

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Giesting: Alright, the next item of business is approval of our August 1, 2022, minutes. Do I have a motion to approve those minutes?

Mr. Philip: So moved

Ms. Andres: Second

Ms. Giesting: All those in favor say aye.

(All ayes)

Ms. Giesting: Opposed?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: Okay, everyone's approved so the minutes are approved.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. Giesting: I'd like to remind everyone that this is a meeting of public hearings.

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; please 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.
4. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the speakers' sheet provided by the Plan Commission Secretary to ensure the official record reflects your appropriate name and address.

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Ms. Giesting: At this time, Mr. Daniel would you please give the Oath?

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

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Ms. Giesting: Thank you

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. Giesting: Alright, at this time we'll look at our first project, PUD-22-054 and FDP-22-054. At this time, Eric do you have any comments to make on this project?

Mr. Berg: We do have a brief presentation to give you on it.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Berg: This is requesting an amendment to the PUD – actually several amendments to the PUD for Vandalia. Largely to allow for a drive-through but also to add standards where there weren't standards and clarify some. The Final Detailed Plan is for a drive-through coffee shop/restaurant located at the northeast corner of Vandalia Boulevard and West Main Street. As I said the PUD amendment, among other things, is to allow the use to put landscaping standards. And to kind of illustrate that, the way the PUD was written, if the original landscaping standards would have applied, they would have been required to have a berm and a Level 5 along the west side of that property which would not have been so good for a commercial use. So, we've worked with the applicant to modify that. Also, outdoor seating and dining standards, among other changes. We have to – the PUD did not account for having a shared drive, so we had to make a change on that. We've had to do that with a couple of PUDs, where it pretty much does not allow it to be seen from random residents at Hobbs Station and probably a couple more others as we move forward. This site will be split into two parcels. It's an incremental plat so you will not see a Primary Plat come to you. We are showing connection to a future development on the north. And also, it's not shown here but there would be a cross-access easement to the east, should Gordon Drive ever redevelop, so that people over there can come to the light. The entrance here is correlated with – you probably remember when HRH was looking at that site – it was correlated with that so that any future development here on the west side will not be adversely impacted by this ingress/egress location. So, that was something that Scott worked really hard on and obviously we appreciate that. This is the site.

This is kind of a different drive-through concept than what we're used to. This is actually something staff has been pushing for. The applicant and the town standards spent a lot of time attempting to increase the quality of the architecture and to get better material than we have hiding back behind drive-throughs and things like that. This applicant has brought what I like to call kind of a building forward design which lets the building shine and be the star of the site instead of seeing a whole bunch of people who have got their taillights on, you know, their brake lights on waiting for a cup of coffee. You'll notice again, they do have the required bailout lanes here and sufficient stacking. In this case also this private drive will – if they get exceptionally busy, will keep the stacking from going onto Vandalia Boulevard, unless they're insanely busy. Which I'm sure they would probably like, but I'm sure traffic folks wouldn't. I'm going to stop yammering because the legend Brian Tuohy is here to talk more about it.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, thank you. Would the petitioner like to come to the podium and give us more insight into this project?

Mr. Tuohy: Good evening

Ms. Giesting: Good evening

Mr. Tuohy: Madam President, members of the Plan Commission, my name is Brian Tuohy. My address is 50 South Meridian. Thank you for hearing our petition tonight. It's Case No. PUD-22-054 and FDP-22-054 which is the property at the northeast corner of Vandalia Boulevard and Main Street. Here with me tonight is Don Hawkins who is the owner of the petitioner, a company called 327 Properties LLC. And also, most importantly, Jordan Yant and Stephanie Yant who are the owners and operators of the Cabin Coffee business. And tonight, they've brought along a sample of their wares, which I had nothing to do with baking which is a good thing for our meeting tonight. And also, Brian Munch, the engineer of this site. So again, thanks for hearing our case. As Eric laid out, we're seeking approval of the amendment to the Vandalia PUD because primarily the Vandalia PUD, while it allowed for commercial uses like this, it didn't allow for a drive-through and really didn't specifically allow for both indoor and outdoor seating at a restaurant. And as we all know, outdoor seating has become a big thing to restaurant operations. So, here's the site. The whole site is about 5 acres, but tonight we're really only focusing on about half of that, about 2.5 acres at the south end. You can see to the west of the site it's vacant but that's part of a commercial area in the PUD. To the north is the Vandalia PUD. To the east is kind of a mix of use; there's the Fraternal Order of Eagles, there's automobile sales, there's some residences along there. And then to the south is the Sugar Grove Farms subdivision and U.S. 40. So, kind of a mix of uses right around this site but it's on a prominent intersection in Plainfield. That's looking west across the street from the site. That's looking south towards the Sugar Grove; the site then is just off to the left-hand side of that photograph there. So, what do the Cabin Coffee folks plan to do? With your approval they would propose to develop about a 2300 square foot Cabin Coffee restaurant and coffee shop. And there's one of these in Avon now; it's in the old location where Ritter's Ice Cream was on U.S. 36. As Eric mentioned, they've designed this site so that there's one access road quite a

distance back from Vandalia and U.S. 40 and that access road is set up to be stubbed if it ever needs to go east. But it also allows for only one cut off of Vandalia, and then when we come back to this board with a development plan for the north side – where it says future development – they will share, that is Cabin Coffee will share that access. As Eric pointed out, this also has, if you look at the far right-hand side of the lower portion of that exhibit, that's where the stacking lane is for the drive-through. The drive-through is on the back of the building so that when you're driving along U.S. 40 or along Vandalia you'll see the front of the building – and I'll show you that in a minute, and you can see the outdoor seating area – but to get to the drive-through you'll be at the back of the building and there is significant stacking space. And as Eric mentioned, even more if it wrapped around the private drive. This exhibit shows the landscaping. The landscaping meets the landscaping codes of your ordinance, and you can see the site has a fair amount of greenspace in it, and significant landscaping along the border above the future development area where that would border those homes in Vandalia. And then along the eastern border – as I mentioned, there's a mix of use around there – the DRC after its review, and the Planning Department indicates that this landscaping plan meets with the requirements of the ordinance of Plainfield. This focuses on the site, as you can see it's pretty green. I'm not saying there's not asphalt there; there certainly is. It's a business that's going to attract folks and their cars, but also shown on here is a sidewalk along the south border of the site. And then running north along Vandalia, the idea is that that sidewalk would eventually connect all the way up once the next parcel is developed so folks could easily walk through the Vandalia residence to this site, and of course the operators hope that happens with frequency. The DRC asked us to add additional landscaping at the south end, which this shows. So right there where the two streets joined there's additional evergreens that have been put in there to meet the DRC's request for more landscaping on the south side of the site. This shows an important feature and that's the outdoor seating area. So, I've zoomed in here a little bit. You can see at the south end of the site, the front door actually faces south and there will be a covered porch area right there, and in that area, there will be outdoor furniture, Adirondack chairs, larger tables and little tables. And then again over on the left side of that photo where you can see a table and chairs, that's also a covered patio area where there will be outdoor seating. So, there will be two areas; on the west side nearest the Vandalia subdivision, and on the south side nearest the intersection, of outdoor seating, and I think there's about 24-30 outdoor seats. The indoor portion of the restaurant has about 60-70 seats available for its customers. And then this exhibit also shows that drive-through being behind the building. And as Eric mentioned, there's a bailout lane for folks that would get an order early or decide they didn't come in and they could get out without clogging the waiting line that long. The idea would be to have employee parking at the north end above that drive-through lane, and then our customer parking would be there on the right and below the restaurant there at the bottom of that exhibit. We've got signage that shows where the – to the left there is the drive-through signage; Cabin Coffee's logo signage there on the right. And then the directional signage so people know where to go if you're going to get in the drive-through lane, and where to go if you're going to get in the parking areas. The dumpster is quite a ways back behind the building and it's enclosed with exterior materials that will mimic the exterior materials of the

building. The exhibit shows that. So, the dumpster is in an enclosure that is made of a brick wainscot and what's called a diamond kote siding, which I'll show you in a minute – which will match the exterior of the building. And again, the dumpster is back where the parking area is, so quite a ways from the streets. So, the site's a little unusual when you think about north, south, east and west but as you're driving along Main Street or driving up Vandalia from Main Street, that elevation at the top, that's the front door to the proposed building. As you can see, it's a combination of stone and brick and a siding called diamond kote, and then asphalt roof shingles. And then the west elevation, which is the lower one, that's that other area of outdoor seating, you can kind of see that porch area. And then on the left side of that lower rendering, that would be the drive-through window. And so, that gives you a picture of these porch areas for the outdoor seating areas. At the top there, that's the back, so that's the least improved side of the building but that's away from view of the streets, and that's the drive-up window area there in the stone portion of that structure. And then this is the east end elevation at the bottom there, and that stone area will screen the HVAC systems, and that's the employee entrance over there. This is what the Cabin Coffee looks like in Blue Earth, MN, and that's that diamond kote siding and that's five years old. So, the purpose of that exhibit is just to let the DRC and the Plan Commission know that this stuff is pretty tough. If it looks this good after five years in MN, it certainly has at least as inclement weather as we do. And it also shows you in general what Cabin Coffee looks like when you blend stone and diamond kote siding. We're actually going to have three exterior materials: brick, stone and that siding. This is a photograph of their Avon, IN location. The one on the left is the front door and then there's outdoor seating. The one on the right shows their drive-through area in Avon with their menu board. So, that's pretty similar to what would happen here. This is just a closer view of their outdoor seating area at their Avon location. These folks have been in Avon for just under three and a half years and it's been well received. There's actually some coffee here, and some of their baked goods tonight, which you're free to sample. These folks would be the owner's and operators of this store as well. This is a rendering, or photograph of their store in Avon in the evening. Their hours are 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and then 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. They are closed on Sunday. When they are at their busiest, they have about eight people working in the store. Of course, as you expect, their busiest time is early in the morning. This is a pretty significant capital investment. As I mentioned, there's about 2300 square feet here and by the time it's all said and done, there would be north of \$1 million in this site. The idea would be, if this all goes favorably, they would start to construct this late this year and be open in the spring of 2023. That would be their ideal timing. We worked pretty carefully with Kevin and Eric adjusting the PUD for allowing this, and also as Eric said, to kind of clean it up. I think the PUD was primarily designed to accommodate the residential side of Vandalia, and this commercial part is just sort of an offshoot, a second cousin to it. And so, there weren't a lot of standards, and we've added some standards to match Plainfield's desires. The staff report mentions that; it also mentions we put the drive-through behind the building and made the building more of a visual first impression as you come along the road there. We submitted findings of fact which I believe indicate that the improvements of design with the development standards of the adjusted Vandalia PUD, they provide for an efficient use of the

land with only one connection point off of Vandalia. And the DRC I believe let that the improvements were of a high standard, and they voted unanimously to give a favorable recommendation to this. In summary, if this is approved it would allow the Vandalia PUD, this long vacant site, to be developed with one drive-through restaurant, with the drive-through in large part being screened by the building. I think it would clarify future development of the other land in that commercial area of the Vandalia PUD, and it will allow for significant capital investment on a site that I think has been vacant for a while but has had a number of interests from various parties. We would of course answer any questions you might have. And thank you for your time this evening.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you. Alright, at this time I would like to open our public hearing for anyone who would like to voice an opinion regarding this project to come forward. If so, please come to the podium, sign in, and express your thoughts. Is there anyone? Come on up.

Mr. Philip: He'll need to be sworn in, Mel.

Ms. Giesting: Were you sworn in sir?

Mr. Daniel: Were you sworn in at the beginning of the meeting?

Mr. Earls: No

Mr. Daniel: Okay

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Earls: My name is James Earls. I represent five pieces of property on Gordon. I didn't have time to really put together a good presentation, so you'll have to bear with me a little bit. Our main concern on Gordon – there are a lot of concerns but our main one right now is water runoff. Traditionally the water west of Gordon all ran, or most of it, directly west. Some of it running along U.S. 40. Everything to the east side of Gordon ran east, half of it going underneath the old railroad/interurban transit, which is a tunnel, the other half of it going to U.S. 40 and running down U.S. 40. The development along the west side of Gordon, the new developments that have taken place there, there's still drainage there but it's reduced considerably in terms of some of that area they turned into a swampy area. It does drain when it is low enough to drain. But Gordon is still too high to allow the water from the east side to get there because of the county's development that they permitted, raising the ground level of that east lot that used to be by the Eagles' Lodge, average of about 3-4 feet, that water now tries to go to Gordon but has nowhere to go. Some of it does still go east but not as much. The rest of the water goes to U.S. 40, either through the Eagle's old property or through the road along Gordon's east side. The trouble with that is Gordon's drainage was never equipped to handle that much water flow. Where they're building this structure, there is a pipe under there I

believe, that goes under Gordon. That pipe was never equipped to handle that water flow. The ditches along Gordon have never been equipped to handle the amount of that water flow. The county is aware of it, and they've confronted it several times and talked to us several times and they always say they're going to try to work something out, but there again they haven't come up with a solution to that water flow. It's really major rains that hit that cause the problem. The problem is every house on Gordon is on septic and well. There isn't enough money in Gordon to (inaudible) septic and well to those houses. More water into it is going to make those septic and wells fail. Nobody along Gordon has the money to support that kind of failure. That area is not a major developed area, and it doesn't look great. The last thing I or anybody else wants to do is become a slum area but that's what's going to happen if the water situation isn't confronted. Yes, someday that may go commercial but someday is a long ways away. And even along U.S. 40, when that does – which is for sale now and will be developed sooner than the rest of it obviously – that's only going to lock in the water issue problem even worse. It's going to have to be confronted, especially the water that goes into the old Eagle's Lodge property. That's our concern. We encourage the development of the area; we like the building in the area, but where's the water going to run to. They put this parking lot in, the water is going to run someplace. It can't go under Vandalia because that pipe can't handle it; it's going to go to the back of Vandalia or off of U.S. 40 and it's going to make that area there wetter, and then when you try to develop that it's just going to create problems. So, unless the water issue is solved – and actually, lawyers have already looked into the county's decision. You know, it's got to be cured. It's a big issue that's got to be cured.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you

Mr. Earls: Thank you for your time.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you very much sir. Is there anyone lese who would like to speak on this project? Would you like to come up to the podium? Have you been sworn in sir?

Mr. Gray: No

Ms. Giesting: Okay. Mr. Daniel?

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Gray: This is the first time I've been here, so...

Ms. Giesting: That's okay, we're all just people. And what's your name sir?

Mr. Gray: My name is Cliff Gray.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Gray: And I live in Vandalia Del Webb. I had two questions when I came here this evening and one of them has already been answered very well. The entrance to this is going to be off of Vandalia, rather than U.S. 40. My second concern though is the speed limit on U.S. 40 at that intersection. It's 55 MPH and they blast through there at 65 MPH, and they run the red light considerable times. And I think what's going on, to get out in front of it, rather than wait until the development is there and we have some horrific crash, I think it should be looked at, at reducing that speed limit. That 55 MPH should be west of that intersection; it should be about 40-45 MPH at that intersection. I just would like for you to look at that.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you

Mr. Gray: That's it.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you sir.

Mr. Gray: You're welcome.

Ms. Giesting: Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this project?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: Alright, with that I'll close the public hearing. And to address some of these issues, Eric do you want to talk about water runoff?

Mr. Kirchoff: Actually, Brian.

Ms. Giesting: Oh, Brian. Brian talks about water runoff.

Mr. Tuohy: Of course, the development will have to meet the drainage regulations for your town. And our engineer Brian Munch advises me that the natural drainage of this site is to the west, not to the east where I believe the first gentleman was concerned. I have a sense that where Gordon Drive is, it may not be in the Town of Plainfield. I'm not certain about that, but I don't think...

Mr. Kirchoff: Yes, you're right.

Mr. Brandgard: You're correct.

Mr. Tuohy: Is that correct? Okay. So, I suspect their drainage issues are probably best addressed at the Hendricks County level. But the main point I would make is that our engineer advises that our drainage, for the predominant part, head west away from Gordon Drive. As for the speed limit, I haven't asked the Yants but I'm sure they're all in favor of slowing the traffic down. That will allow more people to come to Cabin Coffee, so we have no objection to that.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Brandgard: Well, I think that's a state issue.

Mr. Tuohy: I do too. I don't think you folks have much of a...

Mr. Kirchoff: Let me jump in. I don't – I'm a neighbor and I agree with you wholeheartedly and we'll need to talk to INDOT about moving the speed limit west, yes.

Mr. Klinger: It makes some sense but it's definitely something we'll have to...

Mr. Kirchoff: We don't control that, but we can talk to INDOT.

Mr. Klinger: Yep

Mr. Gray: (Not at microphone) (inaudible)

Mr. Kirchoff: We understand that.

Mr. Brandgard: We understand that.

Mr. Kirchoff: We understand that.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, anybody from the Commission have any comments?

Mr. Kirchoff: Either Brian or Eric, can you bring up the plot plan? The reason I'm asking is I have concern about traffic flow on the site. As I'm looking – as the que line comes around and you've got your coffee and you're ready to head out, I'm concerned about that intersection there, and potential conflict. And when I get back up to the main drive, if you've got back up, how am I going to get out of this site and turn left if you've got queuing all the way back up on the road?

Mr. Tuohy: Let me make sure I understand what you're saying, if I could. What you're saying is if you've got your coffee in your hand and you're heading out here...

Mr. Kirchoff: Yes

Mr. Tuohy: And you want to turn left but there's folks that are all queued up in here...

Mr. Kirchoff: Yes

Mr. Tuohy: The operators are actually former operators of Chick-Fil-A, and so maybe I'd have one of you come up and address this queuing and how you'd handle people who just want a quick cup of coffee – because this came up at the DRC also.

Mr. Kirchoff: She hasn't been sworn in.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you.

Ms. Yant: I would love it if we were queued up that far but that would be close 20, 18-20 cars and I don't foresee that ever happening.

Mr. Kirchoff: That's what Chick-Fil-A used to say.

Ms. Yant: Yeah, but I don't foresee that happening. And the nice thing – the reason we let them pull out of line is because we have the ability, like Chick-Fil-A, to go out with our tablet and if the sixth car in line just has a coffee we can go out, take their money, and they can pull out of line. So, that's our system.

Ms. Giesting: Is that what you do in Avon?

Ms. Yant: Yes

Ms. Giesting: Have you ever had 20 cars in a queue?

Ms. Yant: No. I mean, COVID when we were drive-through only, but this is not for drive-through only. So, I mean when we were drive-through only during that shut down time and no one had anything else to do and they'd come get a frappe.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Ms. Yant: So, I don't anticipate that. Though I would love that, I don't anticipate that.

Mr. Kirchoff: And especially with Chick-Fil-A (inaudible) you'll have people that'll be available to direct traffic like they do now.

Ms. Yant: Yep

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Yant: Something we also told the DRC was if it ever warranted it, we have the ability to turn this into a potential two-lane drive-through, if the volume dictated that. So, we would be willing, as the petitioner to do that if the volume dictated that. But as my wife indicated, we average about 380 customers a day and about 60% of our business is drive-through but we have a large majority that's still in-house. We rarely see lines over 10-12 cars. This is a small franchise, the majority – this will be actually the largest stacking ability of any store in the franchise.

Ms. Giesting: So, if you were the seventh car in line, how long is my wait time?

Mr. Yant: Our average wait time is less than four minutes.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, we're going to hold you to that.

Mr. Yant: Absolutely, we hold ourselves to it pretty strictly.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Yant: Any other questions on that? And then also, I wanted to note – I know you mentioned concern about traffic exiting the drive-through, where traffic is exiting the other parking. We do have a caution sign there, kind of a stop sign for any traffic exiting out of the in-house parking, to yield to the drive-through. And if we have to, we are not opposed to putting a boy out there to direct traffic, similar to Chick-Fil-A.

Mr. Kirchoff: (inaudible)

Mr. Yant: We did have that originally- we could potentially do that. I like the access of potentially having two exits. I don't see a major concern with any incidents at that intersection as long as the signage is there. Thank you.

Ms. Giesting: Okay. Any other comments, concerns from the Commission?

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: I'm sorry, we closed the public hearing ma'am. If not, I'd like to entertain a motion.

Ms. Andres: I move that the Plan Commission certify PUD-22-054, an amendment to the Vandalia Planned Unit Development a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, I have a motion. Do I have a second?

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Ms. Giesting: Alright. Andrew, would you like to take the roll then?

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

Ms. Giesting – yes

PUD-22-054 is approved.

Ms. Giesting: Alright, and then I need a second motion.

Ms. Andres: I will also move that the Plan Commission approve FDP-22-054 requesting Final Detailed Plan review for approval for a drive through coffee shop/restaurant on a 4.909 acre parcel to be incrementally platted that is zoned Vandalia Planned Unit Development finding that:

1. The Final Detailed Plan satisfies the Development Requirements and Development Standards specified in the PUD District ordinance establishing such District.
2. The Final Detailed Plan accomplishes the intent set forth in Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The Final Detailed Plan provides for the protection or provision of the site features and amenities outlined in Article 6., C., 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

1. Subject to the Town Council approving the Planned Unit Development Amendment.
2. Substantial compliance with the plans and documents approved by the Commission.

Mr. Philip: Second

Ms. Giesting: I have a motion and I have a second. Mr. Klinger?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Ms. Giesting – yes

FDP-22-054 is approved.

Ms. Giesting: Very good.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you

Ms. Giesting: Congratulations.

Mr. Tuohy: Thank you, have a good evening.

Ms. Giesting: And I am looking forward to reduced speed limits in that area. Alright, second project is DP-22-034 – 7 Brew Coffee. Eric?

Mr. Berg: This is the second of four coffee projects I'm involved with, which is strange for a guy who doesn't drink coffee. This is architectural site design review for a small 509 square foot drive-through located – it's kind of hard to see here with the zoning – Main, Campbell, and an establishment we're not going to mention, Maple Grove, Burlington; it's about 2501 East Main. Over here is the rendering from the site plan that they've provided. I'm going to be a lot briefer on this one. This is a more traditional, loop it around the building drive-through, coming off of Main to the access drive and around counterclockwise. They do require a development incentive and a replat because at some point between when the county platted this and the current owners took over, there was some improper platting that was done. And another reason is this as platted with a 50 foot setback instead of the actual – which helped to require the development incentive to go into that setback. While most 7 Brews have outdoor seating; this one does not. I am going to turn it over to the three folks who are here from 7 Brew because I've already talked way more than I typically do.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Goins: I'm Mike Goins with TMG Construction Management Firm, with 7 Brew. We worked a couple of months to get this approved through architectural review and then also to get through the comments to make sure we comply with everything. We really don't have a presentation but we're here to answer any questions. We also have Kathy Blankman from operations that can answer any questions about how the restaurant functions.

Ms. Giesting: Okay. Alright, anyone from the Commission have any questions? I will say, with the DRC we have had several meetings with 7 Brew, and I have to say that they have complied with all of the concerns that the Design Review had. So, we appreciate that.

Ms. Andres: I had a question on the stacking. The site plan shows 12. There was a presentation, the Joshua Temple letter that mentioned stacking for 24.

Mr. Goins: We, similar to the last concept, the bypass lane during heavy traffic, or like in the mornings, can be used as a double drive-through. So, if we were to have stacking – Kathy, you can probably speak better to this than me – that becomes a second drive-through.

Ms. Andres: So, the bailout lane, is that what you're...?

Mr. Goins: Yes

Ms. Andres: Yeah

Ms. Blankman: Hi, Kathy Blankman with 7 Brew. So, what we do is instead of a typical drive-through menu board order point, we have multiple order points using tablets. So, we'll have four or five texters – is what we call them – taking orders. So, we will open both lanes and have two cash out points at the front, along with multiple cash out points on the tablets. So, that makes it very quick and that keeps things moving two lanes around. So, that's how we get the 24 stack.

Ms. Giesting: Kathy, what are your hours of operation?

Ms. Blankman: 5:30-10:00 a.m. Sunday-Thursday, and then until 11:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.

Ms. Giesting: And how many employees are you planning to hire?

Ms. Blankman: Our plan is to hire 50 because during our peak timeframe, you know, we want to move those people through, so we'll have 10-12 people from 7:00 a.m. to at least 9:00 a.m.

Ms. Giesting: Any other questions?

Ms. Andres: Is the concept just drive-through?

Ms. Blankman: Yes

Ms. Andres: So, no walk-in at all?

Ms. Blankman: No, and no food, so that's what makes us quick. We are coffee, energy drinks, just drinks, so that's how we can get people through so fast.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. McPhail: You know, I do have a question. On the south side of your site there, that's a private road that's always in need of maintenance. Is there any responsibility on your lot to help maintain that private drive?

Mr. Kirchoff: I'm trying to figure out where – is this next to McDonald's?

Mr. Philip: In between Pizza Hut and KFC.

Mr. Kirchoff: Oh

Mr. Philip: The empty lot between KFC and Pizza Hut.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, I drove down there yesterday, and I couldn't visualize where it was going to be.

Mr. Klinger: It's a small lot so you don't even notice it.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, it's a pretty small site.

Ms. Giesting: Yeah, and you're right, the road behind there always needs...

Mr. Kirchoff: The only other question I have, did you have in your presentation...?

Mr. Berg: Elevations?

Mr. Kirchoff: Elevation

Mr. Berg: Yeah, let me pull that up here.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Klinger: I will note Kent, that I think the current owners of the property did actually repave that strip of road there, not too long ago.

(inaudible)

Mr. Kirchoff: That picture on the front there, can you get that any bigger?

Mr. Berg: Oh yeah, I just didn't remember if we had the color rendering.

Mr. Kirchoff: Did the DRC have any concerns about what the building looked like?

Ms. Giesting: (indicates "no") There were concerns about the HVAC but by the terms of building materials, I think it complied. I can't remember Eric, was there anything else?

Mr. Berg: In the first two times this came through there were discussions about that, and then they moved to this type of material which the DRC did not have such an issue with. As Mary said, there were some concerns with some HVAC units and similar that were visible but...

Ms. Giesting: I think they took care of all that.

Mr. Berg: Yes

Mr. Kirchoff: Just a personal preference.

Mr. McPhail: Well, you know, it's a single use building. You know, if this doesn't work the building is totally useless for anything else.

Mr. Kirchoff: True

Mr. McPhail: That's the only problem I had with it.

Ms. Giesting: There was discussion at one point, at DRC, that if the establishment wasn't successful that they would remove the building, but there was just discussion, it didn't go any further than that.

Mr. Philip: We're dealing with a difficult spot that's been vacant for decades at this point in time for a reason, and what's going to happen on that site is going to be a drive-through only type of situation.

Mr. Brandgard: Well, I believe that lot was open because the former strip mall user required that lot to be open for line of sight from U.S. 40.

Mr. Kirchoff: Oh, is that right?

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Klinger: Well, I guess it's just personal...

Ms. Giesting: The coloring, is that what you're concerned about?

Mr. Brandgard: I don't like it but if that's their motif...

Mr. Kirchoff: Just my observations.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Philip: Did you open this for public hearing?

Ms. Giesting: I don't think I have. Alright, at this time I'll open the floor to public hearing. Is there anyone here who would like to voice their opinion regarding this project? If so, you need to come forward, sign your name and let us know what you think.

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: Seeing no one, I will close this public hearing and we'll go forward. Anybody, anything else from the Commission?

Mr. Philip: Madam President, I'm prepared to make a motion.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Giesting: Under old business: Land Use Matrix Text Amendment. Is that you Kevin?

Mr. Whaley: Yes, that's me. Last month you may recall that the Plan Commission forwarded a favorable recommendation on text amendment to the zoning ordinance regarding land use matrix. We made our presentation to the Town Council (inaudible) proposed changes (inaudible) matrix at the work session. The council had expressed some concern about some of the changes to the residential (inaudible) part of that matrix. We went back (inaudible) a look at some of those recommendations (inaudible) address some concerns that were brought up at the work session. We're going to go through that tonight (inaudible) Plan Commission (inaudible) back to the Town Council (inaudible) process we go through. Before we get into these specific changes I did outline in the Planning and Zoning report, I wanted to talk a little bit about what we're seeing in terms of overall growth patterns in the Town of Plainfield and why this particular process has been a bit more challenging (inaudible). (inaudible) growth in the town of Plainfield, there really has been three different development patterns that I would identify. The first being the area around Town Center, which is your traditional residential area of town. We tend to have more of a mix of residential building types, and they tend to be located on scattered sites throughout the area. This is an area that developed prior to the existence of zoning, and then also partially (inaudible) 60's where uses tended to be a little bit permissive in its districts. The uniqueness of this area is it has the capacity to change over time. By that I mean set up in terms of the overall development pattern where having that mix creates the expectation that that mixture can change over time, but the nature of the development pattern in that area. Now I do have examples of some of these development patterns I'll show you tonight, but they're probably not the examples you're expecting to see (inaudible). I would refer to this area in town as being more like a stew. They're all mixed in together and form a unique character and area here in Plainfield in terms of residential. Moving on to the next we have Conventional Zoning development, and this is probably what most people are familiar with. It's the development pattern that really focuses on creating districts that allow singular uses within those districts. There's a clear separation of uses within those districts as well. But also, it tends to provide static development, in that once a development is built to completion, that area is largely going to remain unchanged for the duration (inaudible) of that development. So, if you would (inaudible) subdivision, it's (inaudible). Here's a sample of that as well – you can think of this is the TV dinner of the zoning world, you have your different uses separated into different compartments. Typically, (inaudible) as well. If a pea were to land over in the mashed potato section, it would be painfully obvious that (inaudible). The third is what I think we'll see more often in terms of development that's been proposed here the last few years. It's getting back to this idea of having a mix of uses with the residential building types, but that mix isn't necessarily scattered together like it is in the stew on the left-hand side. It's really more of a pattern like a casserole with the different layering of blending of residential building types, such as the pairing of patio homes with the town homes that we see

(inaudible) village. The single-family detached (inaudible). The challenge that we face with having these different types of development patterns is that they're by and large regulated mostly with a single framework system (inaudible) really designed to create that system (inaudible) separation of uses. Each of these categories has I think their own strengths and challenges. For example, the town center area, the challenge that they face there is that we get a lot of uses that (inaudible) standards, yet they're subject to standards that were written for (inaudible). Conventional zoning has quite a bit of predictability but doesn't necessarily offer a lot of flexibility (inaudible). It doesn't really have the ability to change as people (inaudible) place. (inaudible). Then on the right-hand side the issue the we have with the current development trend when we have (inaudible), the conventional (inaudible) that's set up to create the type (inaudible). We have to go through a few (inaudible) processes in order to do that. (inaudible) modify our standards to basically create the types of developments that you would see in a Planned Unit Development, (inaudible) not necessarily (inaudible) create entirely new zoning (inaudible). We'd like to get into (inaudible) eventually where we can get a district or two set up to where a developer can utilize that particular district to create (inaudible). As we're working through these residential changes (inaudible) these are the challenges that we face with having (inaudible) categories of (inaudible), and it's very difficult to (inaudible) one size fits all. What we've done is we've tried to modify (inaudible). I did throw in this slide, I did show this to the Town Council, just some illustration of why I think we're going to continue to see that right-hand column continue to persist in Plainfield. (inaudible) growth in development of the 1200 plus units that we've approved in the past year or two, and about two thirds of those were in developments that were planned for mixed use of different building types. So again, this just kind of shows that mixture of building types within the projects that you approved. About a third of those are what you would consider to be conventional districts where you have a single building type, like your single-family detached – Trescott for example, or Avalon North. So, this gives you a summary of the changes that we've worked through since the initial recommendation, which are highlighted in the middle and the revisions are shown on the right-hand side in different categories. I'll walk through each of these, but I just wanted to give you the overview here initially, and as we hit each one of these I'll ask for your feedback and specific comments. We tried to create standards that we think will address the concerns of the Town Council, but we also recognized that we do need your input. And so, we are prepared to scale things back if we need to and make modifications. But again, we definitely need that feedback because this is a collaborative process that we are engaging in here. In terms of Accessory Dwelling Units, this was something that was not currently allowed in the zoning ordinance. We established standards for those units and had initially recommended that they be allowed within all residential zoning districts. There was some concern about basically throwing loose throughout the entire jurisdiction of the town, so we came up with a compromise or revision to basically allow a special exception in residential districts so that if someone wants to create an Accessory Dwelling Unit they would have to go through the Board of Zoning Appeals process, and that would be subject to a public hearing and commentary from the neighboring property owners who can express their concerns. I'll cover a little bit more about what that would entail in just a minute. The second is we had initially suggested that we

allow Two-Family Dwellings in R-1 through R-5. We kind of had some resistance on that and I can certainly understand why. If you think back to the example that I just gave about the different zoning development patterns within the Town of Plainfield, that middle one in particular, if you were to introduce Two-Family Dwellings within areas that people have an expectation of single-family detached, that can certainly upset the apple cart for a lot of people, and we can understand and respect that. So, we are proposing at this point in time, until we get more feedback from you, that we basically maintain what we currently have and just to allow them in the R-5 Residential District, as well as the MU and R-U Districts, and TC which are districts that this use is currently permitted in. So, effectively, no change from the current ordinance. Single-Family Attached Dwelling: this is a new definition and category that we are adding, and I think that I gave an illustration on what the difference between this and two-family dwelling would be. These are units that are attached and are located on individually owned lots. So, you have the paired patios where each half of the paired cottage or patio of the home has an individual property owner; they own their own property and there's a common wall between those units. So, it's not two units on one lot, it's one unit on one lot that happens to be attached. And this can go basically from two units attached on up to townhomes. So, a duplex would be when you have two dwelling units on one lot.

Ms. Andres: So, this is where you have two separate lots for each of the...?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, and I've got some examples (inaudible). That is definitely a good question. And then the Attached Dwelling: we haven't proposed any changes to this. What this is, is this is your tri-plexes on up to six-plexes. That's where you have multiple units in a single building on a single lot, but it's also written to allow varying types of development to – cottage homes for example on a single lot could possibly fit into this category as well, but we'll get into the definition in just a minute. We had proposed that this be allowed in R-4, R-5 and R-6 Districts and limited to properties that they have approved alley access. Meaning there has to be an alley, or the applicant would have to construct an alley (inaudible) if one does not currently exist. This is largely intended to allow for densification of the urban core, the areas where we already have alleys. (inaudible) that grid structure (inaudible) street system, areas of the downtown where we want to try to add density to get more units in that area. I will note that we currently, just because of the current patterns of development, we do have several of these types of units in the downtown area that I think converted over time. Anyone, if this were to be adopted, that would try to convert a unit or build new construction would have to go through the building permit process and adhere with current building regulations. A lot of the ones that we have existing, I would suspect probably did not go through permitting; they were converted without any type of approval. So, this would be a requirement of that, so there are those protections in place from a fire and safety standpoint. And I believe if you go above three units, that's subject to commercial building standards as opposed to your one and two family which would be your singles and your doubles. Now we'll go through these and then I'll ask for your feedback, input and possible modifications. This provides the definition of Accessory Dwelling Unit. I think we talked about this a couple of months ago. This is a wide range of category of units that are basically intended to be subordinate to and existing primary structure on a

residential lot. It could be attached or detached depending on the setup/configuration. I'm going to jump ahead here just a second and show you this diagram. This give a good illustration I think of where these units could be located. If you think about someone converting an attic space or a basement to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, or perhaps just an addition to an existing home. These are often thought of as mother-in-law suites, and there are several of these that exist throughout the Town of Plainfield that I have seen through Zillow. I don't know that they necessarily got approval, but I do know that this is something that a lot of people that tend to desire to put into their homes, especially when they have the space to do so. The third category is the detached. I have heard some concerns expressed from some residents that they would not want to see these in their own particular neighborhoods. And so, I think that could be a topic of discussion for the Commission this evening. I think at a bare minimum what we might want to do is try to allow Accessory Dwelling Units that are integrated into the home with the idea being that you can't tell that they're there and they're not having a negative impact, and what is it exactly that we're trying to regulate by prohibiting those within different districts. So, that might be a point of discussion...

Mr. Kirchoff: Kevin, could you move the microphone closer?

Mr. Whaley: Sure

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you

Mr. Whaley: I'm trying to find that happy medium on the microphone. Can you hear me now?

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, finally.

Mr. Whaley: Okay, so I'm going to switch back to this slide here for just a second. Currently the ordinance does not address Accessory Dwelling Units. There are no provisions, there's no mentions of these types of units. I think you would, worse case scenario, have to go through and do a Planned Unit Development if you wanted to put one of these on your property. Best case scenario you could possibly do a variance, just depending on how we interact the regulations. What we had proposed was that these be allowed in all residential districts R-1 through R-5 within the town. Again, that encountered some resistance so we pulled that back to say that this could be a special exception as opposed to being a use by right. And so, at this point, I think it's important to ask for your feedback on this particular topic.

Mr. Kirchoff: Can you go to that next slide?

Mr. Whaley: Absolutely. Yeah, and as a part of that we did kind of tighten up the regulations that we initially proposed. Item "g" here about the exterior finishes matching the existing structure. So, if they did do a detached – of you had a garage in the back for example that you wanted to put a living unit inside it, it would have to match the principal structure so that it fits within the character of the neighborhood. And then we also throughout the item here, h: the owner of the lot would have to reside in at least one of the units. I would point out that this is

something that we have to correct in the language that we send to the Town Council, if we keep this in the ordinance for recommendations. It unintentionally said, “accessory dwelling units” instead of “dwelling units”. It should be “live on one of the dwelling units” because there should only be one accessory dwelling unit per lot. And then last, we saw the potential of people trying to argue that a travel trailer or recreational vehicle could count as an accessory dwelling unit. So, we made that clear that that is not the intent.

Mr. McPhail: You know, I can tell you that Jennifer and I, we kicked this thing around a lot. (inaudible) meeting and knowing that we were coming with this recommendation (inaudible). And so, and thinking that putting it as a special exception would protect neighborhoods. In conversation with other people, I haven't gotten very good feedback from it. I guess my concern is, you know if we say it's a special exception and it goes through the BZA and it gets turned down or approved, or whatever – you know, those decisions are subject to appeal through our local court system. You know, we put some things in there like the property owner has to live in one of the units; the more I think about it the more I'm concerned that we're opening ourselves up a lot of liability and lawsuits that I didn't think about earlier when we were talking about it. I think there's areas where this is totally appropriate because it's happening now but I'm a little concerned – no, I'm not a little concerned – I'm more concerned than I was when we were planning these. I'd like for this to be available in certain areas, but I'm just concerned that by going the special exception route that we could – I know we've got a couple of attorneys in the room.

Ms. Giesting: I have a question. Does special exception trump and HOA agreement?

Mr. McPhail: No

Ms. Giesting: So, an HOA agreement...

Mr. Brandgard: Covenants

Ms. Giesting: Or the covenants, yeah.

Mr. Brandgard: No, it does not trump the covenants.

Ms. Giesting: So, the covenants, they would have to live within the...

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Ms. Giesting: Okay. So, the other question I have is, in one of these meetings that I've sat in there was a gentleman who was building a garage or putting a garage in the back and in that garage, he was going to put a little kitchenette. At the time he suggested that it was not an additional living unit, but it was an additional living unit in all cases. So, would that be an accessory dwelling unit?

Mr. Whaley: If it's intended for habitation by an individual then it would be considered an accessory dwelling unit and they would have to go through this process.

Ms. Giesting: The example I'm talking about, would that have been one?

Mr. Klinger: If it's just a man cave, it probably is not.

Mr. Philip: I mean, there was no living space in that. It was a big workshop area and there was a kitchenette and there was a bathroom, but there was no living area. There was nothing obvious that there was sleeping space or anything like that.

Ms. Giesting: But you could see where that could be a question, right?

Mr. Philip: Agreed, but also keep in mind that guy only came through because he was trying to make it taller than the existing house

Ms. Giesting: (inaudible)

Mr. Philip: He could have done that – he ended up building something anyways he just didn't make it taller than the existing house.

Ms. Giesting: Exactly, yeah. Okay.

Mr. Daniel: Madam President, could I make a few comments?

Ms. Giesting: Absolutely.

Mr. Daniel: This is a policy question for the town. They want this kind of opportunity (inaudible) get into a lot of argument or anything; I'm just going to tell you what I think about this. I'm the lawyer here, I'm not on any of these boards. I'll just walk that line a little bit. Here's my concern: I think a lot of times where this has been utilized in other areas, they have confined this to new developments because in the new developments with people buying in the area, they know what they're getting into. I think the way this is drafted now you're discriminating against areas that have restrictive covenants and those that do not. For those that do not, as a matter of law this becomes a new imposition on their property. Those that have restrictive covenants, more than likely this is not allowed – for some it may be. But then you're going to get into issues with restrictive covenants as to whether or not it is or is not allowed as they read their restrictive covenants and have legal questions about does this apply in our area. Well, you have restrictive covenants and you're going to have probably more than one opinion as to whether or not their particular restrictive covenants, whether this is allowed or not. So, then you're going to have those legal issues coming out in that fashion. One thing I think, just as a person, this allows the owner of the property to live in the accessory building, which I think is not a good idea. I think the last thing you want is to have a property owner to say to himself, I'm going to build me an 800 square foot building in the back and I'm going to move in there because I can get more

rental value out of my house than I could out of that 800 square foot building. And I think that's a really bad way to function with rental property; to stick the owner in the little house – in a residential area – and the rent out the big house. If this is adopted, I think that the owner should be required to live in the primary residence, not in one of the accessory buildings. And as a lawyer I have to say, I don't know what standard the BZA is going to apply. So, if somebody comes in with a petition saying this is allowed in my area and I want to put one of these in – if they comply with all of these requirements in this ordinance, does the BZA have to approve that? Many of you on this board know that's an issue here. And so, as far as whether or not the BZA can or cannot regulate this is a legal issue, whether to not they can deny one and approve another one. And so, I do think that's just a question. For what it's worth, I think this has some real merit to it if properly done. My suggestion, and this is my suggestion only, it would be to restrict it to redevelopments, current areas with restrictive covenants where they provide in their covenants that it's allowed. So, you'd have private property owners making a decision about their property, not the town imposing this on their property whether they like it or not. On unrestricted subdivisions I think it would not be allowed unless they adopt some restrictive covenants. So, once again you'd have a subdivision deciding for their property whether they want it or not. And then last, the owner of the principal owner of the property having to live in the primary house and not in the accessory building. For what that's worth, that's my thoughts on it.

Mr. McPhail: As our attorney, let me ask you another question.

Mr. Daniel: Okay

Mr. McPhail: You know, we've got a lot of rental properties. These (inaudible) are buying up single-family homes like wildfire. It seems to me that if we've got an ordinance that restricts that to an owner living in there in one of those units, we're probably going to get a legal (inaudible). We might want to add, if they've got a property that qualifies to have an accessory unit, they're going to want to do it aren't they?

Mr. Daniel: You mean if this was adopted...

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Daniel: ...and somebody put the small house on, and they want to live – that they would challenge this ordinance you mean?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Daniel: I think they could, but I don't think they'd win that. I mean, I think that a properly adopted ordinance, if the ordinance provided that the owner of the property had to live in the primary residence, I think you could support that in the courts (inaudible).

Mr. McPhail: I think I'm more concerned about all these single-family homes being bought up by all these big real estate firms.

Mr. Kirchoff: As you all worked on this, I really like this (inaudible) to me, some of the issues. My main concern is this one down at the bottom, the detached. If I convert an attic and basement is one thing but to build a separate unit out like that, to me that almost violates the zoning.

Mr. McPhail: It does, I mean it would...

Mr. Philip: That's why we're having this meeting.

Mr. Brandgard: That's why all this would change.

Mr. Kirchoff: I know but that just opens up a whole can of worms here.

Mr. Brandgard: You know, one of the issues we've got in, I call it the old town – and we touched on it a little bit – there's a lot of houses that are single-family that they converted to multi-family or multi bedroom houses. And by the way, they've also done it to the garage they have that was back by the alley. And you know, overall, we don't like that. So, why would we codify it in a new area?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Kirchoff: Can we go back to square one? Why is this an issue to start with?

Mr. Philip: This is a trend, right. People my age and younger have parents they they're looking at how to deal with this issue. This is going on in this country all over the place. Wanting to build a mother-in-law quarter so mom can have her own space...

Mr. Kirchoff: We've allowed that.

Mr. Philip: Well, it's a question of how you do it. You know, putting on attached is this far from a duplex in my eyes.

Mr. Brandgard: Yes

Mr. Philip: Alright, it's darn close, okay. And it looked like we had our shorts in a bunch about duplexes earlier. Alright, so we're going to get to that. But again, around the country there's a lot of folks wanting to put a 600 square foot building on their property to put mom where it's her own space and she's safe and nearby but it's her own space, and that kind of thing.

Mr. Kirchoff: I understand.

Mr. Philip: And in my last two homes in this town, I had restricted covenants that wouldn't allow it, okay. So, the idea that it would be allowed someplace, I think had appeal to me. And I think it's probably part of the reason why some of the people looking at homes in old town, that people have done some different things with over the years; sometimes they're looking at those thinking, I could put this back together somewhat and still be able to use this converted garage or whatever the case may be. So, I hear that, well we don't like that, but I think people are looking at it very differently with us baby boomers – which I'm at the tail end of – okay, but we're still trying to figure out how to deal with this huge cohort of folks that don't need to be in assisted living yet, yet we're building those on every street corner, right. Okay, but if I want to keep them close, do I have to – my mom's not going to make it up the stairs, she's not going to make it. And so, I'm down into the attached option which again, I build one of those on to my house and it looks a whole lot like a duplex. And so, that's what I struggle with because I do think – and this is what I heard from Kevin's point, is this is because the needs have changed. People want walkability and that we're talking about all of this multi-use type of stuff, right – Hobbs Station and things like that. This is similar. This is going on in a big way and people are looking for a solution. Right now, if I'm in Plainfield the way I deal with it is finding an existing place in the old Town of Plainfield that already has something and cobble together a solution, or I move to the county and I can put a second unit on there and nobody's really going to (inaudible) me.

Mr. Daniel: One of the reasons these have become called granny units, that what they call them in certain areas – some of those that have had these in existence for a while, the next issue is when granny passes away then what happens. And too many times then you've got a rental unit there and then you've got people in the home moving around you. You know, so there's ripple effects to these things.

Mr. Whaley: So...

Mr. Daniel: If it was a granny unit to begin with, how do you know whether granny is in there anymore or not?

Mr. Whaley: I'm just going to share a quick story. When I was in college we were required to go through internships – I think most college students are – I had a classmate that got an internship with Johnson County planning department there, and she used to stay for three or four months while she interned. She stayed in a garage apartment that somebody that worked for the city had rented to her, setup as an accessory building (inaudible) three or four months because she needed the short-term housing. She left, went back to Ball State, graduated, liked being in Franklin so much that she ended up getting a job with the city and moving back there into a fairly new house. And then over time as she acquired more wealth and her family got bigger, she ended up building a new house in Franklin. And so, part of this is making sure we have diversification of housing options within the town to make sure that people who want to live here who are at various points in their life, different stages of their life, have the ability to do so. And so that is partially why we are proposing these regulations. This conversation is

intended to draw out the different issues and concerns that you have and see if there are objections that we can overcome, or if it's something that we need to scrap completely. So, that's what this conversation is intended to do.

Ms. Giesting: A practical question would be – a detached unit like this, so how do you get water and everything else to it. Do utilities and all that kind of thing go to his detached house?

Mr. Kirchoff: It should

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, it should have utilities.

Ms. Andres: I'm hearing a lot of concern – I guess as I'm listening to the conversation, I'm hearing a distinction between neat for mom and dad, and we don't like rentals. I mean, that's where I'm hearing the line drawn, we want to have this available for this use, but we don't want it used for rentals. Is there kind of – I mean, Mel you were saying, if grandma passes away and we have this unit here and if it can't be rented... so, is there an ability to resolve that? I mean, to me, that's the biggest issue that I'm hearing.

Mr. Kirchoff: Doesn't that also lead to what it's taxed as? Rentals are 2%.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah. I mean, if you're doing the numbers, it would be off a 2 % rental property. The primary residence – or they can split the assessment – so the primary residence would be at 1% but any accessory uses would be at the 2%. Actually, you could talk to Mark about this. The Hendricks County Assessor will assess your pool house as a 2%.

Ms. Giesting: Really? But only if it's detached.

Mr. Klinger: Detached, right. Yeah.

Mr. Brandgard: I think -you know the other – you're talking about requiring the owner to live in the primary residence and the in-law or whatever in the other one. How do you police that?

Mr. Daniel: That's the issue Robin.

Mr. Brandgard: As I say a lot of times, we're not a police state; we're not going to be out looking for this.

Mr. Daniel: Well...

Mr. Brandgard: So, how do you police it?

Mr. Daniel: That is a practical matter that's impossible to police. You'd have to go and knock on somebody's door and ask if they're related. I mean, you know we have property here in Plainfield where we have two or three people living in the same single-family residence.

Mr. Kirchoff: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Daniel: And there's nothing we can do about it because you can't knock on that door and find out who those people are that are living there. I mean, it's always the same issue as far as privacy is concerned.

Mr. Kirchoff: I have that in my neighborhood.

Ms. Giesting: That being the case, having a statute would kind of be neither here nor there, right?

Mr. Daniel: Yeah, if you say it has to be a relative living there, it's nearly impossible.

Mr. Daniel: Right. This is a little off the edge - Kent and Robin will remember this probably; I'll try to make this short – we had a situation years ago with the property behind the Kroger down there, this fella wanted to build a house. He wanted to do a lot of the work inside of it himself and he wanted to put a mobile home in there to live in while he was – he had rough carpenters doing the outside and he was going to do the interior and all that. So, the town asked, how long do you need a variance to have a mobile home there, and he said a year. Typical Plainfield said, why don't we give you two years that way you don't have to come back here and all that. Time goes on and it's probably been four years and finally somebody said one day, what's going on with that, isn't that house down there done. So, the town went down and checked and yes, it was done, and he was living in his new home, and the son and daughter were living in the mobile home, which is not allowed of course, and the time had passed. We gave him notices and all that other and he refused to move, filed a lawsuit to the court in Hendriks County, and the judge refused to make them move.

Mr. Brandgard: I remember that well.

Mr. Daniel: A clear zoning violation., absolutely clear zoning violation. They refused to make him move so we were stuck with a mobile home down there next to the house that he put there so he could live in the. You know, it's a sad deal but that's what we have to deal with sometimes.

Mr. McPhail: You know, it seems to me we're talking about two issues here: the granny quarters, and affordable housing. To me those are two different issues. Kevin just related to this intern and because there was some affordable housing – you know, do we want to do something like this to create affordable housing? I don't think so.

Mr. Daniel: Kent, could I – to the extent that a new development brought this in and got it approved with this as allowable, I don't want you to miss that because I do think there's an opportunity with a new development where people are buying homes in that development and are aware that when they buy a home in there that there's a possibility that there would at least be an opportunity to develop an area where this is allowed.

Mr. Kirchoff: So, it becomes self-policing by the HOA.

Mr. Daniel: To some extent, yeah.

Mr. Brandgard: I think the other part is, you know we have lot coverage requirements and most lots wouldn't allow you to do that.

Mr. Daniel: Yes, and then some lots would.

Mr. Brandgard: Some would, yeah.

Mr. Klinger: So, I think where I have seen this used and effective it's two different things. It's one, urban areas with existing structures, right. So, it's space above the garage, or the whole garage and turning that into living space. That's typically what I've seen with the detached version. It's not that they're building this new building there – although theoretically they could – but typically what we've seen is we have an existing garage that we want to convert into living space.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Klinger: The other area where it does come into play, I think that's kind of what Mel is touching on – think about Avalon North, you're talking about 5 acre lots. You very well could have someone say, I'm putting in a small in-law quarters on the backside of my lot, and probably don't have an issue with that in terms of, you certainly don't have issues with the lot coverage side of the lot. So, I don't know how we target this, but it seems to me – and I don't have a vote on any of this either, it's up to you guys – but I heard Kent saying there's some areas where this kind of makes sense, right. But how do we target it to those areas?

Mr. Kirchoff: What have you seen in the other communities Kevin? Have you found wording in the other communities?

Mr. Whaley: Most of the language here is pulled directly from other communities, including Hendricks County who passed a similar ordinance back in 2017. I've seen a range in terms of permitting it as a use by right or as a special exception, as we're proposing here.

Mr. Daniel: I missed that Kevin, say that again.

Mr. Whaley: I said, I've seen a range of communities that have permitted this as a use by right where others have permitted it as a special exception.

Mr. Daniel: My question is, if they meet all these requirements, can you turn it down? Can the BZA turn it down?

(inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: Yeah. I mean, if they don't have the ability to turn it down, there wouldn't be any purpose of having a public hearing I wouldn't think.

Mr. Daniel: I didn't hear what you said.

Mr. Whaley: If they didn't have the ability to deny a petition for special exception, I don't think there would be any purpose of having a public hearing and going through that process.

Mr. Daniel: The purpose of the public hearing is so the people who may see issues that aren't obvious from the petition and that sort of thing, to come in and bring it to the BZA and call our attention to it, so that the public, especially the next door neighbors, have an opportunity to be heard because they will many time see thing you won't necessarily see on a piece of paper.

Mr. Whaley: But you're asking me if the BZA has the ability to deny a special exception, so I guess I would direct that question back to you as legal counsel for the BZA.

Ms. Giesting: Being on the BZA, I see it as being a tough way to vote unless you had clear standards. Because you said in the meetings, those people that come to those are usually pretty passionate because they live right next door to whatever is going on. So, to be the person making the decision, I would want clearer standards I would think. You're on the BZA, would you agree?

Mr. Philip: I agree. I mean, I'm not thrilled with us coming up with anything that the rule is if you want one of these you have to take it to the BZA.

(inaudible)

Mr. Philip: You know, to me the BZA has not been the busiest body because our zoning rules and ordinances have been working pretty well, and planning has been constructive in finding solutions and all that kind of stuff. So, I recoil at the thought that we would purposefully create something that would ship people to the BZA. Because at the end of the day, there's all the rules of law and everything else, the BZA could be in for it by how much squeak there is out in the audience, right. If the neighborhood is good with it, the odds of it getting approved are pretty decent, okay. And if the neighborhood is not good with it, the odds of getting approved aren't so good.

Ms. Giesting: Then where's the fairness, right.

Mr. Philip: And so, not what you want to set us up for because then you've got precedence and everything else and come (inaudible) the law. And I don't think I've said anything there that you're shocked by, I just think that's what happens.

Mr. Kirchoff: Is this the only sticky wicket that's holding things up?

Mr. Whaley: Can you repeat that?

Mr. Kirchoff: Is this the only sticky wicket that's holding things up?

Mr. Whaley: Well, we had this and then the two-family dwellings, which we were not going to make any changes to on that. This was a pretty big and significant change, so we wanted to have this discussion. Now what I will say is listening to the comments, we have a pretty broad spectrum of opinions on this, and we are getting ready to go through a comprehensive planning process, so we could pull this back and make it a focus of conversation in the housing component of that plan, to see what the community thinks about accessory dwelling units in the town.

Mr. Philip: There's a piece of me that is a little bit romanced by what Mel said relative to making it available to new developments. I sat here thinking about Avalon North also Andrew. Now, I know for a fact that it's not allowed in their covenants because I was looking for that when it came through. A friend of mine is retiring back to this area from the east, that would have been interested probably if that had been in play. He's going to end up in Brown County someplace now. And so, along those lines that is interesting to me, even as a stop gap at this point in time. I don't know that any developer would have enough gumption to take that on in the near future, but some enterprising person might, particularly if they're building on more substantial lots and some things that would go with that. So, I hear you. I understand the concerns. You know, I'll always kind of guide us towards trying to look for the more progressive answer on some of this because I think what people want is moving from what we've done. Whether we like it or not, you know, the long term we have with Mel and his role and many on the council and rules, it's all about that middle section of history that Kevin talked about, the hey, we've finally got zoning and we've got rules and now we build these things here and those things there. We're talking about a more complicated situation moving forward and trying to find ways that take a step in that direction, to me, makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay, but I'm not anywhere near comfortable moving forward yet. I don't want this to hold up the rest of it.

Mr. Philip: Right

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: You know, another issue that's come up for me personally is that we've worked on this, and I've been consistent in saying I don't think this is appropriate in my neighborhood. But believe it or not, our covenants have a life term on it, and they've got to be reaffirmed. So, you know, these covenants are not forever.

Mr. Brandgard: That's true. If a homeowner's association is not active in paying attention, things happen.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, our HOA is on top of it, but it's got to be – you know, it's going through the voting process right now to make some minor changes and reconfirm those. If that doesn't pass, I don't know where we are in terms of our covenants.

Mr. Brandgard: You know, I've been one who is comfortable and I've kind of pushed to small lots with the bigger houses on it because that's where things are going today. People don't want to cut grass. And this is part of the same thing; we've got to look at what's happening in the world because we're part of the world. So, how do we make something like this work? You know, mother-in-law quarters traditionally (inaudible) and usually the secondary building used to be the old, detached garage, which we don't have much of, and most lots aren't big enough to put one. I don't think we're ready to do it, but I think we need to get ready to do it. That's where I'm at.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, I'd say move forward with (inaudible) and continue studying this.

Mr. Whaley: (inaudible) as we pull this out (inaudible).

Mr. McPhail: (inaudible) you know a few years ago we had an intern do a (inaudible). (inaudible) had a solution to affordable housing. You know, it probably doesn't solve the granny quarters. (inaudible) should we be thinking about (inaudible).

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Whaley: And to that point, I would say there's probably no one solution to the affordable housing issue.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Whaley: It's going to be a series of different things that we try to do, in terms of what we can control and what we can't. (inaudible) this was (inaudible) part of the solution.

Mr. McPhail: You've definitely put a lot of work in on it.

Mr. Klinger: That is part of this, right. (inaudible) development (inaudible) just buying homes, or would your preference be this type of scenario where you have them scattered within different developments. That's essentially what we're talking about if I'm reading this right, no more than 800 square feet. So, you know (inaudible) essentially (inaudible). That's kind of what we're talking about, mixing into existing neighborhoods rather than having it concentrated like this is going to be our tiny home development.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, we don't want that.

Mr. Klinger: So, I don't think that would necessarily have a positive effect, yeah. Anyway, so I think the idea is we take this out for now and continue to study it and see where that goes. And

this is just a tangent, I don't want to keep us here all night, but I do think the thing that you were talking about with restricted covenants – so, at the same time where this is kind of a trend, as Rich has pointed out, people desire this, at the same time that's happening (inaudible) trend where homeowner's associations are changing their restrictive covenants to eliminate rentals all together.

Mr. Kirchoff: Right

Mr. Klinger: Because you have the corporate entities coming in and buying up these homes and renting them. So, my neighborhood is going to vote tight now on the very issue of limiting how many homes in the neighborhood, how many lots could be rented at the same time. It's like 3 or 4, I can't remember now, so putting restrictions on that.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Klinger: And so, you know, you can change those things over time and it's up to the homeowners to make that decision.

Mr. Daniel: And Rich, along with what you said, I try to stay out of the real estate business because I don't know what I'm doing but if there's a market for this – you said something about you didn't know whether a developer (inaudible) – if there's a market for this...

Mr. Philip: Someone will show up.

Mr. Daniel: A developer will figure that out.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Philip: And it becomes the question of, do we open the door for it? Because right now we look like we're the closed-door type.

Mr. Whaley: Well, that's why I said we always have that path forward of someone would come to us to say that...

Mr. Brandgard: Well...

Mr. Whaley: That's actually a question I was going to throw back to Mel. If we put this in the ordinance but don't list it anywhere – or maybe we list it within the districts but say it has to be approved by the Planning Commission through a development plan, that then allows the ability for a new development or someone to do this type of use.

Mr. Daniel: My preference would be that this would be drawn up and just be written and designed for new coming – using the same standards and everything, but then create that other type of situation. But I think along with the new developments you could also add that any current development that wants to amend their restrictions and allow this – you could put two

or three layers in there, so you have several options for different subdivisions if they have any interest.

Mr. Brandgard: Well, the other part I'm thinking about too is how long have we tried and how difficult has it been to convince a developer to put (inaudible) garage access when they build houses, in stead of having (inaudible). We've been at this for years trying to convince a developer to bring that product here and we've finally got it but we're still keeping our fingers crossed. You know, it's (inaudible).

Mr. Klinger: I think the best way forward is what was said, to take it off the table for now and we'll continue to study. Let's get the language right (inaudible).

Mr. Berg: (inaudible)

Mr. Daniel: I think the definition would come out too since (inaudible) allowed.

Mr. Brandgard: If you've got the definition in there, somebody's going to try and use it.

Mr. Daniel: Yeah

Mr. Berg: (inaudible)

Ms. Giesting: So, as we conclude this conversation, we still need a motion?

Mr. Philip: Well, we've still...

Mr. Klinger: We've got a couple more topics to discuss.

Mr. Whaley: We've got a few more slides to run through – pretty quickly here hopefully.

Ms. Giesting: Oh, I am so sorry.

Mr. Whaley: This is back to your question on two-family dwelling. This is two dwellings on a single lot. In the definition it could be attached side by side or one of above the other having a separate or combined entrance. So, this is what you think of as the typical duplex. Currently they're allowed in R-5, Town Center, MU and RU Districts. Again, we are recommending that we keep it in the R-5, TC, MU and RU Districts – no change there. I will point out – I had our GIS Planner provide this map – the areas shown in blue are current R-5 districts. The areas that are shown with the pink outline or the purple outline are PUDs where two-family dwellings are allowed. And the yellow are where we have properties that are assessed for two-family dwellings. You can see there are quite a few that are outside those two areas, the PUDs and the R-5. So, I did want to call attention to that, that this is what we have when we basically maintain the current format.

Mr. McPhail: Have you got enough yellow dots?

Mr. Whaley: There are quite a few scattered in through there. The issue that you have with this – and we saw this up on Smith Road a couple of years ago – we had a two-family dwelling where the owner was trying to refinance and they needed confirmation that it was a permitted use on that property; that they could reconstruct it if that was ever destroyed by fire or other damage, and they could not do that because it was a non-conforming use. So, they came in and rezoned from R-4 to R-5 to basically permit that use at that location. So, there are some ramifications of that. I think that because, as I pointed out in the Planning and Zoning report, two-family dwellings used to be allowed in other districts whereas they're not now. Missing Middle Housing: this is something I wanted to touch on quickly because this is a term that a lot of people have asked us to explore and define. This is basically house scaled buildings with multiple units in walkable neighborhoods. And what this means is – we talked about that middle column at the beginning of this presentation, the Conventional Zoning – Conventional Zoning has typically done a pretty good job of focusing on creating areas where you have single-family detached, it's done a pretty good job of focusing on areas where you have multi-family, so on the right side of that spectrum. (inaudible) more suburban or multi-family districts, but there's different housing types that are in-between those that zoning doesn't typically address, and I think we've seen that and talked about that as part of this process. You know, your quads, your tri-plexes, six-plexes, all those units in there. That good transition between single-family and multi-family, there's just not really that structure in place to allow for these types of units to get built.

Mr. Philip: We just (inaudible) about a PUD.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, go get a PUD, learn how to write a PUD. This just provides an illustration again, showing where those different districts permit the single-family residential, the multi-family residential and that area in-between, we really don't have a lot to address that. We've got the RU District and the MU District which allow some attached housing like townhomes for example, but as far as I know we only have one RU District and that was a part of a rezone that we did a couple of years ago for that 319 South Center Street where they wanted to have three units within an existing residential structure.

Mr. Klinger: You joke about the PUD, but the PUD is really a tool to address lack of adaptability in classic zoning. That's exactly what it's for.

Mr. Philip: Right, no, I understand that's been the only tool in the tool kit before that.

Mr. Klinger: Right, and sometimes it's a clumsy tool.

Mr. Whaley: So, this is a new definition that we added in our revisions, single-family attached dwelling. These have the capacity to look like two-family dwellings. If you look at the example in the middle, you could look at that and think that's a duplex. That is actually from Saratoga Village where each of those units will be on an individual lot with (inaudible) ownership. So, those are the paired homes. The definition is pretty broad so it could expand up to townhomes

like you see on the right-hand side of the screen in that example image. But these are again, single dwelling units on a single lot, they happened to be attached with a common party wall.

Mr. Klinger: The lot line goes right through the middle of that building.

Ms. Giesting: Goes through the middle of the building, okay.

Mr. Whaley: When those townhomes, as a part of Bomar, get constructed, they have six units for example, there's going to be six lots that those units are going to sit on.

Ms. Giesting: Each on their own lot.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: This will be (inaudible) development, right?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah – once the keyboard catches up here – a real quick illustration of the difference between single-family attached and two-family dwelling. Two-family is on the left; it's on a single lot, two dwellings units that are separate but a part of the same building. To the right, this is from Bill Kirchoff's neighborhood but not his house. I intentionally did not pick yours. But this is two dwelling units, each on individual lots. Again, just wanted to make sure to make the clear distinction. These are examples of the attached dwelling/missing middle; they can range from the tri-plexes on up to the six-plexes. Again, typically found in more urbanized areas, walkable neighborhoods. I think we covered that before but... When I look at the Stanley Harris project for example, even though that have an apartment building as a part of that, they are going to have townhomes that will not be owner occupied, that will not be on individual lots. So, lower left hand would be an image that would be considered attached house/missing middle, and not single-family attached, so that's the difference there. So, you have the multiple units in one building from one owner.

Mr. Philip: So, Bill, is your neighborhood then zoned with a PUD?

Mr. Kirchoff: (Mr. Kirchoff indicates "yes")

Mr. Philip: It was a PUD.

Mr. Whaley: With this particular definition and recommendations we did not make any revisions. So, if you have any feedback that you'd like to offer, please do so. I would point out, if you look at the bottom there, new construction would be limited to – we talked a little bit about this earlier – if you're building on a lot it's going to be restricted by the setbacks and other development standards such as building height, lot coverage, lot configuration, if it's an existing parcel on a new plat it's going to limit the size of that building. And that's really what makes these compatible with single-family detached houses; they're essentially subject to the

same standards, it's just that you have more units within a building than what you typically find in your single-family detached.

Mr. Philip: And what was the reason council remanded this back?

Mr. Whaley: We did not hear any objections to this particular item, but we did want to bring it up to show that we're not proposing any changes. Just again, to make sure that we're all on the same page because this would represent a change from our current policy. It would legalize, potentially legalize and existing multi-unit dwellings in the downtown area that are on approved alleys and have alley access. It would also allow for redevelopment of sites to have these types of units and alley access properties downtown. And it could allow, over time, for potential conversions of single-family dwellings into multi-unit structures. And again, that represents a change from what we currently allowed under the zoning districts today, so we had to have this discussion to make sure that there's agreement and understanding of what this involves.

Mr. Philip: Was there heartburn at the council about this or is this just change that we (inaudible)?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Philip: I'm asking questions guys. I'm...

Mr. Kirchoff: I wasn't involved. I just (inaudible) send it back.

Mr. Klinger: As I recall the primary issues were regarding the accessory dwelling units and that topic. Which we've have has plenty of conversation about, but I think you know, it came back to look at all of the potential residential changes.

Mr. Philip: Okay

Mr. Kirchoff: Did you want to put a package together for us to go to next month, or what? I mean, I assume we have to know what we're sending back to the council.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, we certainly do have the time for some space on that. As I said, the recommendation of the ordinance was given to the council, they did have two readings on that, but the third reading could be tabled for the Plan Commission to have further time to review these changes.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, sounds good.

Ms. Giesting: (microphone not on) (inaudible)

Mr. Philip: I'm not sure (inaudible) discussion either, by the reaction that we're getting.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, we thought it was important to touch on all of these housing issues, just to make sure – and again, I mean part of what I heard earlier, Robin’s comment about this may not necessarily be desirable downtown versus Rich that said that it might be. So again, I want to make sure that we...

Mr. Brandgard: I think the problem is, you look at what we have down here in the old area, it doesn’t look good and most of it’s not kept up. That’s the issue. So, how do we do that?

Mr. Whaley: Yes

Mr. McPhail: Well...

Mr. Philip: (inaudible)

Mr. Brandgard: Then again, that comes back to the ownership of it.

Mr. Philip: (inaudible)

Ms. Andres: That’s not a product availability, that a...

Mr. Philip: This is about making them into separate units, owned separately. I think the odds of it being – maintaining...

Mr. Brandgard: This part here, I don’t think there’s any problem.

Mr. Philip: And I think – so, that’s kind of what I’m trying to get the temperature of, is how we feel about this one, because I’m not hearing concerns.

Mr. Brandgard: I think the major concern was when we were talking about the mother-in-law quarters.

Mr. Philip: Right, turning into rental properties and not controlled and not maintained.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Philip: And I get that. I’m fine with that but... So yeah, I think if you packaged this up for us, you could get a recommendation from us on something like this Kevin. At least your odds are good.

Mr. Whaley: Okay

Mr. Philip: We may change our mind in a month, but right now that’s the vibe I get, right.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: You know, as one serving on the committee, you know, I told Kevin that I didn't think we'd done a good enough job for the Plan Commission to send on to the council.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, so that's why we're revising some of these, to get on the same page.

Mr. McPhail: That's why we're going through it.

Mr. Philip: And that's fine. And I appreciate you and Jennifer letting us react and rework these issues. It's not always so easy. And that's why I'm trying to drag some stuff out of you guys about trying to figure out where we are.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, and for the mother-in-law, I agree we need to come up with a solution.

Mr. Philip: Yeah, and it's not an easy thing, I get that.

Mr. Brandgard: It's not easy. You know, a lot of people are building houses with that built into them.

Mr. Philip: yeah

Mr. Brandgard: Which is a little different than coming back and...

Mr. Philip: And dealing with it later. But certainly, people's situation changes so we need to (inaudible)...

Mr. Kirchoff: (inaudible)?

Mr. Whaley: I just have one last thing.

Mr. Kirchoff: It's my wedding anniversary, I need to get home.

Mr. Whaley: Oh, sorry about that. Okay. This is just informational. This was not remanded or commented on from the Town Council but as we were going through the ordinance just doing some double and triple checks on all of our language, we did notice that we had inadvertently allowed car washes in with drive-through facilities which is restaurants. And if you remember, you all had created a new district to take those automotive uses out and create those in a separate district. So, we've clarified that in the ordinance by modifying this definition. That's all that I have. Please go and enjoy what's left of your anniversary Bill, I'm sorry. I was here on my anniversary earlier this year, so I understand.

Ms. Giesting: This does not require a vote, is that correct? Do we need a motion for this? Not tonight, okay.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Giesting: So, with that, thank you.

Mr. Philip: I move we adjourn.

Ms. Giesting: Do I have a second?

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Ms. Giesting: All in favor?

(All ayes)

Ms. Giesting: Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

Approved at Plan Commission Meeting - 10/3/2022