

**PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION**

**January 5, 2023**

**6:30 p.m.**

Ms. Andres: Good evening. Thank you all for being here today. We will call the Plainfield Plan Commission meeting to order.

**ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Ms. Andres: First off, we'll have a roll call please.

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Phillip is not here; he was not able to make it.

Mr. Everling – yes sir

Mr. McPhail – here

Mr. Kirchoff – here

Mr. Brandgard – here

Ms. Andres – here

And Mr. Bahr, also not able to attend but we do have a quorum for doing business.

Ms. Andres: Thank you Andrew.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Ms. Andres: If everyone will please rise, we'll say the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Andres: Alright, next up we have some minutes provided to us. Are there any comments or changes? If not, I'll have a motion to approve.

Mr. Kirchoff: I would move we approve the minutes for both November 22<sup>nd</sup> and December 5<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Everling: I'll second that.

Ms. Andres: First and second; all those in favor please say aye.

(All ayes)

Ms. Andres: Any opposed?

(inaudible)

Ms. Andres: Okay, thank you.

## **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Ms. Andres: I understand we have a special guest with us today. Mr. Klinger, do you want to introduce?

Mr. Klinger: Yes, so we do have a new staff member, replacing Todd Cook as the Director of Economic Development. We have Alyssa Woolard who is here this evening. I'll give her a minute to introduce herself.

Ms. Woolard: Hi, my name is Alyssa Woolard. I have my master's degree in business administration; I have about two years' experience in Economic Development. I'm originally from Hendricks County so I'm excited to be back here. I came back here from Madison, the city of Madison, and that's where I learned a lot of the skill sets I have now. So, I'm really excited to get started and grow and learn here in Plainfield.

Ms. Andres: Welcome aboard.

Ms. Woolard: Thank you

Ms. Andres: Thank you. Next on our agenda we have election of officers. Anyone want to...?

Mr. Kirchoff: (microphone not on) (inaudible) I would move (inaudible) current officers (inaudible).

Mr. Brandgard: I would second that.

Ms. Andres: Alright. Do we want to do a roll call for that Andrew, or just voice vote?

Mr. Klinger: Voice vote

Ms. Andres: Voice vote, alright. All those in favor please say aye.

(All ayes)

Ms. Andres: Any opposed?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: Great

### **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT**

Ms. Andres: Then the Design Review Committee appointment. That's me, right?

Mr. Klinger: Yes, if you are so willing, that would be you.

Mr. Whaley: Yes, so Steve Craney and (inaudible), their terms expired this past year, 2022, so they're up for reappointment to the DRC. You also need to appoint someone from the Plan Commission membership to the Design Review Committee to serve as the ex-officio member and chair the committee. And I believe that Jennifer has indicated that she's willing to serve in that position, but I'll let her speak for herself.

Ms. Andres: I would be willing to so serve if no one else desires to serve.

Mr. McPhail: I would move that we approve reappointing the other two and Jennifer.

Mr. Everling: I'll second that.

Ms. Andres: Okay, all those in favor please say aye.

(All ayes)

Ms. Andres: Any opposed? Thank you.

### **GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Ms. Andres: Alright we will move on then to our regular agenda. We will have some public hearings for this evening so if you plan to testify will you please stand, and we'll administer the Oath of Testimony. Oh, before, do you want me to read the guidelines?

Mr. Daniel: You can.

Ms. Andres: The guidelines for our meeting today:

1. The proceedings are recorded for public record; 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 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 the same position.
4. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the sheet provided by the Plan Commission Secretary to ensure the official record reflects your appropriate name and address.

## **OATH OF TESTIMONY**

Ms. Andres: Thank you, now if you would...

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

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Ms. Andres: First up on our agenda we have RZ-22-091 – The Lakhan Rezone.

Mr. Berg: The applicant has requested a continuance on this. When the notices were supposed to go out, they were quite under the weather and could not get them out. We usually get them to them about a week early so that if something like this happens, they have extra time, but even that was not enough. So, they've requested a continuance to the February meeting.

Ms. Andres: Great, thank you Eric.

Mr. Brandgard: I would move to approve.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Ms. Andres: We have a first and second. Do you want to do a roll Andrew?

Mr. Klinger: Sure

Mr. Everling – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Ms. Andres – yes

The motion to continue is approved.

Ms. Andres: Thank you. Next on our docket we have PUD-22-095 – The Hobbs Station Sign Package.

Mr. Berg: I'm sure you're all very familiar with where this is located, in the northeast corner of the Smith Road roundabout. They are seeking today to amend their Planned Unit Development of the approval of a sign package. As you probably remember, that was one thing that was outstanding from the original Planned Unit Development. This has been through staff and has been through Design Review Committee, and largely has been viewed favorably. The Design Review Committee did request that the rooftop sign on several of the buildings be removed. And then we have noted as staff that that has happened. And they did also talk about the placement of the sign there – as you can see, with the blue arrow, roughly adjacent to the Tractor Supply. Kent, as you know, was the representative from this board to the DRC, and I will defer any comments that he wants to make from the membership to him. If there are not comments or questions for me, I'll sit down and defer to Kent.

Mr. McPhail: Well, the DRC had some pretty in-depth discussions and they felt that the location of the monument sign should be closer to the project itself. They have it located there clear up by the Tractor Supply building. You know, signs have been the biggest issue we've dealt with since I've been involved with the Plan Commission, from day one. You know, I do try to look at both sides of this thing and go through the narrative, and I did that today on their submittal. They've indicated that they want that sign in that location for visibility from Perry Road and from U.S. 40. If you look through the details they sent us, they showed some photographs from coming up Perry Road. You could see it going north on Perry Road, south of U.S. 40, right, south of Main

Street. And then they had some views from the corner of Perry and Main Street, and you could see the sign there; obviously not visible if it's moved where DRC recommended that they put it. I think that's probably the biggest issue we still have outstanding from a DRC standpoint. I went out there today and took another look at it and you know, I understand the views that they've shown. My biggest concern is, at this point in time – when I went back and looked at our Beacon site, I'm not sure where your property line is. I know you've got a drawing in here that shows that, but Beacon shows your property line at about the north end of the Tractor Supply building and not the south end. I don't know how accurate that is and I don't know how accurate the survey is, but the farther south you get, the less depth you've got, and I don't know where the right-of-way is there. So, I don't know if – you know, I guess I'm in a position to probably support you locating that thing there as long as it's out of the right-of-way and on your property, but I don't know how to clarify that. I copied some of the stuff from Beacon to look at, but I don't really know – and looking at your drawings, I really can't tell – I think it's showing the property line. Is this, has that been surveyed and detailed and all that...?

Mr. Kirchoff: Isn't that in their packet

Mr. McPhail: ...where the right-of-way is and all that?

Mr. Kirchoff: It looks like a (inaudible) in the packet that shows it may be.

Mr. McPhail: I'm sorry?

Mr. Kirchoff: It's way back in their package – page 60 in their package – it looks like they show some property lines that go south.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Ms. Andres: Is your concern Kent that the Beacon line wasn't the same as they're showing?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah. And Beacon is not always accurate where they draw the line. Believe me, I'm not (inaudible), but I don't even know where the right-of-way line is up through there. And I took a photograph standing at about that location today, and there's not a lot of width there. So, I just want to make sure we don't get a sign put someplace that somebody could come along one of these days and say that's not on your property.

Ms. Andres: Okay, are we ready for the petitioner to come up and...

Mr. McPhail: Oh, yeah.

Ms. Andres: Please do.

Mr. Bamgbose: Isaac Bamgbose, New City Development, 350 Mass Ave, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. Good to be with you all again tonight. Thank you, Kent, for that summary. We do have

surveys that show – we picked up, as part of our acquisition, that land. And some of the work that we've done with staff on the plat side of things – Eric will hand out a few of our packets here – but just to answer your question, we have that triangle that – it's a little bit of an odd showing triangle showing on Beacon, but the surveyors actually went out and captured that. So, we're keeping it just south of the point and where there's enough land within our lot to be able to place that signage, so that it's within the property. But we'll agree to make sure that that is the case, and it's not in the right-of-way or on others...

Mr. Klinger: Just as I'm looking at Beacon right now, there's a missing, essentially a missing parcel – so, that would essentially be a triangle that Isaac's speaking of. So, as long as your surveys reflect that it exists and that you own it... I think there's an error with Beacon, is the problem here.

Mr. McPhail: Oh, I'm sure it probably is but you know, where you're at is pretty tight and the further south you get it gets narrower, and I don't know how much right-of-way is there. Right-of-way usually goes about what, five feet behind the sidewalk or something like that?

(inaudible)

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, so I'm guessing that there's enough room there if your drawings are correct.

Mr. Bamgbose: Yeah, absolutely. So, we kept it off the very edge and it was about over twenty feet once you get past the very corner of the triangle there on the survey.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Bamgbose: And so, we're in agreement.

Mr. McPhail: The DRC did recommend that it be placed farther north.

Mr. Bamgbose: Yeah. Well, I'll be quick then with this presentation that we have here. You know, we've gone through a few things as it relates to being able to work with the staff...

(Technical difficulties with presentation)

Ms. Andres: While we wait for that, Kent, maybe if I could ask you a clarifying question. In the staff report it talked about there was a concern with the DRC about the roof sign.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Ms. Andres: And they've taken it out of the submittal but it's still in the ordinance. Was the concern just that it was presented originally – or can you maybe help me understand what the DRC's comments were with that?

Mr. McPhail: I think the DRC recommendation is that there be no rooftop signs.

Ms. Andres: Okay

Mr. McPhail: You know, over the years we've as a community we've said we don't want rooftop signs. I personally don't see any value in rooftop signs for this development. I would recommend it be taken out of the language of the PUD also.

Mr. Bamgbose: Alright, so it looks like we're back on. So, just kind of running through a few of the items here as it relates to the overall presentation here for the signage package. What we've got here is simply just a little bit of a recap and summary as it relates to the overall project. One of the pieces that I'm excited to show – and this is even just a little bit dated – is a drone shot of the site as the progress of the infrastructure work is commencing. You can see that the ponds are forming and have been laid and are filling up. You can see the path for the mixed-use building, that's the kind of gray area. So, you can see the site kind of start to take shape which is really exciting, and I wanted to share that here real quick. The ordinance, as Kent has referred to, is what we are also talking about from the signage package standpoint as it relates to the overall site. So, the team has worked in tandem here with the staff and created a really robust package that again, we've gone through a number of iterations on. And so, just kind of showing a few of the excerpts and details – whether it's with regards to the building signs, whether it regards to the street signs, whether it's regards to even temporary signage, but a lot of detail has gone into the signage package that has been presented here to the DRC and now to this body as well. So, some of the changes that we've made already are listed here. I'm not going to run through all seven of these but it's in the packet as well, so you can reference those. And then additionally, we are eliminating the rooftop signage. And as far as it goes to the PUD, we are amicable to eliminating it from the PUD as well. I think through conversations, we're in agreement as it relates to the necessity not being there for this project. We view it in different ways as it relates to where you use it and how you use it. It is really key in different – as far as being key to part of the architecture – but here with how we're building this project we really don't think that, moving forward at least, it's as important to the architectural design of what we're creating. So, we indicated that since the DRC, with our package. And then the other part of what we've done as well – through this whole process – you can see on screen, these are some of our formal monument signs that were much taller, much wider, and we've adjusted to what is being talked about here today. Part of what we've also done since the DRC too, is reduce the width of the sign. So, part of the concern with where it's located, being closer to Tractor Supply and trying to get that visibility from U.S. 40. Because that's really where we have that traffic count on some of these studies too, as it relates to where those vehicle per day are really going to be that help us draw folks – again, the project is going to be visible in many ways, but at the same time, as you think about what's visible beyond just the structures of the multi-family and the office, things of that nature, we really need to pull people to that retail. We've got some great momentum with some of the retail that we've, even to date, that we've been able to sign up with the project not even being out of the ground yet. So, we want to make sure that we're taking care of those folks that we're signing up. So, that being said, we have reduced the width – that was one of the recommendations from the DRC as well. So, we've gone from a 14 foot wide sign to a 12 foot wide sign, while also trying to keep the proportions correct. And then just a quality comparison,



everything that we've done with this project, as this body knows, is about quality and is about elevating standards. And so, we feel really excited about what we're presenting here in terms of the mark it's going to set once it's up. And then again, just looking at what we're talking about when it comes to U.S. 40 and what we're trying to do, just comparing and wanting to approach this from an approach in terms of fairness of what we're dealing with from just a visibility standpoint. Again, going to the comment on the overall site – this triangle here is a part of our overall site. So, we purchased that when we purchased the land for this project. And so, we're staying off of the corner because it gets really, really thin over there. So, we're kind of slightly in an area that allows us to have the appropriate width of the sign. Looking at this slide, this is kind of the meat and potatoes of this piece of the discussion where we're looking at almost 1,000 feet, or a little over 1,000 feet of distance from the retail that sits on our Phase 1 project. If you look at some of the comparisons of when people are actually on U.S. 40, and when you think about Perry Crossing being right on U.S. 40, and those distances being either similar or slightly less, and yet they have that direct visibility. So, we know we're not going after direct visibility on U.S. 40 we would love to have direct visibility on U.S. 40, but that's just not a luxury we have at this point. So, we're going for what's best next up in that regard, and we still have some distance in there. So, these are some of those views that Mr. McPhail was referring to, just kind of showing as you head up from U.S. 40. You get that visibility again where it's just a little off of the corner – and the same being from the very intersection itself. This is just showing a little bit of the traffic counts that I was referring to; this is per day. And you can see again why everyone wants to have the sort of visibility from U.S. 40. The traffic counts right there are much more on Smith and Perry, right before it turns into Smith. And obviously we think our project is going to route more traffic as it relates to our front door with Station Boulevard. But again, getting folks there in the first place is a key. And so, these are just some views from U.S. 40 as you go along the east and showing how you really can't see our project from that street because of all the retail that sits along U.S. 40 there as well. So, just some of the reasons why at the end of the day it's important to us to really be able to get – at minimum – that concession there as it relates to working with you guys to get the positioning along our property line there. Happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Andres: Any questions from Commission members? Just curious, I don't recall having been out there? Where is the Tractor Supply sign? Is it in front of the building? It's not along the road – I'm trying to remember.

Mr. Bamgbose: It's right on U.S. 40 actually.

Ms. Andres: It is, okay.

Mr. Bamgbose: It would essentially be over here.

Ms. Andres: Okay, so it's in front of...

Mr. Bamgbose: I think we have what it looks like...

Ms. Andres: Yeah, I saw that, and I was just trying to remember where it was located.

Mr. Bamgbose: We'd love to replace that with something.

Ms. Andres: Alright, well thank you.

Mr. Bamgbose: Thank you

Ms. Andres: Was there a reason you just haven't gotten to taking or amending the PUD to take the rooftop signs out or...is that something you have decided that you guys would be willing to do since you've filed everything?

Mr. Bamgbose: Correct, yes. Thank you

Ms. Andres: We will now open it up for general public hearing from the audience. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: Alright, seeing none we will close the public hearing. Any further discussion from the Commission?

Mr. Berg: Just a couple of points of clarification, the Tractor Supply sign that he's referencing is a directory sign for the Plaza North directory; it's not simply for them. I understand – I mean, they put together a very good sign package – one of the best I've seen since I've been here. I am a little concerned, or perhaps a little confused by the fairness argument in comparing to Perry Crossing and Target, as those are signs are on platted lots, and lots that have actual primary uses. So, those are two things that are different in this case; this is on a block which is not actually a lot, and it is a lot that perhaps is not even buildable. So, those are just some concerns that we have, and worried about and concerned about whether this will cause others to try and play games with the sign code.

Ms. Andres: Any further comments or discussion amongst the Commission? Any concerns we want to raise? Discussion on Eric's point?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: There being no other discussion, is there a motion?

Mr. Brandgard: I would move that the Plan Commission certify PUD-22-095, an amendment to the Hobbs Station Planned Unit Development, with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Ms. Andres: I have a first and a second. Andrew, would you call roll please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Everling – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Ms. Andres – yes

Motion carries.

Ms. Andres: Thank you. Up next then we have PP-22-116 – Sureties Waiver.

Mr. Whaley: As part of the subdivision platting process the subdivision control ordinance requires that the developer post a performance bond, or an irrevocable letter of credit for improvements that are not complete at the time that the plat is signed. Obviously, the town had been involved with this project from the standpoint of having a development agreement with the developer. There's some language in that agreement that references a waiver of the requirements of the performance bonding – and at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Mel because he's prepared some language consideration to address that requirement.

Mr. Daniel: Well, when we initially looked at this, it seemed like waiver would be the simplest and easiest way to deal with this because what we have is a situation here of a different developer being required to produce a performance bond when they're not going to perform the work on this or these improvements. When we got to looking at the ordinance – we may take another look at that after this situation – there are areas in there that allow the Plan Commission to waive certain things, but it does not allow the Plan Commission to waive a performance bond in this type of situation. So, as a result of that, we decided that a waiver technically wasn't the way to go. So, I did take a look at that, and I think that the best thing to do – I think Kevin sent out just today a proposed order that would allow the Plan Commission to order that a performance bond not be required because of the language in the development agreement. We just wanted to make sure there was clear record here so that somewhere down the road somebody says – well, one of these days they're going to have to have a secondary plat approved and under the ordinance they would have to have a performance bond on file to do that. So, this would alleviate that, and the order would take the place of that performance bond. As the order is drafted, it is a little too narrow, so I think you can if you choose to prove that tonight, I think we should expand that to include the remaining infrastructure and not just – it refers to streets, but it also speaks generally about filing the other document which we have, and so we revise that just by adding the other infrastructure. If it's approved.

Ms. Andres: Thank you for that explanation.

Mr. Daniel: You're welcome.

Ms. Andres: We will open it up then – are there any other comment from staff before we open it up for public hearing? Any comments from the Commission?

Mr. Whaley: No additional comments from the public; I don't think it requires a public hearing. Does it Mel?

Ms. Andres: Great, even easier.

Mr. Kirchoff: So, Mel, is it (inaudible) position to approve it tonight, or should we wait until it's revised?

Mr. Daniel: The change is going to be relatively – I think you can approve it subject to...

Mr. Kirchoff: Modification

Mr. Daniel: Right, to include there remaining infrastructure, yes. Other than streets, right.

Mr. Kirchoff: I would so move.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Ms. Andres: First and Second, Mr. Klinger would you please call roll?

Mr. Klinger:	Mr. Everling – yes
	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Ms. Andres – yes

The order is approved 5-0.

Mr. Daniel: I think technically we should have the petitioner of the proposed waiver as it's identified in the proceedings of the Plan Commission tonight, so somebody doesn't wonder what happened to that (inaudible).

Mr. Moore: Good evening, Madam President, members of the commission, John Moore, my address is 50 South Meridian Street, Suite 700, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. Here as attorney for your petitioner, and with that agreement to approve the order as amended, we do consent to the withdrawal of the waiver request. Thank you.

Ms. Andres: Do we need a motion to accept that?

Mr. Daniel: Yes

Mr. Kirchoff: So moved

Mr. Everling: Second

Ms. Andres: We have a first and a second. Andrew?

Mr. Klinger:	Mr. Everling – yes
	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Ms. Andres – yes

The withdrawal of the waiver request is approved.

Ms. Andres: Alright, thank you. Moving on then, our next agenda item is TA-22-109 – Accessory Use Text Amendment.

Mr. Whaley: As the Plan Commission members are hopefully aware, we've been working on the ordinance for quite some time now, since about mid/late last year, and I think we're about 50-60% of the way through that process. So, hooray for that. We're on to accessory uses and structures now and before we get too far into this portion of the ordinance rewrite – one of the overarching principles that we've been focused on when we're looking at our regulations is trying to figure out what it is that the regulations are going to produce in terms of development, and how that development would impact Plainfield in the long run. I think we've said many times over, and you're probably sick of hearing us say this but building placement is really important to developing a quality place, enhancing our streetscapes. It affects walkability, how people perceive a space within the community. What I've got up on the screen right now is an example of a community just east of Indianapolis, Greenfield – several of you have probably been there before; this is S.R. 9. I just wanted to share this example as an illustration of why we're focusing on getting buildings up close to the street. Hopefully this is impactful to you. This is S.R. 9 back in 2008. The city of Greenfield amended their ordinances to require that parking be placed on the side of the building, or to the rear, in what they call their North Gateway Corridor. As you know, that's something that we worked on as well. We amended our parking regulations to require that same requirement, move the parking to the rear and to the side. Again, this is from 2008, this is what that same corridor looks like in 2022 now. As you can see there's obviously been some

streetscape improvements that have been done in tandem with some new construction on the west side of the street. What they've done is they've place multi-tenant retail buildings up about 15 feet off of that public right-of-way. And it's hard to see on this particular image but that parking is located to the side of those buildings, and to the rear. And as I saw that on street view – I've traveled this corridor several times, we used to take that route to go down to Mass when we lived in Ft. Wayne – and I saw that construction taking place over a period of time. And again, it was really impactful to me, to see that change in streetscape. So, I just wanted to share that with you as we get into these discussions tonight to talk about accessories uses because one of the challenges that we have with pushing those buildings up close to the street is – obviously we have a lot of land uses that depend on drive-through customers, and have drive-through traffic – so, the question becomes, how do you accommodate that type of accessory use on a property but still get the buildings up close to the street? As you all are aware I'm sure, most drive-throughs have this typical configuration – the building is located in the middle of a lot, the drive-through circulates around the building and it creates what I've seen referred to as a drive-through mote, and you can kind of see that in the image on the left with the stacking taking place at the Wendy's. You end up with a bunch of vehicles wrapped around the building, and it ends up oftentimes blocking the additional circulation for the people who want to park on those perimeter parking spaces.

Mr. Klinger: You sure that's a Wendy's, because I don't think I've ever seen that many cars at Wendy's.

Mr. Whaley: And then we've got the McDonald's on the right. I did include this – this is from Madison, Indiana, trying to make our new guests feel a little welcome here. My wife is from Madison but the way, so we've got that connection. Anyways, we've got the McDonald's in Madison and you can see, it doesn't present the greatest from the street. It is a nice looking building, but when you pull that building off the street, it doesn't have that same impact with the roadway, and obviously pedestrians have to cross through that parking lot to get to the actual entrance of the building. What we're proposing is that as we're continuing that push to the buildings up closer to the street, that we have drive-through standards which emphasize placing the drive-through at the rear of the building. We do also have an option for placing the drive-through on the side, it's approved by the Plan Commission. But the default would be to put the drive-through window on the rear of the building. We've included some illustrations to show what that could look like in terms of the actual property. You've got the illustration on the left, and then on the right hand side, that's an example of a Chick-fil-A out in Oregon. It's got essentially the same set up as what's shown in the illustration. So, I wanted to include a natural reference so you could kind of see the comparison. That example on the right also has some pedestrian facilities within the parking lot, which is something that we are requiring now as a part of our parking standards, to try to channel pedestrians to that front door. One of the concerns that we've heard as we've looked at some of these alternative drive-through options is that if you require the drive-through in the rear, that's going to end up being more dangerous for pedestrians. But in reality, if you compare this to the typical drive-through design where most of the parking spaces are onto the exterior of the lot, pedestrians still have to cross from their

vehicles, across that interior access lane or the drive-through lane, depending on how it's functioning. In most cases there are very few parking spaces that are actually adjacent to the building itself, that you should not have to get into that, and the ones that are – in this case where the traffic is backing up on that site – that becomes a circulation issue because you can't back out of that parking space if it's being blocked. So again, emphasizing placing the drive-through at the rear of the property, or to the side. This is an example or illustration of what that could look like if the drive-through window was on the side of the building. One of the changes that we are also looking at with respect to drive throughs is a bailout lane. The ordinance currently requires that the bailout lane be constructed basically the full length of the drive-through from the ordering point, so that people have the option of exiting that drive-through lane to get out, in case they decide they no longer want to place their order for food. This shows a couple different options for escape from that lane. The reason we included these in the illustrations is again, to show that side drive-through option, but also this type of configuration isn't something that would currently be allowed under the ordinance, but it is something that you can find out in the developed environment. Here's a couple of examples of property uses that are about 2/3 of an acre. You can see they used a couple of different options. The one on the left has a double drive-through lane so they have that full escape lane basically on the left side of the building. So, once you place your order you can get out of that lane if you need to. And then the one on the right took a different option where they constructed that escape lane that's completely independent of the drive-through, and it's got the little landscaped island in the middle. This is an example of another Chick-fil-A out in Oregon – I will say that when we look for these types of examples from a restaurant perspective, Chick-fil-A has been probably what I would consider the leader in this space when it comes to developing these alternative drive-through options. With this one it's probably hard to see on the screen, but they have a yellow demarcated area that channels the double drive-through lane down to a single drive-through lane, but then as you go around the building it opens back up to two lanes. And I think that they have some cones there in the middle so that they have the option to make that function as two lanes if they need to – and this is what that would look like from the street. So, as you can see it's got the outdoor seating area in the front, between the building and the street, it doesn't have the parking spaces. We have found examples of this option also being used in multi-tenant retail buildings that have the drive-through on the end space – you can see how that functions with the horseshoe shape, the one on the left looks a little bit more like a question mark. This is a list of national restaurants, franchises or chains that we have found examples that use this type of drive-through design. So, it is possible for them to implement this particular type of layout and meet those same goals we're trying to achieve here of pushing the building up to the street, enhance the streetscape and deprioritize the drive through. So, it is possible to have the best of both worlds – in my opinion.

Ms. Andres: Kevin, do you think that adds any requirement in terms of lot size? Does it change the lot size requirements for that building at all, to have this structure versus the other one? Or is it about the same, do you think?

Mr. Whaley: I think it all depends. When you take all the different variables into consideration – whether it be landscaping, parking requirements, setbacks – all those work together to determine the amount of space that you need for a particular site when you're selecting a site for a restaurant. We looked at one, I think I shared this with the Plan Commission a few months ago, that was in North Carolina, that was on a corner lot, and it ended up being roughly about the same size as the Chick-fil-A that we have here on Main Street in terms of acreage, and that was a situation where the building was right up on the street.

Mr. Everling: Along those same lines Kevin, I appreciate that list because that was going to be one of my questions. So, they will do it but what's their general reaction to these design alternatives. Is it business friendly or is it you know, we'd rather do it the old way? Is it more expensive...?

Mr. Whaley: We haven't heard any comments specifically about expense. I think that the preference is to stick with what's been working for decades. The communities that have decided that they want to go a different path with drive-throughs have been able to compel those restaurant operators to meet the standards, and they have done so. But again, I think the preference is to have the kind of standard layout with the building in the middle of the site and the drive-through wrapping around the building, just because that's what they've done for so long.

Mr. Everling: You don't think it's a barrier to – if they're looking at two sites and one town is saying you've got to do it the alternative way...

Mr. Whaley: That's a difficult question to answer. I think if they were looking at two towns, it's probably not a fair comparison because they're looking at specific markets based upon traffic volumes and counts and those types of things. So, I don't think it would be a situation where they would necessarily say well, if we can't build this type of store here in Plainfield we're going to go to Mooresville for example, because they're trying to serve a specific market. It might be a case where one site in town might not be as appropriate for that type of layout versus another one. So, it could be within the same market where it causes a little bit of friction.

Mr. Everling: I personally like the alternative design, but I just didn't know what the impact would be in the business side of it.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah. Any other comments or questions about drive-throughs?

Mr. Klinger: I'll just say that I do think that sometimes there's sort of a cookie cutter mentality, right, we have a certain design, a certain way we do things, and there's just not a lot of flexibility to want to do something like that. And as Kevin has shown, we can see where all of these major restaurant chains have done it where they have to. And so, we know that they can do it, but they still like to stick with their cookie design, basically.

Mr. Everling: Sure



Mr. Brandgard: I think part of it too, is if we decide to go that way, we have to say we're going that way and we're not deviating. I think that's part of the fear of the companies – we get them to build on like that and the next one comes in and we let them go do something else, that doesn't work well.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, and along those lines I think we recognize – you know, to your question about whether it's a barrier or not – that simply telling someone that you have to put the drive-through in the back could be a barrier, at least a perceived barrier based upon what they've done in the past, if all things are equal. And what I mean by that is if we don't change setbacks, if we don't change the requirements for the bailout lane to allow some flexibility, if we don't change some of these other standards – the parking being an example, if we still had minimum requirements for parking spaces based upon the square footage of the building – which we don't anymore, it's based more on the market now – if we still had that requirement and didn't change it, I think that then it would become a barrier. But the fact that we are changing these other elements within the ordinance, I think it evens the playing field, if you will.

Mr. Everling: Yeah. Well, the Avon McDonald's is a really good example of if you park alongside where the drive-through is, there's a good chance you won't get back out of it.

Mr. Brandgard: Chick-fil-A is somewhat like that. They're working to fix that but it's...

Mr. Whaley: So, one of the other changes that we are looking at with this revision is with respect to front porches. Currently the ordinance requires the front porch meet the same setback as the house. And so, you can see on that illustration we have on the screen, you've got the building on the right where the façade is basically sitting back a little bit farther than the other one because of that porch is meeting the same setback. The reason we think this is important to allow encroachment into that front yard is because it could end up causing some renovations that we might find desirable, such as the one shown on the screen, where someone has taken a stoop for example, and created that front porch across the front of their property. On those two examples there, you've got sort of different eras homes showing where that could be desirable. To be honest with you, the inability to place a porch in the front yard is something that I find a little bit foreign because all the other jurisdictions that I've worked in have had some type of encroachment, and I see that fairly commonly in other communities. That's not to say that it's been wrong all these years, but it's just something that we need to carefully think about if we want to do that.

Mr. Brandgard: I'm in favor of it. You know, we talk about going down the streets and you see all of these garages and driveways, you have the same thing when all you see is a flat house going down the street because you can't build a porch out into the front yard where there's room to do it. So, it's...

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, in most cases – at least in my experience – when the builder applies for a permit to construct a house, they're going to set the house typically just beyond the building

lines. So, if it's a 30 foot front yard setback, they're going to set it at 31 feet, and that doesn't leave much space to put any additions on the front in terms of a front porch. I'll just quickly go through some of these other changes that we have looked at. We did focus on basically the area that has allowed for accessory buildings. Currently the ordinance says that you have to take basically the square footage of the accessory use within the structure, and then add that to the accessory buildings that you have on the property, and it can't exceed the total floor area of your living space. It's kind of complex and doesn't really make any sense. So, we tried to base it off of the size of the building and then the district. So, if you have a lower density district, you can have a little bit more space in terms of accessory uses because those are fairly common in the areas that have larger lots. And then also, we looked at the number because it limits the number to two regardless of which residential district that you're in; we decided to up that a little bit in the lower density districts. I think R-1 you can do up to three. Also, for example, Avalon North, they could have a little bit more square footage for their accessory buildings, and have more of them, if this were adopted. Fences, it prescribes a height within the ordinance, but it doesn't really say which district that applies to, so we did create some standards for the different districts. Mechanical equipment as well as recycle and reuse bins and some of these other areas, are basically just consolidating language from other parts of the ordinance. In a moment we'll talk about the omnibus, but basically that's what the omnibus does, it cleans up a lot of those different areas that are no longer needed within the ordinance, if this is passed. So, we have these on a parallel track. So, what we're asking you to do if you move forward with the accessory uses, we would also ask for the omnibus to get a favorable recommendation as well. With mechanical equipment, one of the things that we clarified is with respect to commercial areas and how the requirement is effectively applied to development. There's a couple of different ways you can read the ordinance right now. I think some people have looked at it to say if you have an elevation picture of a building, as long as that elevation is hiding the mechanical equipment, you're okay. So, if you have a situation where it rises and falls, there's some open spaces in the parapet of the building and you can see the mechanical equipment from an angle, the ordinance will allow that. So, potentially we're going to close that loophole by saying that it has to be screened from all views, and that it you also can't use those rooftop screens that they want to drill into the roof basically. The other thing with respect to mechanical equipment would be the industrial areas. Line of sight measurement is from 4 feet off the ground – we've talked about this for a while, that 6 feet is a more appropriate number. 6 feet because 4 feet is only about this tall – I didn't bring a measuring stick with me, but it's about this tall – it might be okay for people riding in very low to the ground passenger vehicles but if you're in an SUV or a pickup truck, or even just walking on the street and you're a full grown adult, it's probably better to measure from 6 feet as opposed to 4. Any questions about those, or any other changes we've shown within the ordinance?

Mr. McPhail: Kevin, you know I know we've been over a lot of ground with these things – when we go back and we're talking about pushing these buildings up closer to the road, the only thing that I'm concerned about is we've got a roadway that we may want to have widened someday,

and if you push that building up there, we're going to have to buy it. I don't know how you forecast that kind of stuff, you know.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, so that is a good point, we did talk about that in the committee, and I'm glad you brought it up here so the rest of the Plan Commission can hear the discussion. When we have setbacks for buildings, it's measured from the proposed right-of-way – and we do have a thoroughfare plan for Plainfield which provides that proposed right-of-way that we would need to accommodate the expected future roadway. So, if it's going to be a primary arterial in the future, we expect that's going to have a certain amount of right-of-way that is required for that primary arterial as a part of the development. So, when the development plan comes into you all for consideration, the front setback is going to be based upon that required right-of-way for the future, and not what it is today.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, well, we may not be 100% with that, you know. If we're looking at it from a traffic standpoint, that's probably going to solve most of it. You know, moving those buildings closer to the roadway should help us a little bit in fighting all these signage (inaudible). You know, it's a lot better to see that building than it is to look for a sign. You know, I just don't understand all the push for all the signage, and we see some that are not even maintained. But that building being closer to the roadway is sure a lot easier to see than any kind of sign you put out there (inaudible).

Mr. Klinger: The signage on the building basically.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. Whaley: I think we've also talked about how for the longest time, the standards have been focused on trying to get the best building possible, architecturally, and to have a developer/applicant create this architecturally pleasing building and then pull it so far off the road – I think we want to get that up closer to the street and showcase what we worked so hard to accomplish. We have a lot of nice buildings in town.

Mr. McPhail: Well, I know that these guys have really been working on these things to try and eliminate all these waivers and all these things we're going through. You know, we've had some discussion recently about PUDs; the better job we can do on this type of stuff, we're going to have less PUDs to mess with. I would like to see us look at that PUD ordinance a little bit to say – you know, our PUD ordinance really says you can do a PUD to enhance something different about the density and the land use. And yet we let them open the thing up for them to regulate everything in there. You know, I think if we've got a PUD, the PUD ought to be able to go back and meet all the other ordinances other than those that they're looking for density and that type of thing. We wouldn't be going through these packages with sign ordinances and all that stuff for PUDs. You know, I just think we can streamline some of this stuff a little bit. And we just approved some major changes in our sign ordinance, so I don't want to see somebody come in here with a

PUD and want to do something that you can't do outside the PUD in terms of signage and some of those types of things.

Mr. Whaley: I appreciate those comments. That's definitely something that we've had as a driving factor of this ordinance rewrite, is trying to put into place a prescription of what it is that we want as a community so that when developers come to Plainfield to look to build here, they can see that and (inaudible) working itself out. But to your point, yeah, I would generally say that I think the fewer PUDs that we have, the better off we'll be. That's my own personal opinion.

Ms. Andres: Any other comments or questions?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Whaley: One thing I will say is that I don't think we really had a chance to sit down with Mel and go over this ordinance, so if you decide that you do support it, it should probably be subject to legal review, and we can meet with Mel since the holidays and vacations are no longer (inaudible).

(Brief pause)

Mr. Whaley: Since I'm up here and already at the microphone, the Omnibus is just covering a lot of the cleanup that we think a lot of the new portions of the ordinance is no longer necessary. If you had a chance to look through the redline version that we have posted on the website, you'll see that a good chunk of this is focused on the mechanical equipment because it appears in about 16-17 different places – obviously, I'm exaggerating, but it is in quite a few. This is part of our streamline process we're working through here.

Ms. Andres: Well, I appreciated having the redline; it was really easy to follow what our proposing to change. And to echo Kent's sentiments, you guys have been working really hard to cleanup changes and consolidation to make it easier for all of us. So, work well done.

Mr. Whaley: Thank you. I'll sit down for now and let you have the public hearings. Let me know if you have any other questions.

Ms. Andres: Alright, we will open it up for public hearing, if anyone wishes to come up and speak.

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: Seeing none, we will close the public hearing. Any further discussion from Commission members?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: On either the amendment or the omnibus?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: If not, I'll take a motion either in favor or otherwise.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Brandgard: This is a technical thing – we started the discussion with the TA-22-109 and we moved into TA-22-110 but we didn't open that up for public hearing.

Mr. Kirchoff: We should've had two public hearings...

Ms. Andres: Alright, then let's...

Mr. Brandgard: Or combine them.

Ms. Andres: I thought that they – I presumed that we were combining them but I guess I didn't clarify that.

Mr. Brandgard: Oh

Ms. Andres: Then we will open it up for a public hearing on TA-22-110, if anyone wishes to speak.

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: Seeing none, then we close that public hearing.

Mr. Brandgard: With that, I would move that the Plan Commission certify TA-22-109 with a favorable recommendation, subject to review by counsel.

Ms. Andres: Is there a second?

Mr. Everling: I'll second that.

Ms. Andres: Andrew, would you please call roll?

Mr. Klinger:	Mr. Everling – yes
	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Ms. Andres – yes

TA-22-109 is approved.

Ms. Andres: And then finally, is there a motion on TA-22-110, the Omnibus?

Mr. Brandgard: Again, I would move that the Plan Commission certify TA-22-110 with a favorable recommendation, subject to review by counsel.

Mr. Everling: I'll second that.

Ms. Andres: We have a first and second. Andrew?

Mr. Klinger:	Mr. Everling – yes
	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Ms. Andres – yes

TA-22-110 is approved.

Ms. Andres: Great, thank you.

## **PLAN COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Any other business to be brought, by Commission members or otherwise?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Andres: Kevin can't resist.

Mr. Whaley: Just because I promised Alyssa this meeting would go till 8:30 tonight – just kidding.

Mr. Brandgard: She left on you.

Mr. Whaley: No, I did want to say that we did select a consultant for the Comprehensive Plan update. I don't know if you're all aware or not, but we went with Planning Next which is a firm out of Columbus, Ohio. They're going to be starting the process in February sometime. They said

that they have a couple of other projects that they are currently wrapping up, so I think they'll be ready to start in February. I just wanted to share that information with you. We will be going through a steering committee selection process and it's going to be maybe a bit unique to some of the processes that we've used in the past. Potentially they have basically an application process where applicants would apply, and then they have a matrix that they're going to use to try to make sure that they get a good cross section of the community. So, they'll be looking at different factors in terms of race, gender, those types of things, again, just to make sure that we have a good cross section representation. So, if there are any specific groups within the community that are not represented as a part of that, this process allows them to try to target those individuals and pull them into the process, which I thought was fairly unique and interesting. That's all I have.

Ms. Andres: Great, thank you for that update. Anything else?

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kirchoff: I move we adjourn.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Ms. Andres: All those in favor?

(All ayes)

Ms. Andres: We are adjourned, thank you.

Mr. Steve Bahr, President

DocuSigned by:  
  
965ABE261770450...

Mr. Andrew Klinger, Secretary