

**PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION**

**January 3, 2022**

**6:30 p.m.**

Mr. Bahr: Good evening and welcome to the January 3<sup>rd</sup> Plainfield Plan Commission.

**ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Mr. Bahr: If you would Andrew, call the roll.

Mr. Klinger: We'll start with Ms. Andres.

Ms. Andres: I'm here; I'm sorry I can't be there in person for the first meeting.

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Bahr – here

Mr. Philip – here (virtual)

Mr. McPhail – here

Ms. Giesting – here

Mr. Kirchoff –

Mr. Brandgard – here

All right, we have a quorum present. We have two operating remotely and Mr. Kirchoff gave his regards, he's not able to attend this evening.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mr. Bahr: If you would all please stand and join me in the Pledge.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Bahr: Approval of minutes from December 6, 2021. Is there any discussion/corrections?

Mr. Brandgard: I would move to approve.

Ms. Giesting: I second.

Mr. Klinger:

Ms. Andres – abstain

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

The minutes are approved.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

### **SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBER**

Mr. Bahr: Now we are at a swearing in of a new member. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. Daniel: Thank you. Jennifer, I have the oath here and after we finish with that, we'll leave this with whoever you tell me you'd like to leave it with, and you can sign it later. If you would raise your right hand, please.

(Mr. Daniel swears Jennifer Andres into the Plan Commission)

Mr. Daniel: Congratulations.

Ms. Andres: Thank you

Mr. Daniel: Who would you like for me to leave this with, so you can come in and sign it?

Ms. Andres: If you want to leave it with either Andrew or Kim, I can stop by Town Hall at some point, that'd be fine.

Mr. Daniel: I'll leave it with Andrew.

Mr. Bahr: Welcome Jennifer, you'll make a wonderful addition to the Commission.

Ms. Andres: Thank you

## **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Mr. Bahr: Andrew, we're at our annual election of officers.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, at this point we just need to entertain some motions for nominees. What do we need Kevin, is it just a President and Vice President?

Ms. Giesting: Mr. Bahr, I'd like to nominate you for President.

Mr. McPhail: I would second that nomination.

Mr. Bahr: Andrew?

Mr. Klinger: I think we can do those together, if there's also a motion for Vice President.

Mr. Daniel: Yes

Mr. McPhail: I would Nominate Mary as Vice President.

Mr. Bahr: Second

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Klinger: All right, we'll poll the Board.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

All right, we have President Bahr and Vice President Giesting. Thank you.

## DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Bahr: Design Review Committee Appointments: you'll have to help me there.

Mr. Klinger: I'll turn to Kevin on that.

Mr. Whaley: The Plan Commission needs to appoint someone from its membership to serve as the ex officio member on the DRC. That is a nonvoting position and it's basically your liaison to that committee. That person would attend the meetings and then occasionally report back on the Design Review Committee's recommendations for projects. And then you also need to appoint a full-time citizen member; former Plan Commission member Bruce Smith had expressed an interest in serving on that committee as the full-time citizen member, if you are so inclined to make that appointment.

Mr. McPhail: Bruce has served at that position the past three or four years, so I would certainly nominate him to fill that position if he would like to do so.

Mr. Klinger: Because he served as the Plan Commission member previously, he was an ex officio member and he didn't get to vote, so he would be very eager to be in a position where he can vote.

Mr. Brandgard: Are there any volunteers from the Plan Commission?

Mr. Klinger: So, Kent, that was a motion, in terms of appointing Bruce, right? So, I think that needs a second.

Mr. Brandgard: Oh, okay, I didn't know if you wanted to do it together.

Ms. Giesting: I'll second that.

Mr. Klinger: Okay. And then yeah, is there another member of the Plan Commission willing to participate in those DRC meetings?

Ms. Giesting: Yeah, I'll try that for... how long is a term? A year?

Mr. Klinger: For the Plan Commission member, I think it's annual.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, I'll try it for a year.

Mr. McPhail: I think you'll enjoy it.

Ms. Giesting: Excellent.

Mr. Brandgard: With that, I would nominate Mary Giesting.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Klinger: All right, so we have Mary Giesting and Bruce Smith as nominees to the DRC.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

All right, we're good.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Bahr: All right, public hearings. The public hearings are designed to allow public input regarding the subject matter

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 five (5) minutes or less; 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 at the podium.

## **OATH OF TESTIMONY**

Mr. Bahr: Mr. Daniel, would you administer the Oath?

Mr. Daniel: Yes

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

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Bahr: We have no resolutions. Petition RZ-21-139. Eric?

Mr. Berg: Thank you Mr. President. This is, as you said, RZ-21-139, shorthand calling it the Awale Rezone. Located right off Klondike Road, you can see it right over here, this area in yellow. Part of the property owned by Mr. Awale and his company Royal Transportation; the remnant piece is in this yellow area here to give you kind of an idea of where we're at: Airtech Parkway going east/west along there, Ronald Reagan Parkway north/south, and then Main coming at the southwest to northeast, or northeast to southwest, whichever you prefer. What the applicant has requested is a zone map amendment of about 5 acres from GC and I-2 – there's just a little bit there that's GC. And again, that might be a map error, but we figured it would be better to include it so that there's not any issues at a later date with that. In '19 we had a development plan for the limo part there, and there were some development plan conditions on that, some of which have been fulfilled, some of which have not yet been fulfilled, but could potentially be fulfilled during this. Keeping in mind the words of the Plan Commission President, I am keeping it brief, and I think that's my last slide, yes indeed. So, I will turn this over to Mr. Awale. He's here, I will gladly turn that over to him if there are no questions for me.

Mr. Awale: Hi, my name is Isaac Awale and I own the business Royal Transportation here in Plainfield. We probably see a couple times each other, before this. I own 15 acres down between Ronald Reagan, (inaudible), in the middle over there. I use about a quarter acre of that for my business and I decided to build my residence on 5 acres on the south side of the property; it was connected with the current (inaudible). I thought it was very quiet and it would serve me and my family to still work in my business, even if I have to walk by. Originally I have a plan where I was planning to build a parking lot and after I thinking about it and I see all the environment and all the animals live in those trees, I thought to just build one single house and still leave as much trees as possible and make a road connect to the current dock, it would make more sense to me than to destroy all the trees and put a parking lot. So, I want to change zone, only those 5 acres. And it's walking distance to my business.

Mr. Bahr: Very good. Questions?

Mr. McPhail: Well, I don't have any questions, but you know, I think the applicant has not made his prior commitments on the rezone, that he owes us a tree preservation plan, a connection to Klondike Road. In the meantime, he's built a building that he didn't get permits to build, so I'm inclined to see those things completed before I can consider granting this rezone.

Mr. Awale: Well maybe I can just say one more thing. My plan is to clear up those acres, only three acres in the middle, and to leave at least 2 acres around, still with the trees. So, even if I put a house there it will be no visible for any roads, and it just connect with the current dock. I already have another three house close by, it's been there since 80's and 70's and it's people who live there.

Mr. McPhail: Well, you know, I understand that, but you made a commitment to us, when we rezoned it before, that you would do a tree preservation plan and you haven't done that. There's a requirement you know, and I don't remember the timetable, to connect to Klondike Road. I don't have a problem with what you want to do but I do have a problem with you not meeting prior commitments.

Mr. Brandgard: In regard to that, when were those prior commitments supposed to be accomplished? Since we haven't before, I suspect he's still within his timeline.

Mr. Berg: The road was within two years, and the tree save plan was prior to the improvement location permit for the original building. As you'll remember, that building was not constructed then he came to you and was permitted as a temporary structure.

Mr. Bahr: Eric, being that we have two new members, could you give a brief summary of the project?

Ms. Giesting: Thank you Steve.

Mr. Berg: Of the current project, or the previous project?

Mr. Bahr: Previous project with the commitments that were offered up, and where we're at today.

Mr. Berg: Back in 2019 Mr. Awale came forward to add a building to his site – it would have been up in here. It was going to be a maintenance building for his limo business. During that time the Plan Commission did approve it, and they were looking for a tree save plan, I believe in this area over here, in the northern portion here, to preserve the view coming particularly southbound on Ronald Reagan. The other part was connection to utilities because the maintenance building was probably going to have for instance, vehicle washing, that type of thing, and it was a concern that the existing septic would not be able to handle that type of usage. So, that was another one of the conditions. And then the thought of the connection over here to Klondike because over time the Reagan corridor is going to get a little bit more restricted. And to be honest, the thought on our mind when we suggested this site to Mr.

Awale, was that when the Airtech got connected over here to the airport, that this would be a perfect location to be able to come down and then across. So, that was kind of one of the things that we looked at when we talked to him, when he was originally looking to relocate from Indianapolis. About a year later he came back – actually, we kind of brought him back because there was a building that was constructed without a permit or without approval of the Plan Commission. To be fair, it seems as though he may have been misled by his builder, into believing that a permit was not required, and we worked together with Mr. Awale and the Commission as well, to approve that as a temporary use. I don't recall exactly how long of a timeframe, I think it was one year, and then available for the director to then extend for a period of time. That was a bit more rambling than I'd hoped to give there, so hopefully that was followable.

Ms. Giesting: So, Kevin, the one year has come and gone, is that correct?

Mr. Whaley: (not at microphone) Yeah, the one year marked in December and then given a one year extension.

Ms. Giesting: Okay. And then the plan for the trees, has that been submitted?

Mr. Whaley: (not at microphone) That has not, and as Eric pointed out, the idea behind that requirement was that the current landscaping would form a buffer. The existing trees. The commission requested some sort of a plan showing what would be saved..

Ms. Giesting: Sure, but you don't have that in hand at this time?

Mr. Whaley: No

Ms. Giesting: Okay

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Yes sir?

Mr. Awale: I recently apply, a building permit for my original plan for the garage, and I did all the requirement and planning, waiting for to get my permit to start the construction for my big garage have been approved, for three years ago, for the committee. We make a few change, we take all of the utility out and the carwash, and also reduce the size of the building. I am waiting to get my permit and hire people who do the site plan and everything. So, I'm going that process also on the side, planning to start that project by the spring. The reason I requesting for zone change for this one, because the connection of the current dock, if I been approved to build my house over there, I'm trying take one (inaudible) out, (inaudible) and split it out – one go to my house, and other one go to my business. So, that's the plan I have.

Ms. Giesting: Kevin, is it unreasonable to ask that some of these things could happen before we rezoned this, or ask for rezoning?

Mr. Whaley: So, the Plan Commission's responsibility in this rezone is to make a recommendation to the Town Council. It would offer up that if the condition to provide the tree save plan is an issue, you could potentially offer a favorable recommendation subject to that tree preservation plan being provided before the Council finalizes the ordinance. And then the Council has up to 90 days after that recommendation is certified, to actually take an action on that ordinance.

Mr. Bahr: This is a public hearing. I would ask if anyone opposed or in favor of the project, to approach the podium.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Seeing none, I will close the public meeting and open it up for further discussion.

Mr. McPhail: Kevin, do you want to clarify what I think I heard, that the Council has 90 days? I would certainly think the applicant could be able to put together a preservation plan in 90 days.

Ms. Giesting: So, if that were the case, would – since I'm new – but could we ask that that happen and then he come back? Or do we make a recommendation to the Council, based on having that in hand?

Mr. Whaley: (not at microphone) You're making a recommendation to the Council based upon that condition.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, so that becomes a condition?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Ms. Giesting: Okay, well, I'll make this motion then. I move that the Plan Commission certify the zone map amendment request RZ-21-139, a petition requesting a zone map amendment of 5 acres of land from GC: General Commercial and I2: Office/Warehouse Distribution to R-1: Low Density Residential with a favorable recommendation with the following conditions:

1. Completion of the unresolved conditions from the 2019 Development Plan;
2. Connection to municipal utilities;
3. Other conditions as deemed appropriate by the Plan Commission.

Do we have any other conditions, Kevin, that we should be putting into this motion?

Mr. McPhail: There's a connection there but I don't think a time.

Mr. Brandgard: No, I think the connection that was mentioned, he's going to have to do that before he gets a permit, or as he gets a permit. I think we need to say, completion of the unresolved conditions from the 2019 Development Plan need to be fulfilled before Council gives approval.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. McPhail: I would second that motion.

Mr. Bahr: Very good. Andrew?

Mr. Klinger: Al right, we have a motion and a second.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

RZ-21-139 is approved as read.

Mr. Bahr: Very good. Good luck. DP-21-135 – Hobbs Station. Kevin? Is there a possibility of grouping these?

Mr. Whaley: Can you repeat that?

Mr. Bahr: Is there a possibility of grouping?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, I think what I can do is we can walk through the first two presentations since these projects are all interrelated, that might speed things up a little bit, but if there's any questions along the way, please feel free to interrupt me. The first one that we'll focus on is PP-21-135 – Hobbs Station Mixed Use Primary Plat. This is going to be the first of three plats that we're going to be considering tonight, and again, these are all interrelated. This first plat, the reason it appears first on the agenda is because this actually creates a block which would then be further subdivided by Pulte to develop single-family residential – and we'll get to that here in

just a minute. This first plat is to subdivide approximately 87 acres on the east side of Smith Road, north of Township Line. I think you're all familiar with this project, so we won't spend too much time on it, but this is for Hobbs Station, a mixed-use development. It's highlighted in the teal color on the screen, in the aerial. The area to be subdivided is to the left of the area that's shown with the three industrial buildings that's highlighted in the white, so it's going to be to the left of that. That's the area that includes the mixed-use retail buildings, the multi-family, and the single-family residential, and it's got the buildings shown on the Proposed Concept Plan from the Planned Unit Development which was approved by the Plan Commission and rezoned by the Town Council. So again, this subdivision plat would create Block A, which again would be further subdivided, and that's going to be another plat that will come before you after this plat is considered by the Plan Commission. This highlights the different blocks and lots which would be created by this Primary Plat. Down in the lower left-hand corner you have the blue color showing the proposed office building which would be built in the future; you have the lots above it which would be a mixed-use retail and multi-family buildings. And then you have the green, which is a lot as well; that's the park, which would be a park for this development. And then to the north of that you have the senior housing, as well as multi-family and some townhomes. And so, this primary plat would subdivide all of those lots and blocks which would then come back later as development plans for each specific project. This table just provides the summary of the different lots and blocks that will be created with this primary plat, as well as the acreage that will be associated with each potential land use which again, is a part of the Planned Unit Development which was approved. At this point in time, the applicant is here, so we'll turn it over. They have a presentation to go through, to highlight some of these lots and blocks to be created as part of this primary plat.

Mr. Sheward: Hi, good evening, Brian Sheward with Kimley-Horn Associates. I'm the Civil Engineer on the project, or at least everything other than Block A. My offices are at 250 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 580, Indianapolis. I'll keep this very short. Overview, I think Kevin did a nice job of showing where that's at, as well as the primary plat itself. There's not a whole lot to add. We did get a few comments from staff through the process. Just so everyone understands, we're intending to file the first step in your new development plan process; we just called a Conceptual Plan filing on Thursday, and that's for the mixed-use building that's on Lot 1. So, if you're looking at the screen, it's the piece that sits right here where the hand is. We're also moving forward actively with the design of the industrial buildings, which I think Kevin will speak to, here shortly, as well as Station Drive, which is the main east/west drive through the development, and then two of the roads here. There's King Street – I think these names are pending finalization – and then another street connecting these two together. It may seem that this is (inaudible) out; it's really not intended to, it's all going to be built at the same time, it's going through the process at the same time, but due to ownerships and whatnot, we've got it split into three different primary plats. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

(Brief pause)

Mr. McPhail: So, this is a plat for the single-family, the one lot of multifamily, and the one industrial? Is that correct?

Mr. Sheward: We show the single-family as Block A, and then Banning and Lance and Steve, they took Block A and platted Block A. Hopefully it's not too confusing, but the intent is to plot everything in Hobbs Station and what we're calling Terminus at Hobbs Station, which is the industrial portion to the east. It just happens to be in three different Primary Plats.

Mr. Bahr: Excellent

Mr. Sheward: Thank you

Mr. Bahr: This is a public hearing. I would entertain any comments opposing or in favor of the project.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and open up for discussion.

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: (microphone not on) The staff report notes that they concerned about the traffic down there? Is that correct? (

Mr. Whaley: Are you looking specifically at the transportation section report?

Ms. Giesting: (microphone not on) I'm looking at the third paragraph.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, that relates to the access to – I want to say Lot 1. Is that Lot 1, on the corner where Smith and Perry...? Is that what she's referring to?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, and I think that was Scott Singleton's comment, if Scott wants to address that.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, is Scott here?

Ms. Giesting: Sorry Scott.

Mr. Klinger: Do you want to address that?

Mr. Singleton: It's no problem, I'm happy to address it. Yeah, so back when the PUD came through, that corner area did not indicate any access either to Station Drive or Smith Road. It is generally desirable for us to look for roads like those are, to be intersected by local streets more than direct access drives, to a commercial property, particularly as you get closer to an intersection that is an arterial roadway like Perry Road and Township Line Road. So, from that

standpoint, those were what my comments were. So, in that context we did ask the developer/petitioner to contact A&F engineering to do some supplemental review of those drives...

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Singleton: ...to make sure that they did not create a traffic concern beyond what the original scope of the traffic study they filed with the PUD zoning, and their response was that they did not see, even with knowing some future development we are expecting to occur on the west side of Smith, their opinion was that it would not create a negative impact on the overall traffic in the area, by adding those two drives there. So, it really is a value to that corner site, to be able to develop with those access points. So, we're not indicating that it's going to be a concern but it's a variance from what originally was reviewed and approved, and it does represent kind of not an ideal situation where we would like it to be. So, that's where those comments were made, to make sure you guys – brought that to your attention. And you're welcome to ask any questions of the petitioner. I'm happy to respond where I can but they've looked at that more than I have.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, thank you Scott.

Mr. Singleton: You're welcome.

Mr. Klinger: I referred to that as Lot 1; it is actually Lot 2, just for the record.

Mr. Bahr: Any additional discussion?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: I'd entertain a motion.

Ms. Giesting: So, this would be Motion 1 – did you say we were going to do them all together?

Mr. Daniel: Mr. President, before you go forward with the motion, something I wondered about was referring to page 3, Condition 2 on the Sanitary Sewer: it indicates that obtaining the offsite easements or an alternate sewer route which does not require offsite easements must be a condition of primary approval. And I may be missing this Kevin, but I don't see that in the conditions in the motion.

Mr. Klinger: We would need some language included in the motion then.

Mr. Bahr: So, we would need language to correct that motion?

Mr. Daniel: I didn't understand what Kevin said.

Mr. Klinger: He was agreeing with you; it's not in the motion as it's written.

Mr. Daniel: Oh, okay. So, it should be a further condition of the approval, yes.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Brandgard: That was the Primary Plat?

Mr. McPhail: Can we get that back up – with the ABC's and 123's up there – I want to make sure what I'm looking at.

Mr. Klinger: There we go.

Mr. McPhail: So, the first petition is for Block A only, right?

Mr. Klinger: No, it's to create this whole...

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, everything you see on the screen here, except for the white box which is the industrial. That's going to be a separate plat.

Mr. McPhail: Okay

Mr. Whaley: So, this is the PUD zoned property, whereas the industrial is zoned I-2.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Klinger: And then there's an additional petition on the agenda that addresses Block A separately. Is that right?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, so the sequence of this is, if you approve the primary plat for this subdivision, that will create Block A, and then Block A would be further subdivided by Pulte into single-family lots.

Mr. McPhail: Okay

Mr. Whaley: And that's another plat that's going to come through.

Mr. Brandgard: Mel, I will do the motion but when we come to the additional words, if you would provide them.

Mr. Daniel: Well, I think I can help you out with that. If you will – do you have page 3 available there, Robin?

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Daniel: You just need to read that last sentence out as Condition 4. In numerical paragraph 2, under Sanitary Sewer, if you would just take that last sentence and put it as the fourth condition of the approval.

Mr. Brandgard: Okay. Is that under the Primary or the – we have waivers and...

Mr. Daniel: Right, that's Motion 2, right?

Mr. Brandgard: Right. Motion 1 is the Primary Plat Waivers. I move that the Plan Commission approve waivers to the Subdivision Regulations to allow the development to be subdivided in concordance with the approved Planned Unit Development finding that:

1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare, or injurious to other property;
2. The conditions upon which the requests for the waivers are based are unique to the property for which a waiver is sought and are not applicable generally to other property;
3. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations is carried out; and
4. The waivers will not contravene the provisions of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Philip: Second

Mr. Bahr: We have a motion and a second.

Mr. Klinger: All right, I'll poll the board.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

Motion for the waivers is carried.

Mr. Brandgard: Motion 2 is Primary Plat. I move that the Plan Commission approve PP-21-135 as filed by Hobbs Station MU Multifamily QOZB LLC to create a four (4) lot and three (3) block subdivision on approximately 86.84 acres finding that:

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.

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

1. Compliance with the Town Standards, including but not limited to the following Chapters of the Plainfield Town Code;
  - Chapter 51: General Sewer Use and Wastewater Pretreatment • Chapter 52: Water Regulations;
  - Chapter 55: Drainage;
  - Chapter 56: Storm Water;
  - Chapter 93.15: Access to Public Streets and Thoroughfares;
  - Chapter 152: Flood Hazard Reduction; and,
  - Chapter 154: Subdivision Control Ordinance
2. Substantial compliance with the primary plat file dated January 3, 2022.
3. Any additional waivers to the Subdivision Regulations beyond what is shown in the approved primary plat file will be at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Zoning.
4. Lot 2 may need to be may need to be served with Sanitary Sewer at the southwest corner of Lot 2. If the Grundy Farm develops prior to Lot 2, additional service options may exist for Lot 2 to the west.

Mr. McPhail: I will second.

Mr. Whaley: Mel, you wanted the paragraph above, didn't you?

Mr. Daniel: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: You want the paragraph above?

Mr. Daniel: Right

Mr. Brandgard: I thought you said last sentence, sorry.

Mr. Daniel: On paragraph number 2, Robin.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Daniel: Second sentence that starts, "Obtaining"

Mr. Brandgard: Okay

Mr. Daniel: And then where it says, "Offsite easements", stop right there.

Mr. Brandgard: Gotcha

Mr. Daniel: All right

Mr. Brandgard: Okay, remove item 4 that I just read, and we'll add a new item 4.

4. Obtaining the offsite easements or an alternate sewer route which does not require offsite easements.

Mr. Daniel: That's it.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion and a second, very good job. Andrew?

Mr. Klinger: All right, we'll poll the board.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

PP-21-135 is approved.

Mr. Brandgard: Mel, thank you.

Mr. Daniel: You're welcome.

Mr. Whaley: Moving onto PP-21-132 – Terminus at Hobbs Station Primary Plat. This is going to be the primary plat for the industrial portion of the project. You're looking at approximately 50 acres, located just to the east of the site that you passed a primary plat on of the mixed-use portion of Hobbs Station. This plat would be to subdivide the existing tract of land. As you can see, highlighted on the screen in teal, it has split zoning between I-2 and GC which is General Commercial. It's going to essentially follow that district boundary for those zoning classifications and subdivide it as shown on screen. The area highlighted in purple would be Lot 1 and it would be approximately 30 acres. The petitioner would use this property to develop the two industrial buildings and the industrial flex building which we've shown as a part of the rezone petition. The residual acreage to the east and highlighted in red would be owned by Adesa and would be a separate lot. This shows the concept plan which was provided at the rezone hearing for the I-2 industrial piece. Again, there were restrictions, limitations offered by the developer on the size and number of buildings that would be located on the site. No building would be larger than 300,000 square feet, and the total industrial buildings would not exceed 500,000 square feet. And then again, there's the industrial flex building to the south, of approximately 40,000 square feet. One thing I did want to point out, in the staff report we did kind of highlight a conversation we had with the applicant about some potential issues that could be created by having all three buildings on a single site, under single ownership; the petitioner did decide to go ahead and move forward with that. That is something that is permissible under the zoning ordinance; you can have more than one industrial building. This would essentially be considered an integrated center, and from our conversations it sounds like they intend to hold this property for quite some time, but we did just want to make you aware of that conversation that we did have with the applicant. As a result of that, we did ask that a condition be placed on the approval, if you decide to approve, that some language would be added to the plat, just reaffirming that any further subdivision of the property would have to follow the Subdivision Control Ordinance. With that, again Brian Sheward is here and can talk more about the project.

Mr. Sheward: So, again, Kevin, I'll let him pull up the slide really quick. This is, as he said, just east of the primary plat we were just looking at. One point of – not clarification but maybe emphasis – the red portion that you saw which is the Adesa parcel, we're not proposing to do anything different with that. No modifications, it was requested by staff to include because of the previous splitting of the lot; prior to my time, I think prior to staff time, but in any event, they asked us to loop that in because it may have been subdivided outside of a primary plat process. So, we've looped it in, we're officially splitting it via primary plat, and that's kind of why the Adesa piece is even a part of this at all. We're not proposing anything different with that. Again, the site is located just east of the PUD portion of the site. Just to highlight a few

things, we do have one lot. The zoning graphic that was pulled up there almost exactly – I guess I would feel comfortable saying exactly that, is going to be submitted on Thursday, same building square footages, plus or minus layout. Everything is pretty much exactly the same, and we're submitting for development plan, the beginnings of that, this Thursday. The applicant does envision to keep the lots, or the one lot with both buildings under the same ownership, so we didn't see a need to split it into multiple lots, but we did have quite a few conversations with staff about that and it is understood that if in the future it were to be desired to be split, there would be a process and we would have to follow all the rules at that point too. So, that's not lost on us, we just have no intent to have multiple lots at this time, so we kept it as one. One thing is, Station Drive shown there on the bottom of the screen, that will connect all the way over to essentially Smith or Perry, before it approaches the roundabout that you saw in the previous primary plat, and then this will connect there at what is currently a dead-end street on the southeast corner right here. So, that will create a continuous linkage between this road that is the frontage to Adesa. Again, if there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. This being a public hearing I would ask anyone in favor or against the project to step forward.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Gath: My name is Arnold Gath, I live at 191 Williams Trace, kind of the thorn in the town's side because we're right on the railroad tracks. My concern is, right now with building those warehouses, those semis are going to go down to the roundabout and then they're going to be on Smith Road, which right now is 5 ton, and we already have semis going up and down this road at 80,000 pounds. So, we're overweight, we're going to be listening to J Brakes and all this other stuff while this is going on, or can they go some way up to Ronald Reagan and around to go to the warehouses north. So, that's my main concern there. Smith Road is not made to handle these semis as it is now, and if you've ever encountered any on the roundabout, it's crazy because they need a wide berth to go through there. Somebody not paying attention in a car could easily get ran over, which I almost did once. So, that's my main concern.

Mr. Bahr: If you would, put your name and address. Thank you. Any other comments?

(Brief pause)

Mr. McPhail: I don't have a question. I don't believe that gentleman was sworn in.

Mr. Daniel: Stand and raise your right hand.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Bahr: Thank you Kent.

Mr. McPhail: I'd ask Scott to address this issue because we've worked really hard to try and eliminate truck traffic.

Mr. Klinger: Do you want to go ahead and close the hearing before we go down that road?

Mr. Bahr: Yeah, seeing that there are comments, at this time we'll close the public hearing. Scott?

Mr. Singleton: Yes, thank you, and I'm happy to acknowledge Mr. Gast's – well, not happy to acknowledge it, but he brings up an important issue and we do recognize that it's a challenge with the AllPoints Business Park being on Bradford Road, and being partially on either side of Smith Road once you get north. We do know that the existing Smith Road is creating a cut through that is restricted to truck traffic but is used inadvertently. The connection to Station Drive over to the existing Adesa Street, over to Perry, we did talk about this as part of the PUD planning. That stretch, once you get west of the industrial developed land, is going to be more of a boulevard design with a narrower radius on the streets, to try and send a signal that this is not intended for truck traffic. It does have businesses that are going to be fronted in that mixed-use development, so it is going to accommodate truck traffic, it needs to, but the desire is to incentivize and to push that truck traffic over to Klondike Road, to come down Adesa. We'll try to do some of that through signings, as part of the road planning, as well as some of those design features of the road itself. We are, as a staff, looking at other methods to help curb the truck traffic that wants to use Smith Road, both for folks that live up in Westmere and the west side of Smith, as well as this area that's going to continue to grow right through here. We do think the growth will kind of be a signal to the trucks that they're heading into the wrong direction, but unfortunately a lot of times – the signs are prevalent, the truckers acknowledge that they saw the sign, but they choose to follow the shortest route to get their deliveries, and it's what their GPS is telling them. So, it is an issue that we're challenged with, but we think that we're doing what we can in this area to at least curb that abuse further, but I certainly can't stand up here and say that it's not a legitimate concern.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. Questions, discussion?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: I'd entertain a motion.

Ms. Giesting: I move that the Plan Commission approve PP-21-132 as filed by Hobbs Station Industrial QOZB LLC to create a two (2) lot subdivision on approximately 50.21 acres finding that:

1. Adequate provisions 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.

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

1. Compliance with the Town Standards, including but not limited to the following Chapters of the Plainfield Town Code;
  - Chapter 51: General Sewer Use and Wastewater Pretreatment
  - Chapter 52: Water Regulations;
  - Chapter 55: Drainage;
  - Chapter 56: Storm Water;
  - Chapter 93.15: Access to Public Streets and Thoroughfares;
  - Chapter 152: Flood Hazard Reduction; and,
  - Chapter 153: Subdivision Control Ordinance.
2. Substantial compliance with the primary plat file dated January 3, 2022.
3. The Secondary Plat shall include an additional note reiterating the obligation for any future subdivision to be in compliance with the Town of Plainfield's Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion and a second. Andrew?

Mr. Klinger:

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

PP-21-132 is approved.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. Eric?

Mr. Berg: This is for the single-family or Block A. It's – well, you know where it's located; we went through two plats on this. We're looking at Block A in the orange area here. They are proposing to start with Phase 1, moving on to Phase 2 on the northwest side, and then eventually Phase 3. The reason that this has to go after the first one is because without the mixed use, there's no way to get here. So, it's kind of rational why this one will go at least second, or last. We made a comment about addressing in the staff report, that's because of these areas here in red that don't have a street that they front or back up upon. And this isn't a slam or anything like that about the applicant, we just have not faced this type of development, so that's another reason we asked for a little bit of latitude with the waivers, so as these issues kind of come up we can work with the applicant to address them. We did note a couple of labeling areas here. The one at the bottom there, that did get corrected, but we still have some minor things to clean up for the secondary plat. And again, keeping it as short as possible, that's all I have as far as pictures and pithy descriptions. So, if there are no further questions for me, I will sit down and let Mr. Ferrell from Banning speak.

Mr. Bahr: Very good

Mr. Ferrell: Good evening, Lance Ferrell, Banning Engineering, 853 Columbia Road, here in Plainfield. My grandmother always told me to save the best for last, so hopefully this works. We're here tonight as the tail end of all of this, to subdivide what was the gray area, Block A, 45.6 acres basically, into eventually 242 lots, residential lots. I worked with Eric and staff on the street names, and so on and so forth. I don't think there's anything left over that is outstanding, that we can't get through with the process of filing the secondary, and construction plans, and so on and so forth. We've worked simultaneously with Kimley-Horn, so everything kind of goes together with that. I'm here to answer any questions you guys have.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. Being a public hearing, at this time we would open it for anyone who would like to address the Commission, in favor or against the project.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Seeing none, I'll close the public...

Mr. Whaley: We did have one comment that was submitted.

Mr. Bahr: I'm sorry?

Mr. Whaley: We did have one comment that was submitted online earlier today, and I thought I would share this with you all. I don't know if you had a chance to see it yet or not. Greg Miller who lives at 3370 Keystone Pass, submitted a comment regarding this project. He had two comments actually. The first one says, "Gold star for designing a neighborhood not dependent upon cul-de-sacs. Plainfield need far fewer cul-de-sacs and more streets that actually connect

to other streets.” And then a second comment, “Would greatly appreciate some provision for extending Vandalia Trail further east, south of this plat.” Which as you all know, is included as part of this project.

Mr. Bahr: Both the comments were from Mr. Miller?

Mr. Whaley: Yes

Mr. Bahr: Now at this point I’d like to close the public hearing and open it up for the Commission.

Mr. McPhail: I don’t think there's any cul-de-sacs in that thing.

Mr. Brandgard: That’s what he said, it’s time we had one without any.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, I think he was complimenting the fact that there are no cul-de-sacs in the development.

Mr. McPhail: Oh, okay.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: I would entertain a motion.

Mr. Daniel: Before you do that, we need to see if we need to add that condition language that we put in the other one. Hang on just a moment – and the answer is yes...

Mr. Bahr: See Mel, that’s exactly why I like you sitting up here.

Mr. Daniel: Okay

Mr. Bahr: We’ll fix that next month.

Ms. Giesting: That would go as Motion 2?

Mr. Daniel: I’m sorry?

Ms. Giesting: That would go as an additional...

Mr. Daniel: As a condition, yes. And in this one – one page 2 where it says, “Sanitary Sewer, a:” then in the last sentence, except we would stop where it says, “offsite easement”.

Ms. Giesting: All right, here we go. Motion 1: I move that the Plan Commission approve waiver(s) to the Subdivision Regulations to allow the development to be subdivided in concordance with the approved Planned Unit Development the finding that:

1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare, or injurious to other property;
2. The conditions upon which the requests for the waivers are based are unique to the property for which waivers are sought and are not applicable generally to other property;
3. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would not result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations are carried out; and,
4. The waivers will not contravene the provisions of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Klinger: I think under number 3, did you mean to say, "would result"?

Ms. Giesting: Would result, yes, thank you.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion, and a second by Robin.

Mr. Klinger:	Ms. Andres – yes
	Mr. Bahr – yes
	Mr. Philip– yes
	Ms. Giesting– yes
	Mr. McPhail– yes
	Mr. Brandgard– yes

Waivers are approved.

Ms. Giesting: Al right, Motion 2: I move that the Plan Commission approve PP-21-133 to create a 242-lot residential subdivision on approximately 45.598 acres finding that:

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.

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

1. Compliance with the Town Standards, including but not limited to the following Chapters of the Plainfield Town Code;
  - Chapter 51: General Sewer Use and Wastewater Pretreatment
  - Chapter 52: Water Regulations;
  - Chapter 55: Drainage;
  - Chapter 56: Storm Water;
  - Chapter 93.15: Access to Public Streets and Thoroughfares;
  - Chapter 152: Flood Hazard Reduction; and,
  - Chapter 153: Subdivision Control Ordinance
2. Substantial compliance with the primary plat file dated January 3, 2022.
3. Any additional waivers to the Subdivision Regulations beyond what is shown in the approved primary plat file will be at the discretion of the Director of Planning and Zoning.
4. Obtaining the offsite easements or an alternate sewer route which does not require offsite easements.

Mr. Brandgard: I second.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion and a second.

Mr. Klinger: I'll poll the board.

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Philip– yes

Ms. Giesting– yes

Mr. McPhail– yes

Mr. Brandgard– yes

PP-21-133 is approved.

Mr. Bahr: Ver good. Good luck gentlemen.

### **PLAN COMMISSON DISCUSSION**

Mr. Bahr: any other discussion amongst the Commission?

Mr. Whaley: I just have one other thing, and hopefully I will get the name right. We have a new Plan Commission member, Jennifer Andres. She's here with us tonight and I just wanted to give her an opportunity to introduce herself and offer any comments that she might have.

Ms. Andres: Well, thank you. So, it's great to be with you. Again, sorry I can't be with you in person but I'm keeping my germs at home. So, I have previously served on the Redevelopment Commission and I'm excited to join the Plan Commission now. Of course, I live in Plainfield. I've got four kids. My oldest is a freshman and I have a middle schooler, and then two elementary school kids. I'm just excited to get more engaged with the planning process that happens within town. So, thank you for allowing me to join.

Mr. Bahr: We're very fortunate that you're a part of it.

Ms. Giesting: I promise I'll turn on my mic more often for you Jennifer.

Mr. Bahr: Very good. Any other discussion Kevin?

Mr. Whaley: No

### **ADJOURN**

Mr. Brandgard: I would move to adjourn.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Bahr: So be it.

DocuSigned by:  
  
7F4D64129B54495...  
Plan Commission President

DocuSigned by:  
  
965ABE261770450...  
Plan Commission Secretary