn back to the Commission for any questions/comments. I think the DRC at the time went through in some detail with them about how to find a good way to make this building kind of, this extension kind of disappear and to avoid razor wire, if possible and perhaps an electronic monitoring for security purposes, if that can be worked out. Any other questions/comments, or are we ready for a motion?

Mr. Slavens: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-17-018B as filed by Meridian Design Build requesting Architectural and Site Design Review of an amendment to the original development plan to add an exterior equipment enclosure on a 19.4 acre parcel zoned I2 (Office/Warehouse Distribution) within a Gateway Corridor at 845 Airtech Parkway finding that:

1. The Development Plan complies with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan complies with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans dated April 19, 2019.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second and just to verify, the address was correct on this one? This is the 845 Airtech, very good. I have a motion and a second, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens- yes

DP-17-018B is approved.

Mr. McIntos: Thank you gentlemen for welcoming LifeNet Health in Plainfield.

Mr. Smith: Good luck, welcome. Next up, three related matters for Strategic Capital Partners.

Mr. Jones: Yes, that is correct. There are three actual applications. This is actually in the corner of the northeast corner Ronald Reagan and Stafford Road. You’ll recall, the Planned Unit Development to rezone that was approved in January by the Town Council for the site. It was zoned previously Industrial and Agricultural. Within that property there are three subdivisions and to the north, the farthest north, there is a drive called Melody Lane, the particular reason that isn’t included, and the applicant can explain this if you have any questions, it was never actually recorded, that plat wasn’t recorded but the streets were recorded. This reason for this application this evening, or applications, are to vacate the platted lots and the open spaces as well as the covenants. While we’re on the covenants, I would suggest that possibly in the motion, if you’re inclined to go forward with this; after it says, “all or portions of the plats,” add, “and covenants”. It was brought to my attention this afternoon that I failed to include “and covenants” in the motion. The applicant did bring it to my attention and it’s important that we state that in the motion as well. He can explain that in detail if you have any questions about it. But again, this is simply fairly straight forward. The site was zoned for the Planned Unit Development and it does not allow residential uses. The streets, as was stated earlier, streets and easement will go forward to the Town Council, as in the other project that was mentioned
earlier tonight and it’s on next Monday night’s Town Council agenda for consideration as well. With that, I’ll turn it over to Alex Beatty.

Mr. Beatty: I’ll keep this brief; I know we’re here pretty late. For the record, Alex Beatty, offices at 1 American Square Suite 2900, Indianapolis, Indiana. I am an attorney here on behalf of the petitioners, Strategic Capital Partners. As Terry mentioned, we are requesting the vacation of the three subdivisions; Applecreek, Peaceful Acres, and Hilltop Addition. As Terry mentioned, this is part of a larger project that you guys are familiar with and you approved earlier this year, the PUD ordinance for the redevelopment of this corner, or this quadrant of this intersection. And this vacation essentially allows this portion of the property to be developed in consistence with that PUD ordinance. So, that’s the reason for the vacation request. Terry gave really a great summary, so I don’t have much to add but if you have any questions for me, please feel free to ask.

Mr. Smith: This is on the agenda for a public hearing so I will open the floor at this time for anyone from the public to comment concerning Strategic Capital Partners. Hearing none, we’ll close that portion and return to the members of the commission. Any comments or questions? Terry what paragraph was it that you wanted to add the wording?

Mr. Phillip: I’ve got it, Bruce.

Mr. Smith: Oh, you found it?

Mr. Phillip: I’ve got it.

Mr. Smith: Very good.

Mr. Phillip: Mr. President, I’d like to make a motion.

Mr. Smith: Please do.

Mr. Phillip: Here we go, I move that petitions VAC-19-054 Applecreek Subdivision and VAC-19-056 Peaceful Acres filed by Strategic Capital Partners and the Indianapolis Airport Authority to vacate all or portions of the plats and covenants be approved upon the finding that:

1. The conditions in the platted area have changed so as to defeat the original purpose of the plat because:
   The growth of the neighboring Indianapolis International Airport, razing of all the houses that previously occupied the subdivision, and the significant development of Industrial/Warehousing uses in the immediate area, has resulted in the land that makes up this platted subdivision no longer being desirable to single family residential uses or development as was originally intended in 1966, when the plat was recorded.

2. It is in the public interest to vacate all or part of the plat and covenants because:
   The current use limitations within the covenants of the recorded plat and the lot layout with related utility easements prevent the subject property from being
developed consistently with the Town of Plainfield Comprehensive Plan and the recently approved Planned Unit Development.

3. The value of that part of the land in the plat not owned by the Petitioner will not be diminished by vacation because:
The Petitioner owns 100% of the lots within the subdivision to be vacated and will also file petitions with the Town of Plainfield to vacate all public right-of-ways and platted easements within the platted subdivision resulting in an unencumbered parcel ready for development consistent with the Town of Plainfield Comprehensive Plan and the recently approved Planned Unit Development involving the subject property.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Phillip, could I add one...?

Mr. Phillip: Please

Mr. Beatty: ...item and I apologize. Because of the covenant there is a separate statutory standard. Most towns and cities, including the Town of Plainfield, don’t have a form for this when you file. So, in addition for both, because of the covenants, and I apologize Terry, we’ll have to add as well that, “finding that the platted area is within an area needing development, the covenant vacation would promote a recovery of property values in the area and needing redevelopment by allowing or encouraging normal development and occupancy of the platted area”. That is what I sent you from Indiana Code 36-7-4-714a.

Mr. Smith: Terry, you’ve seen this?

Mr. Phillip: Number 4, so moved.

Mr. Smith: All right. As amended, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger:  
  Mr. Phillip- yes  
  Mr. McPhail- yes  
  Mr. Brandgard- yes  
  Mr. Smith- yes  
  Mr. Kirchoff- yes  
  Mr. Slavens- yes

VAC-19-054 and VAC-19-056 are approved.

Mr. Smith: I need another motion for Hilltop.
Mr. Phillip: Give me number 4 and I’ll read it. Mr. Beatty, this is what you have as number 1 on this, correct?

Mr. Beatty: Correct

Mr. Phillip: Okay. I’ll do my best, here we go. I move that petition VAC-19-055 Hill Top Addition filed by Strategic Capital Partners and the Indianapolis Airport Authority to vacate all or portions of the plats be approved, upon the finding that:

1. The conditions in the platted area have changed so as to defeat the original purpose of the plat because:
The growth of the neighboring Indianapolis International Airport, razing of all the houses that previously occupied the subdivision, and the significant development of Industrial/Warehousing uses in the immediate area, has resulted in the land that makes up this platted subdivision no longer being desirable to single family residential uses or development as was originally intended in 1966, when the plat was recorded.

2. It is in the public interest to vacate all or part of the plat and covenants because:
The current use limitations within the covenants of the recorded plat and the lot layout with related utility easements prevent the subject property from being developed consistently with the Town of Plainfield Comprehensive Plan and the recently approved Planned Unit Development.

3. The value of that part of the land in the plat not owned by the Petitioner will not be diminished by vacation because:
The Petitioner owns all but one lot within the subdivision to be vacated. This single lot not owned by the Petitioner will retain direct access to public right-of-ways and utilities and new development of the immediately adjacent land will be designed to accommodate the use of the lot for residential purposes. The Petitioner will also file petitions with the Town of Plainfield to vacate all public right-of-ways and utility easements within the platted subdivision resulting in an unencumbered parcel ready for development consistent with the Town of Plainfield Comprehensive Plan and the recently approved Planned Unit Development involving the subject property.

4. The platted area is within an area needing redevelopment and the covenant vacation would promote a recovery of property values in the area needing redevelopment by allowing or encouraging normal development occupancy of the developed area.

Mr. Slavens: Second

Mr. Kirchoff: You said, “approved/continued”

Mr. Phillip: I did?

Mr. Kirchoff: Yes
Mr. Phillip: I read an awful lot, Bill. I meant, “approved”

Mr. Kirchoff: “Approved,” just so we get it in the record. And I’ll second.

Mr. Smith: All righty, we have a motion and some extra... and a second, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip- yes

Mr. McPhail- yes

Mr. Brandgard- yes

Mr. Smith- yes

Mr. Kirchoff- yes

Mr. Slavens- yes

VAC-19-055 is approved.

Mr. Beatty: Thank you all.

Mr. Smith: Good luck, guys.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Phillip: Tell me you’ve got something good for us, Mr. Berg.

Mr. Berg: I’m just going to let you know that we’re not going to be handing out the future agendas, we’ll be emailing them to you so that you can look at the links. We just noticed that we’ve been finding a lot of them and we’ve been taking them up, you know, taking the stuff up so... Also, everybody gets to sign their autograph today.

Mr. Smith: I might add one small thing; I know from the DRC agenda, tomorrow, that the Barlow building is for next month, for here I presume.

Mr. Berg: Wednesday, Bruce.

Mr. Smith: Wednesday?

Mr. Berg: Yeah, we’re moving it because of the election.

Mr. Smith: Oh, good point, good point. Well, whenever the DRC meets again, and back here next month, that should be an interesting building.

Mr. Daniel: Concerning Walmart, I have emailed a lady whose name I can’t remember, who we’ve been working with, who indicated that she was going to take it to those authorized to sign it. I sent an email reminding her, she said she had a meeting with them shortly thereafter saying this was going to be approved, but I haven’t heard back yet. I have followed up with
another email. Frankly, if we don’t get some response on that, I’ve talked to Terry about the possibility of sending another letter indicating that we enforce a zoning violation.

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you

Mr. Daniel: I got a call from Terry, I think Andrew’s been involved in this to some extent, the discussion about signage on some of these projects in this Town Center District, and more than likely are going to be something our sign ordinance doesn’t provide for. Terry and I have looked at a section in the zoning ordinance authorizing the Plan Commission to set up an alternate procedure for specialized items and I think this meets the requirement to allow the Plan Commission to create procedure which basically set up a hearing officer for just signs that would be in the Town Center District that relates to new development during development, construction allowing the hearing officer to determine size of the sign and the time period that sign would be approved because that will be short term because when a development opens, that sign is gone. So, with the Town’s permission, I will prepare a Resolution because we have to be able to set up a procedure and you will have to determine who the hearing officer would be. And we should also appoint an alternate hearing officer in case number one can’t be available. With your approval and permission, I’ll go ahead and work on that.

Mr. Brandgard: Consent

Mr. Daniel: ...try to get something that works a little better during this development...

Mr. Kirchoff: We’re going to have two here pretty soon.

Mr. Daniel: That will alter the Town Center a great deal.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, yeah

(Consent is given)

Mr. Smith: Anything else for the good of the cause?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Slavens: Move to adjourn

Mr. Smith: We’re adjourned.