

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Slavens: The next item is the review and approval of the minutes from August 2, 2021.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Do we have a motion?

Mr. Brandgard: So moved

Mr. Slavens: A motion from Mr. Brandgard.

Mr. Philip: Second

Mr. Philip: A second from Mr. Philip. All in favor, please say aye.

(All ayes)

Mr. Slavens: Any opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING GUIDELINES

Mr. Philip: There are several items tonight for public hearing.

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

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Slavens: Mr. Daniel, if you could order the Oath of Testimony.

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

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: Thank you sir.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Slavens: It looks like the first item up is DP-21-075, and I'm assuming DP-21-076, continued from last month.

Mr. Berg: Thank you Mr. President. I've wanted to say for a long time, "Previously, on Plan Commission." You approved AllPoints 14 last month, and then there were some issues with the landscape plan that needed revision. They have brought those revisions to us; they are compliant with the ordinance. We issued some revised staff reports that basically said the same thing. We reissued them because there are three motions for each of the proposals, two development incentives, and an approval or denial of architectural and site design. So, unless there are questions for me, I'm prepared to step aside and turn this over to the applicant.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Eric. If the applicant would like to come forward and speak.

Mr. Hebert: Most of you know, my name is Terry Hebert with Browning; I'm at 6100 West 96th Street, Suite 150, Indianapolis, Indiana. We've been working with Eric and the planning staff and Scott Singleton, and I think they've done a good job on the presentation, and I think we've covered everything. So, I'd be glad to answer any questions you have, or talk about any kind of concerns or anything.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, any questions for the applicant? Concerns?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you sir. These two items are listed for public hearing...

Mr. Whaley: (microphone not on) We closed the public hearing at the last meeting.

Mr. Slavens: Oh, I did, that's right. My apologies. We'll go back to the Commission for any sort of discussion or a motion.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I think that the applicant has properly addressed the staff concerns.

Mr. Kirchoff: So which ones are we dealing with?

Mr. Slavens: DP-21-075 and DP-21-076. So, first up for motion would be DP-21-075 – AllPoints Midwest 15.

Mr. Smith: Mr. President, are you ready for a motion?

Mr. Slavens: Yes sir.

Mr. Smith: This is the first of three motions related to the project. This one concerns Depth of Yard Development Incentive. I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Depth of Yard Development Incentive, finding that:

1. The Plant Unit Value to be provided in the required Yard or required Bufferyard exceeds the normal standard for such Yard by a multiple of 2.0 or more;
2. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and,
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Slavens: We have our first motion from Mr. Smith. Do we have a second?

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a second from Mr. McPhail. Andrew, can you do roll call for Motion 1?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion for Development Incentives is approved 7-0.

Mr. Smith: Motion 2, this concerns Orientation of Loading Spaces Development Incentive. I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Orientation of Loading Spaces Development Incentive, finding that:

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

Mr. Slavens: We have a Motion 2...

Mr. Brandgard: So moved

Mr. Slavens: ...from Mr. Smith; a second from Mr. Brandgard. Andrew, can you do roll call?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Development Incentive is approved 7-0.

Mr. Smith: Motion 3 – Architectural and Site Design. I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-21-075 requesting Architectural Site Design approval for Architectural and Site Design review for a proposed 1,010,387 +/- square foot speculative single distribution center on a 47.79 acre parcel to be incrementally platted that is zoned I2: Office/Warehouse Distribution within 600 feet of a residential zoned property, finding that:

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

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

1. Substantial compliance with the plans and document approved by the Commission.
2. A secondary plat will be required within sixty (60) days of the Primary Plan approval.

Mr. Slavens: A motion from Mr. Smith. Do we have a second?

Mr. Philip: Second

Mr. Slavens: A second from Mr. Philip. Andrew, can you roll call please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion is approved 7-0.

Mr. Slavens: It looks like we have similar motions for DP-21-076 – AllPoints Midwest 26.

Mr. Philip: So, Mr. President, Motion 1 is around Depth of Yard Development Incentive. I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Depth of Yard Development Incentive, finding that:

1. The Plant Unit Value to be provided in the required Yard or required Bufferyard exceeds the normal standard for such Yard by a multiple of 2.0 or more;
2. The proposed development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and,
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Bahr: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Mr. Philip, a second from Mr. Bahr. Andrew, can you roll call please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion is approved 7-0.

Mr. Philip: Mr. President, the second motion is around Orientation of Loading Spaces Development Incentive. I move that the Plan Commission approve the requested Depth of Yard Development Incentive, finding that:

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

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Mr. Philip.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Slavens: A second from Mr. Brandgard. Mr. Klinger?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion is approved 7-0.

Mr. Philip: So, Mr. President, Motion 3 is Architectural and Site Design. I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-20-076 requesting Architectural Site Design approval for Architectural and Site Design review for a proposed 551,837+/- square foot speculative warehouse/distribution center on a 32.84 acre parcel to be incrementally platted that is zoned I2: Office/Warehouse Distribution within 600 feet of a residential zoned property, finding that:

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

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

1. Substantial compliance with the plans and document approved by the Commission.
2. A secondary plat will be required within sixty (60) days of the Primary Plan approval.

Mr. Slavens: A motion from Mr. Philip. Do we have a second?

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Mr. Slavens: a Second from Mr. Kirchoff. Andrew, could you do roll call please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

Motion is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. That closes out the items that were continued from last month's hearing. So, next on the docket is PUD-21-085 – Stanley Terrace.

Mr. Whaley: Yes, this petition is for a rezone, as well as a Final Detailed Plan approval, for a proposed multi-family development, located at approximately 422 North East Street. This is basically located between North Vine and Ellis Street, to the south of the Vandalia Trail. The property is highlighted in the teal color shown on the aerial. It probably doesn't show up on this screen for the audience, but the sort of salmon color that you see encased in that teal outline indicates that the property is currently zoned R-4 which is Medium Density Residential, and within that district, it permits single-family dwellings. To the east of that site, we have R-5 which is High-Density Residential, and that permits single-family, as well as two-family residential dwellings. To the south, we also have R-4 Single-Family Residential. The reason for this particular request is the applicant is proposing to redevelop this site for a mixture of townhomes, as well as an apartment building, and in order to allow those particular building types and uses, this is a good candidate for a Planned Unit Development. The other typical, conventional zoning classification which would have worked at this site, R-U which is the Urban Residential District. Here you can see the site outlined in yellow; it shows a little bit better on this image. Everything to the west of North East Street, all those buildings that you see on this aerial, have been cleared and demolished. The buildings to the east are still in existence today. You can see on the aerial that we have residential to the south, west, and east, and the trail is located to the north of the site. The access to the trail does come up through the middle and connect with East Street, as you can see on the screen. In terms of the Comprehensive Plan recommendation for this site, it does recommend Historic District Residential. The plan text specifies that this is predominantly intended for single-family residential dwellings, but it also notes that more dense residential building types such as townhomes or multi-family should be included with that Historic District Residential designation on the plan as well. But then it does go on to say that any structures within that area should be compatible with the surroundings. This shows the site plan, the applicant will get into more detail when they get up and do their presentation, but this just gives you a (inaudible) where you can see the proposed multi-family apartment building, located to the west of North East Street, the single building to the west there. And then to the east we have six, four-unit townhomes shown on that site, so this will be on the east side. And as I said, the applicant is going to get into more detail with their presentation, and we'll turn it over to them.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kevin. Applicant, come forward.

Mr. Surak: Good evening, I'm Nick Surak with Woda Cooper Companies. My address is 6500 Westfield Boulevard, Indianapolis, Indiana 46220. And just to be clear, you want me to keep this to about five minutes? I'm under that sort of...?

Mr. Slavens: That was for the public hearing.

Mr. Surak: Okay. Okay, just to give you a little bit of background on the development team: the Woda Cooper Companies is a vertically integrated development of family companies. We do

development, general contracting, and property management, all under one house. We are located in Columbus, Ohio, however we have multiple regional offices, including mine here in Indianapolis, which handles all development construction in kind of the Midwest region. Over the course of our 31-year history we've developed about 400 projects in 16 states, we have 14,000 units of housing under management at this time. We are long-term owners, as I indicated up there, we have one property that we've sold over the course of that time, but the rest have all been long-term projects for ourselves, and that kind of informs how we approach development, because we have to live with the decisions that we make, as part of the development process, and we need to live with that over the next 30-50 years. We do have one previous project here – I say previous, it's under construction right now – it's over by the Shops of Perry Crossing, kind of behind where Ross is, if you go behind that area. We're getting ready to pour the slab next week, and we'll be vertical in the next few weeks, and that also went through the PUD process as well. Because of the nature of that site, it kind of required stepping outside of the typical boundaries of the zoning code to make the site plan work. This project, as everyone knows, is the former Stanley fertilizer site. This site was acquired by the Community Development Corporation, and they conducted a search of multiple developers that they asked to pitch their vision and a prepare a site plan for them. We were selected based on the strength of our proposal, which includes the site plan that we're presenting today. The development would consist of 60 general occupancy units, which means there's no age restriction. And as Kevin alluded to, it will be split between a townhome component and a multi-family component. We'll have one-, two-, and three-bedroom units at this development. The total investment is a bit north of \$13.1 million dollars. And if we are allowed to proceed with this, we would be looking for a construction start, most likely about toward the late summer of next year, and it would take a year to complete. So, we'd be looking at sometime late in 2023 when this would be ready for occupancy. The question is, "why did we seek a planned unit development?", and Kevin touched on this as well a little bit. The existing zoning code comes with some restrictions in terms of setbacks and whatnot, and it's more tailored towards, I think, a more standard Greenfield site where you've got kind of nice, even boundaries, and an easy shape to work with. This is a little trickier; we have two groups of parcels that are separated by a street. One parcel is fairly rectangular, but the other one has kind of some odd cutouts, and if you take into account standard setbacks and things of that nature, you're actually taking a lot of that site off the board, as far as being developable for parking or structures. So, we thought this would – you know, we approached this site with – we wanted to be creative, not just take a straight forward approach where we just say, okay, we've got two parcels, let's just throw down a building here and a building here and surround it with parking, but let's think about something that compliments the neighborhood a little bit more, and isn't just an unimaginative kind of cookie cutter development. So, I just went through some of the features of the project. As with all of our projects, we will get, at a minimum, a LEED Silver rating, which is an energy efficiency rating. So, along with that comes things like enhanced insulation, high-efficiency appliances, high-efficiency HVAC, energy conserving lighting and water fixtures. We'll have a – it's actually designed as a separate building, but it's a community building that will serve as a community room, a laundry room and exercise facility, as well as our manager's office. For a project of this type, we have a full-time, 40 hour a

week staff, both a property manager, as well as maintenance technician. The development quality is very high; I like to point this out, we literally use the exact same cabinet and flooring suppliers that developers of places like The Barlow used. And I mean that, like literally, it's the same supplier. So, it's built to a very high standard, and it's designed for durability and long use, and to be modern and attractive, not just an "up the middle" sort of approach. One of the things I like about this design is just, we have a mixed building design. There's you know, different approaches taken here where you have the townhomes for folks who want something that is more approximate to a single-family residence. And then we have a multi-family building for folks who want to live in a traditional double-loaded corridor building with an elevator. We also have a number of these units that are designed for folks who need additional accessibility, and so that is baked into the cake here. So, on the multi-family piece, that means that they're accessible through the elevator. On the townhome side of things, those units will be single-story instead of double story like other ones. And some of the features that are tied up in that are just kind of enhanced clearing spaces in kitchens and bathrooms, grab bars in the bathroom for people to pull themselves up; we would typically have removeable under counter cabinets so that if someone's in a wheelchair, they can pull themselves up to the sink or the worksurface, things like that. So, one of the greatest amenities to this project I think, is being located right on the Vandavia Trail which provides a lot of connectivity to downtown and amenities in town like the park system. Lastly, I just want to emphasize that the building exteriors are also high-quality; they're strictly masonry and fiber cement board, no vinyl siding on these buildings. They're meant to be attractive, modern, and built to the highest standard possible. And if anyone's interested, just because this came up last time, I do have samples if you want to feel and touch what the Hardie Board and all those other things look like, I'm happy to show those. So, Kevin went through the site plan really quick, but I wanted to touch on this a little bit, and why we made the decisions that we did. On the eastern parcel here, we thought, we wanted to make sure that we kind of activated the use of the trail. It's obviously pedestrian and bicycle oriented, and so rather than throwing down sort of a traditional building that would have to be set far back from the street, and then you'd have a large parking lot fronting the trail, we came up with this design where we could place the townhomes along the perimeter, and hide the parking inside, and we think that's really going to be a much more attractive look and give it more of a neighborhood feel than you would have with a more traditional multi-family structure. Then on the western side, this is one that's a little bit more difficult because of the shape – and we elected to orient the building north/south, as opposed to east/west, and our thought process there was, again, we wanted this to be closer to the trail to give it that sense of walkability. That also allowed us to place the community building, and the playground and picnic area close to the trail. We also like to have that within the line of sight of the community manager as well, so they can monitor what's going on there. And by doing it that way, the building, if it was east/west, it would have kind of a pretty big presence to the single-family to the south; this way we're minimizing it, limiting it to the very end there. And by moving it as far over as we did, there's a significant buffer between the homes on Vine Street, that wouldn't be there if we had gone with the east/west orientation. And then lastly, just to add an additional buffer, if you look on the westernmost boundary there, we do have a pretty significant landscape buffer there that we built into the site

there that will have trees and other plantings there to help screen some of the parking and make sure that if someone is returning to the building at night, that the lights aren't shining into the windows of the folks next door. I'm just going to go through these a little bit quicker, so I pick up the pace – these are just kind of colorized versions of what I showed you, to kind of help bring it to life a little bit more, and it shows a little bit of the landscaping plan. So again, you see the multi-family building, next to it, it's got the community building with a covered walkway, a picnic area and a playground to the north. And then here's the townhome orientation as well, which we discussed before, and they all have kind of like a front porch effect, so that way they're all facing outwards towards the street; you know, we don't want to show the rear end to whatever pedestrians are there, we want to create a sense of community. This is a colorized 3-D rendering of what it looks like if you're going north on East Street. So, on the right-hand side here you have a perspective of what the townhomes would look like once they're completed. And then if you look across the street, what you see there on the corner is the community building, and that's designed to sort of mimic the style and the look of the townhomes. You can see there, they have a course of masonry along the bottom, and then the upper floors are Hardie Cement Board, or we tend to use another product called Allura, but it's basically the same thing. And then you can also see the multi-story building that is behind the community building, and the impact it would have here, which I think is pretty muted. And we also elected for more of a flat roof design instead of a pitched roof design, to keep the height down. Here are some color renderings of the townhomes, to kind of show what we have in mind. And our intent here is to illustrate that we intend to go for different color schemes for each of the gabled pieces, and kind of play with the textures of the Hardie Board and the brick, in terms of whether it's horizontal or panelized, or going north/south. And the other thing that I think that we did here that is notable, and I think, kind of clever, is to reduce the visual impact. If you notice, there are four entry doors here, each one of these buildings has four residences in it, but we designed it with three gables, so it looks like it's three homes, even though there are four there, so we're just trying to keep the scale down to neighborhood size. This one I'm showing you, this is what one of the clusters that would have the accessible units would look like. So, if you look, the two units on the end are single-story, with a pair of two-story ones on the middle, so I just thought it was useful to show this. You see that everyone has a covered porchway and things like that. This is looking north on Vine Street. So again, it's a colorized 3-D rendering to show the impact of the multi-family building. You can see it's pulled back quite far. I feel like it's got – by doing that it really minimizes the impact on the street, and especially the single-family homes on the west side of things. The only difference between this and the site plan that we've shown is, here we're still showing the parking that faces Vine Street, but we've shown that we're going to replace that with a bigger landscape buffer, just to make it a bit deeper. 2-D renderings of the building, and again, this is just to illustrate the mix of materials. You can see on the ground floor, and protruding under the second floor, you have masonry. And then in the recesses you have multiple different styles of cement fiber board; some of them look like siding, some of them look like lap siding. But this is again, just for illustrative purpose, to help you visualize. This is a colorized version of that, which I will admit, I don't like as much because the colors kind of bleed together too much, but what we intend to do is to do darker brick further down, and then the recessed areas we will use a

lighter colored brick. And I have some samples with me here that we've used at some other projects; it's kind of a darker charcoal brick at the lower level. And that will also be mimicked on the townhomes, the brick piece that's on the lower part – we'll use this same dark brick. And then on the higher parts here, we will use a lighter colored brick. So, that concludes the slideshow, hopefully I covered all the basis that you're looking for. I'm happy to take any questions, if this is the time for that.

Mr. Slavens: Yeah – any questions initially for the applicant?

Mr. Brandgard: No

Mr. Slavens: No questions, thank you Nick.

Mr. Surak: Okay

Mr. Slavens: This is listed for a public hearing, if anybody would like to step forward to speak for or against this, now is the time to do so.

Ms. Muncy: My name is Darlene Muncy...

Mr. Slavens: What's your address?

Ms. Muncy: My sisters and brothers and I own the property of 419 East which is right across from where all of this is happening. First of all, I have to tell you, a lot of my neighbors would be here, but we just got the notice today. The guy across the alley from us, who is also very impacted but he's, he got his notice today, but he was working and couldn't ask for time off at this point, to be here. The people across the street, I don't know when they got theirs, but I think they had the same problem, we didn't get notice that this was getting approved tonight; we thought it was a zoning issue, and I think you'd have a lot more people here, had they known. Next point: he did a great job of presenting how much thought went into the look of the buildings, the landscaping, and all of that, but what I never got out of it was how it relates to what is already there. Now, you talked about the other project over there at Perry Crossing. Well, there were no homes or streets up there, where they worked there. Right now, the house that we own – which you saw with the little picket fence in the view, that's us – I don't know how we fit into what they're doing but I fear it. I'm all for progress; we're thrilled to death that the Stanley disaster finally got cleared up, I bitched about it for years. Mr. Carlucci told me, "Oh, well, it's hot potato and we want the state to help us, and maybe we can get some federal help, but the county can't afford..." and that charred mess sat up there for years for us to look at. And how many times I called and said that there was purple kind of strange stuff rolling down the street and into our yard and killing the grass. So, that went on for years, so I'm grateful that something's been done, don't think I'm not, but I don't know how much thought they gave to the people who already live down there, and have lived there – we're in that alley that I have a horrible feeling is about to become a two-way street. That alley, we have plowed it, we've put gravel down it a couple of years because the town didn't put anything on it to keep it from being a mud bog, we sprayed the weeds, we've

done everything down there, and now I think that's being turned into a two-way street. Well, when the walking trail went through, it took a big section of our front yard. And now it's fine, it's a lovely walking trail and we watch every day as the bicyclers and walkers use it, but there's no place for us to park on the street. So, now if they come along and make a two-way street next to the side of our house – in one of the drawings that we saw they build that street coming all the way up to the side of the house, so we have the choice of driving cars and parking them in the front yard or parking them in the backyard and driving across sidewalks to do that. So, I'm not real clear on what happens to the alley between 419 North East and the house on the other side of the alley. What happens to that alley? I think it's going to be a cut through – I never saw where the entrance is to this, the entrance and the exit into these divisions. Is that going to pour right out into our backyard? Because there was a little curb thing on that drawing, and I've got a feeling that's the exit, which is right across from what little we would have left of our backyard. And there are people in this room, I'm sure, who have the same concerns about their houses and yards, and we don't feel like that was addressed, or that we got a fair chance to find out what they're really doing to it. We can tell from that – the people across the street, they park right next to the fence where Stanley was. Where does their parking go? So, all of us are thrilled to death that you're doing something, but we don't know how much we're going to lose. I mean, we've owned that house for 65 years, and now because a lovely new development is going in, our living arrangement is not going to be acceptable. We're not going to have a place to park our cars. So, please don't approve this tonight, until we get some answers.

Mr. Slavens: Well, the public hearing is to listen to the questions...

Ms. Muncy: Okay, and I know there are other people that I talked to outside the room here, that are very concerned about what's going to happen to their property, their lives and situations that they're familiar with. We're not opposed to it; we just want to be taken into account and have some accommodations made, so that we can still have a lovey life there on that end of town.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you for posing your concerns and questions. The public will still be open, so we'll listen to more questions, and then we'll go back to the applicant.

Ms. Muncy: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. Anybody else that would like to come forward to speak for or against the petition? If you'd like to speak, come up to the mic.

Ms. C. Muncy: I'm not sure what you're asking me, because I couldn't hear anything that's going on. Some of my concerns may have been addressed in the presentation but I couldn't hear the presentation. The mic doesn't seem to be working.

Mr. Slavens: Could you state your name and address please, before you start?

Ms. C. Muncy: I thought the sign on the door said we had to wear masks.

Mr. Slavens: You can wear it...

Ms. C. Muncy: One of my concerns is the soil contamination, which we had a number of conversations with Rick Carlucci before he retired and then passed away. He was having ongoing conversations with us about the soil contamination. He had indicated – and if this is a repeat of anything she said, I apologize but I couldn't hear – he indicated that the soil contamination was pretty severe. He even said that he didn't know if the Town of Plainfield could buy the property because of the cost of the cleanup. Now, I understand that since then that you found out that there were federal grants available, and maybe that's why the town went ahead and made the purchase, because of federal grants that would clean it up. I also understand that you did do some removal, like about 20 feet deep or so, right behind the office, but I'm concerned that there was other contamination on the other side of Depot Street where those very rusty tanks sat for years, and years, and years. We've lived there 65 years so we kind of know a lot of the history. We know a lot of the disaster that that area was, so I have a concern about that. I also have a concern about drainage because we live – our property is to the immediate south. Stanley was allowed to pave all of that property to the north of us, totally paved or building on it, with no allowance for storm drains. So, instead of just our own water, storm water on our property, which we could have handled, all of that storm water from what they call an "outlot" ran over into our yard. We would get 5-6 inches of water if we had a heavy rain. So, I want to know, now that something else is being built there, will they make some allowances for storm drainage? Will there be drains put in so that all of that no longer all drains down into our yard. So again, he may have addressed storm drainage in his presentation, but if he did, I couldn't hear it. I did hear her mention the notification letter, the fact that we just received it today; the residents at 220 North Street, I happened to be in her kitchen today when the mailman knocked on the door and delivered her letter today. Now, Eric Berg told me that it was legal, that everything was legal. Well, it might be legal, but it's not good, it's not right. We only got notified today, of this meeting tonight. the letter does say something about written comments, well I had not time to prepare written comments. Another concern is access, because of the narrowness of East Street. The way I used to go to the house was go up Vine Street, across Depot Street, around and back south on East Street to our house. Now, if they're removing Depot Street, you know, access to our house is a little more of a problem. And once I get there, where am I going to park? Another concern that I have is the name. We've lived there 65 years, and I don't know if this name is to honor Everett Stanley, but he was not a good neighbor, he was not a good citizen. The way he allowed that property to be, with the burned-out buildings, and the dump that was there, where people dumped sofas and couches and mattresses, and they stayed there forever. And the graffiti on the building, he was not a good citizen. I would like to see it named, if it's going to be, I'd like to see it named something else, and certainly not in his honor, he doesn't deserve to be honored. That was originally called Crawford Addition; if they want to name it for Crawford, which was originally in 1904. Since 1904 it's been Crawford Addition, so why can't it be named for him? Or Emmett Bly owned much of that property at that time. Emmett Bly was a good citizen, name it for Emmett Bly, but not for Everett Stanley.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Ms. C. Muncy: And then, as I said, the other issues that she already mentioned.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you, appreciate it. And if you could, sorry ma'am, could you say your name again, and address...

Ms. C. Muncy: Carolyn Muncy, 419 North East Street.

Mr. Slavens: And please sign the piece of paper in front of you. Sign the piece of paper on front of you.

Ms. C. Muncy: There's not a piece of paper. So, she was supposed to sign it too?

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Ms. C. Muncy: I'll leave a line for her.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. If there's anybody else here, while she's filling that out, that would like to speak for or against it, please do so now.

Ms. C. Muncy: Will we receive any answers tonight?

Mr. Slavens: Yes...

Ms. C. Muncy: Regarding that drainage and the...

Mr. Slavens: When we close the public hearing, we'll go back to staff and the applicant to address the questions.

Ms. C. Muncy: Okay

Mr. Slavens: Good evening.

Mr. Carlson: Hi, my name is Eric Carlson, my primary address is out in Danville, 1351 Wildwood Road, Danville, Indiana 46122. We own the rental property on 419 Vine Street, so we're the house kind of on that corner that's jutting around. I did receive, in Danville, I did receive my letter last week. So, just to state for the record, I did receive it last week. I submitted a question earlier today, regarding a fence, if the developer would consider a fence. I don't have any opposition against it. I think it's a great property, I'm in favor of the development. I have no issues there, it looks great. My concern is really on the, it's not only the privacy, there's also the security. You're building a 36 multi-family development, that's just a lot of people. I've got a young family, young mom, two kids – right now there is an existing fence, but it's actually been knocked down by the heavy equipment when they were demoing. I haven't addressed it with the town, assuming that would have been fixed; it hasn't been fixed, so it's now leaning both on the north and the east side. So, there's currently a fence that I'd like to see replaced, replaced with more of a nice

looking, maybe it's a PVC, whatever it is, but a security privacy fence, in addition to the landscaping.

Mr. Smith: Can you describe where that location is?

Mr. Carlson: 419 North Vine Street. That's the house address, so it's on the, it would be the – the apartment building, it would be on the southwest corner.

Mr. Smith: Of the apartment building?

Mr. Carlson: Of the apartment building, yeah, there's currently a fence that's been...

Mr. Philip: Where the (inaudible) was, and that...?

Mr. Carlson: Yep

Mr. Philip: And that concrete? So, you're talking about a fence that would be to that southeast...?

Mr. Carlson: There's a fence that currently there.

Mr. Philip: Northeast

Mr. Carlson: Yeah, the north and east side. The fence is currently there. I don't know how long it's been there; we just bought that property last year. But when they were removing some of the trees and doing some of the land work, some of the heavy equipment did bump into the fence. It doesn't need to be fixed now but I'd like to see if that could be replaced, more as security. The arbor variety, I mean, trees are great, but where's the trash going? Trash is still going to be blowing straight through there. Floodlights, just from the cars and that parking lot, having some kind of a physical barrier would not only help aesthetically, but also functionally.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Eric. Anybody else that would like to come forward and speak for or against the petition?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Okay, seeing none, we'll close this public hearing and turn it back over to the Commission for additional questions, or look to staff. I know a lot of questions came about, especially around notifications. Eric or Kevin, can you address the notification question and concern, first and foremost?

Mr. Whaley: With respect to the notification question, staff did publish signs; one on North East Street on the west side, and also a sign on North Vine Street, at least 10 days prior to this public hearing. As I was placing the signs, I did have a neighbor come up and ask me some questions about the project. So, the signs have been up there. The courtesy notices that were sent to surrounding properties – the town owns property in that area, so we received notice as well, via

certified mail, and they were postmarked by August 31st, at least 10 days prior. I think the issues with the postal service are well documented. I know that we've had some issues with our code enforcement department, with getting notice to people, and then we've also put a section in the Town Council report about some of the issues that we're having. Staff is working to try and make some changes with how we get the notice out to the surrounding properties owners, by placing more of the responsibility on the applicant. We're going to try to move that up in the process so that we can account for more time, so that people get that notice hopefully sooner. Obviously, we can't make changes to the operation of the postal service, so we'll try to change things on our end, to get that out sooner. I did want to say for the record that we did receive a couple of communications prior to this public hearing. The first was from Mr. Carlson, who just spoke, and he lives at 419, and he did write the comment about the fence request. And then the second was a letter from a Randall Chance, who stated that he is opposed to this particular project, and that letter was forwarded to the Plan Commission members; it's also posted on the town's website on the project page. With respect to questions on drainage, that's not something I can speak to, but I think that the applicant's engineer might have some information to provide on that. And then if Tim Belcher is here, he can probably speak to that as well. And Scott Singleton can address transportation questions.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kevin. Scott, are you prepared to address the traffic patterns, parking, etcetera?

Mr. Singleton: Yeah, I didn't prepare any slides of that nature, for this.

Mr. Slavens: Sure

Mr. Singleton: I think we can get from this, or get a pretty good sense of what Ms. Muncy was referencing. I don't know exactly how well these detailed site plans line up with the alley, legal descriptions and all of that; I think these guys have to go through, obviously, a full design development. But I do – the existing alley that sits north of a couple of these homes, it is expected to be converted over to a new public street, which would look very similar to the street section that you see by Bob Ward Park, just south of here. So, it's about a 20-foot-wide pavement section with 2-foot gutters on either side, so it's 24 foot width total. I'm sorry, 18-foot-wide pavement section – 16-foot-wide pavement section with 2 foot curbs on either side, 20 feet back to back, curb to curb. So, that is the matching section, so that is the matching section to what we have down near the park, and then with the bump out for parking spaces as well. So, what is being expected for signing is that east of the drive for this new street would be two-way traffic, so basically entering into the new townhome neighborhood. Traffic would be expected to come up Ellis Street and some across into the drive, and then exiting traffic could go to Ellis Street if it was going back to Avon Avenue, or it could take a right out of the neighborhood and come down East Street, which would be a one-way southbound. That is really the biggest new change in the traffic patterns for accessing the site. Depot Street, which is just off this screen, is only 13 feet wide, so we are recommending, we'll assign that one-way. We're somewhat open to which one-way makes the most sense; I think right now we're leaning more towards it being an exit lane for the

apartment building to go over and get to Center Street without having to cut through the neighborhood, for getting out. Then to one of the Muncy's comments, we have talked with the petitioner, and we expect to do "no through traffic" and "one-way only" signs on some of these alleys to help indicate that these are not intended to serve through traffic for the new development, they are intended to continue to serve the residents and their needs, for locals. But again, just to be clear, the alley north of the Muncy's property that was mentioned earlier, some of that is expected to go away in favor of a new public street. It would have two-way availability on portions of it, and some street parking. Have I answered all of your questions?

Mr. Kirchoff: Scott, clarify for me, I see the trail and it coming down – so between the two properties, it's trail only, it's not a road. Is that correct?

Mr. Singleton: That is correct. Cars could come, if they wanted to, to get to this parking area where their community building area is, they would be coming up Ellis, across Ellis, and then could pull in here. And then when they leave, they would get forced to go south on East Street.

Ms. Muncy: And where's the parking area for the homes, the people who live in those homes?

Mr. Klinger: So, Scott, I believe there's eight street level parking spaces along that new road, correct?

Mr. Singleton: There are eight proposed street level parking. I think there's at least six or eight that exist on the street to the south, on North Street, on the north side as well.

Mr. Slavens: So, it's not taking away any existing parking?

Mr. Singleton: We're not taking away any existing parking, I think the concern is obviously the alley that exists there, is being used for parking by some of the residents that live there. But we are adding eight new spots on the street.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Any other questions for Scott, around traffic? One of the questions, I don't know if you know...

Ms. Muncy: (inaudible)

Mr. Slavens: Excuse me, excuse me, the public hearing is closed, so I think Scott has addressed that the parking that we heard about in the public hearing, the parking is not diminishing, they are adding parking to the alley, even though it's going to expand. I'm going to try to reiterate here. So, there should be additional parking available, we'll have eight, when this is all said and done.

Mr. Singleton: I think so, I think I heard you say – just to be clear, this is going to be a street. The alley will basically be converted into a full street section, that will have with parking spaces along that street.

Ms. Muncy: But is that parking for the residents there, is that where they park?

Mr. Kirchoff: Ma'am

Mr. Slavens: I'm sorry ma'am – it's for anybody, it's open parking.

Mr. Singleton: We have no plans to put any restrictions on it for any individuals, just open parking, like you said.

Mr. Smith: And of course, the residents, they've got the whole big parking lot in the interior of the project, that's all their parking. So, they have spaces for them.

Mr. Singleton: That is correct.

Ms. Muncy: But if they're (inaudible)...

Mr. Slavens: Excuse me ma'am...

Ms. Muncy: ...street, that's where they're going to park.

Mr. Slavens: Ma'am, the public hearing is taken care of. After the meeting, if you'd like to follow up with the staff, please feel free to do so. I think we're looking to address the comments right now. Thank you, Scott.

Mr. Singleton: Anything else?

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you

Mr. Singleton: Thank you

Mr. Slavens: Petitioner, if you'd like to come forward, so you can address some of the questions that we've had. I don't know if you have your engineer here to address about the drainage.

Mr. Surak: I'll let Pat handle most of the stuff about the drainage, but I did want to speak to the fence. We're totally amenable to adding that in there, that's not a big thing for us. Obviously with our development timeline, if he wants a fence now, that might be on you guys, or he's just going to have to wait it out until we're ready to go. But if it needs to be something that we put up, we can definitely put that into our site plan. I'll take direction from staff on how that would need to be included in the language of the PUD, if we need to put something in there about that.

Mr. Slavens: Good, thank you.

Mr. Moon: My name is Patrick Moon, Farnsworth Group, 8910 Perdue Drive, Indianapolis. With regards to storm water runoff, we did meet with staff early on when we first started looking at this, and we were told that we were going to have to provide storm water detention over what's

currently out there, which is basically nothing. The vision right now, it's going to be underground storage containment, and it will be tied into the existing storm system, wherever that may be. We may have to track it down a block or two to get to it to the existing storm system, to tie it in. We're going to do a controlled runoff, control it on site. The way it's currently running now, just running off the site into the property, it will not happen. It's going to be curbed and guttered, so (inaudible) in the parking lots, so it's all going to be kind of trapped and collected in a uniform location.

Mr. Slavens: So, it will improve the drainage situation?

Mr. Moon: It should, because we're going to contain it on site, take it out to a controlled location. Right now, it's just running – I looked at the site and it just goes everywhere, so we're going to kind of control it the best we can.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. And I don't know who to – Tim or anybody – about the soil contamination comment.

Mr. Belcher: Yeah, thanks for the chance to talk about that, because I have been around here a long time – not as long as you folks, as far as living in the neighborhood, but that site was a terrible problem to try to figure out how to get to the contamination issue. We did do a, collectively, the town and the property owner, a Phase 1 and Phase 2 on both sides of the street. The east side was found to be clean, there's nothing on that side where the buildings still exist. So, it was all on the fertilizer side where all the tanks were, which we all, looking at it, expected. So, the State of Indiana did step in and assist, and has spent somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300,000 to \$350,000 removing tanks, contaminated soil that was under those tanks. They even found coal dust in the ground that they didn't expect; that's been removed. So, there are still more steps to go through, as far as I understand it, I'm no expert in this, but the idea of testing to be sure that the ground is suitable for redevelopment, for people to live on it, right, not just the folks in the neighborhood, but anybody else who would move in. So, that's all still in process and will be done. And I believe what it's called is a "no further action" letter from IDEM, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, will look at the site, look at the tests after all the cleanup is done, and that kind of a letter has to be issued before it goes any further. So, again, not being an expert in it, I know that much about it. And certainly, it's something that we're concerned about and really pleased that the state came in because that was one of the problems of the town, not being able to take on that liability, right, without some kind of assistance to get it cleaned up. So, that has taken place and we were pleased to see that happen.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, so no building will start until IDEM has given its approval of decontamination?

Mr. Belcher: Right, and they did, for folks who live near this site, they went across the streets and even tried to find out if anything went underground and went further away. So, they did a very thorough investigation, which I think is what's required by all the regulations. So, it was a very

good thing to see, I think, for the neighborhood, and certainly it's headed in the right direction compared to where it was.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you Tim.

Mr. Belcher: Thank you.

Mr. Slavens: I think the only other question we'd look to address is if the applicant can remind us of where the entrances and exits are for each section.

Mr. Surak: Sure, so the apartment building, it's on North Vine Street, you can see up here there's an entrance and an exit built off the parking lot there, so that's where folks will park for that building. And then you'd approach the townhomes on Ellis Street, and you would make a left on that alley – that we are going to improve on our own expense, I want to throw that in there as well, that all the improvements that are going in that public right-of-way are being borne by us. And then residents that are leaving, that are parked in the center there, have either the choice of returning via Ellis Street, or going down North East Street. So, you have two different approaches depending on which part of the project you live in.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. I think the letter also stated, that we received earlier, about concerns around the existing water and sewer line capacity, given the addition of new homes.

Mr. Moon: We've had a few conversations with the Utility Department. We know where the sewers are. Actual capacity of the line, we haven't gotten that far into the due diligence, trying to get the site plan approved. The water lines of the apartment building – on similar type projects, if there's not enough pressure, they put a booster inside the building to get proper pressure for the residents there.

Mr. Surak: And I think to address one of the comments in the letter, whether that's a public expense or a private expense. That's a private expense for us to make those improvements on the site. I think that was one of the concerns in the letter, whether the town was on the hook for that, but it's our site, we've got to handle it.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. I think I captured everything. Did I miss anything, Commission members?

Mr. Smith: I do want to ask about the – there's an embankment on the north side, against the trail, and the condition of that right now is...

Mr. Surak: I missed the first part of that; are you talking about the trees or...?

Mr. Smith: Yeah, the trees on what looks like a very steep embankment.

Mr. Brandgard: The old railroad embankment.

Mr. Smith: The railroad embankment.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah

Mr. Surak: Right, so you're talking about right up there by the multi-family building, right up there by along that property line?

Mr. Smith: What can you do to clean that up and make that attractive?

Mr. Surak: So, we, in our landscape plan, we have new plantings for trees and things like that in there, and we can work with the town to remove the scrub that's there and replace it with new plantings. I remember, we talked about this before and it would enhance the project and provide a little more screening as well. We've got that in our landscape plan as something that has to be addressed.

Mr. Smith: Okay, good. It's pretty rough right now.

Mr. Surak: Yeah

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Any other comments or questions from the Commission members?

Mr. McPhail: Well, I'd just like to make a comment that, you know, the detailed site plan has not been developed for this site, and we have regulations on storm water, utilities, and all those sorts of things, all those things will go through the engineering department, reviewed, and meet all of our standards. So, I guarantee you, the site will be improved.

Mr. Slavens: Yes

Mr. McPhail: From its current conditions.

Mr. Slavens: Yes, thank you for the reminder that this is not a public hearing for the detailed design. We'll have another hearing on the detailed design later on – not a public hearing, sorry.

Mr. Philip: (microphone not on) He pointed out that there's interesting timing issues relative to the fact that they won't start development for another year out, and so by the time development is done, we're talking about probably two years from now. So, might have more conversation about that during...

Mr. McPhail: All right, thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you Kent. Any other comments, questions?

Mr. Smith: There's also another pretty bad current condition. The boundary on your east side, between the development and there's a row of fence and scrubby trees and brush and

everything, between you and a row of doubles over there. Is that your property, or theirs? Who can clean that up?

Mr. Surak: We don't have a survey yet, so we'll have to see if that fence is on our side or on the other side, and just kind of where that lies.

Mr. Smith: Okay

Mr. Surak: And that's something we can take up, depending on what the outcome is.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Surak: But obviously we have a self-interest in wanting it to be attractive and nice.

Mr. Smith: Right

Mr. Surak: And if we can...

Mr. Smith: ...nice landscaping done through there, possibly.

Mr. Kirchoff: They don't own the property yet.

Mr. Smith: Oh, well I'm leaping ahead. Okay.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Nick. Any other questions, comments, motions?

Mr. Philip: I'd just like to point out maybe for a minute, as much as there's challenges with the post office and things, we've seen in the past that a best practice is to have some sort of a meeting with the neighborhood that's going to be impacted by something of this magnitude, on the developer's side. That probably could have handled a lot of this issue before we got here, particularly for the amount of time that's already been spent on this, with what IDEM has put in and everything else. It stands out to me a little bit, that we had people living nearby that didn't really know about it, you know, coming till today. I think from both the developer's side and the town's side, I think there's things to think about that we could do better. With that, I'm willing to make a motion.

Mr. Slavens: Sure

Mr. Philip: I move that the Plan Commission certify the zone map amendment PUD-21-085 requesting rezoning of 2.81 acres at 422 N. East St. from R-4: Medium Density Residential to PUD: Planned Unit Development with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion for the PUD rezone. Do we have a second?

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Slavens: Motion from Mr. Philip and a second from Mr. McPhail. Andres, could you do roll call please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

PUD-21-085 is approved.

Mr. Philip: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve PUD-21-085 as filed by Nick Surak on behalf of Woda Cooper Development, Inc. requesting Final Detailed Plan approval for a 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 6.1, C., 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

1. Substantial compliance with the PUD file dated September 9, 2021.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion from Mr. Philip and a second from Mr. McPhail...

Mr. Whaley: Staff would recommend that you add an additional condition to require the installation of a fence along 419 Vine Street, on the shared property line, subject to compliance with the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Philip: Okay

Mr. Kirchoff: Could we talk about that? Since they don't own the property yet, and we don't want to wait another year, I would suggest we not put it in there, and ask the CDC to consider that.

Mr. Philip: So, my motion stands as issued.

Mr. Slavens: So, the motion stands from Mr. Philip, second from Mr. McPhail. Andrew, could you do roll call please?

- Mr. Klinger:
- Mr. Philip – yes
 - Mr. McPhail – yes
 - Mr. Brandgard – yes
 - Mr. Smith – yes
 - Mr. Kirchoff – yes
 - Mr. Bahr – yes
 - Mr. Slavens – yes

PUD-21-085 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. Thank you. The next item up on the agenda is VAC-21-091 – Apex Plat Vacation. Terry?

Mr. Jones: Thank you, this next item is a Vacation of part of an existing plat, which is known as Blocks A and B Plainfield Commons IV Phase 1. It will be replatted – well, not necessarily replatted, but it will be platted into or consumed into the Apex at Perry Crossing Subdivision, which primary plat was approved in November of 2020. By way of letting you know where this general area is: it's at City Center Way, Perry Road, and just east of Perry Road there at the steakhouse, Logan's Steakhouse and Red Robin. The roadway runs east and west. The area, as you can see by the exhibit there, Block A is the roadways that you would be familiar with if you drive there, and then Block B is the pond there just to the east, and just to the west of what is Apex at Perry Crossing. You see where the red "Block A", Block B", that is the apartment complex that was approved in November, and the plat itself, the primary plat at that time. The biggest

concerns that staff had on this was, number one – it came down to two things – because nothing is really going to change on the ground that much, as you see those lines there. The intention is to take these areas and move them into Apex at Perry Crossing and do very little change within those lines. There will be some adjustments along the way, but not a great deal. To kind of give you a better idea of what the Vacation is, in the darker area there this is the Vacation Exhibit, the actual area of the roadway to be Vacated is the darker lines of Block A, which is in Plainfield Commons. Then Block B is the pond there. So, this is what's actually being Vacated, and to give you an idea of what it's going to look like in the new plat, Apex at Perry Crossing, so you can see there's very little change. So, the concern that we had though, was that these are currently called "Blocks", the right-of-ways area, or the streets there, being used as streets, but they're actually just private drives, and they're now going to be converted to a private street, which by ordinance, requires them to come up to particular standards, street standards versus a private drive. I think all along it was probably intended, when Plainfield Commons created those roadways/drives, that they would at some point in time become street status, and that time is now. This was kind of intended all along, with the apartment complex when it came through, and the development plan for that, and it just sort of is – now's the time to do it. The second part of the equation is the timing. The timing of it is dependent on – we don't want to Vacate it until it's ready to be platted. So, based on any approval here this evening, we'll let you know that it will not be recorded as a Vacation until a Secondary Plat for Apex Crossing is ready to go, so it's a timing issue. With respect to the – that's the lower portion of Perry Crossing, Apex at Perry Crossing – with respect to the status of the actual street, that's part of the concern in the staff report, there was discussion about what the finished street would look like, the private street and town standards. So, we've worked with the applicant; their legal counsel is here this evening, and we've received a commitment that the areas in blue, as you can see there, are going to be milled out and it's going to be reconstructed and resurfaced. The area in red, they're going to put the final topcoat on there. The core samples have been done and we've found that that seems to be an adequate suggestion for the time being, until such a time it is ever dedicated as a public street. Then again, this commitment that they're offering addresses that issue. We haven't had an opportunity for our legal counsel to review it yet. So, any approval, we would ask that it be conditioned on legal counsel reviewing that commitment, and that the Vacation, and that the new plat would not be recorded until all those things come together. Like I said, the applicant's representative is here this evening. Scott singleton, Transportation Director is available for any questions you may have on that commitment, and the roadway conditions. Thank you

Mr. Slavens: If the applicant would like to come forward.

Mr. Comstock: Good evening, my name is Tyler Comstock, I'm with American Structurepoint, 9025 River Road, Suite 200, Indianapolis, Indiana. I'm representing the applicant, Sila Capital. I'm the Civil Engineer on this project; American Structurepoint is also the surveyor that prepared the Plat Vacation Exhibit, as well as preparing the Primary Plat and Secondary Plat. Terry did a really good job explaining everything. It's a lot of just legal cleanup, pulling pieces out of that Plainfield Commons Plat, adding it into the Secondary Plat an Apex at Perry Crossing. It's definitely going to help everything out for maintenance purposes, as well as just kind of tying everything together,

providing the right access and everything to Perry Road from the Apex at Perry Crossing development. If there's any questions or anything, I'm here to help, as well as legal counsel. Thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you. Any questions for the applicant?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: No questions. This is listed for public hearing. If anyone would like to come speak for or against this project, please do so now.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: Seeing none, we're closing it for public hearing and turn back to the Commission for any discussions or a motion.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: I think it seems pretty straight forward and really, like the applicant said, more legal cleanup than anything.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Slavens: If there's no further discussions, I'd entertain a motion.

Mr. Brandgard: Mr. Chairman, I move that VAC-21-091 Vacation of Block A and Block B of Plainfield Commons IV Phase 1, a plat vacation petition, filed by Sila Capital, be approved finding that:

1. The conditions in the platted area have changed so as to defeat the original purpose of the plat because: the Sila Capital property would like to separate itself from the overall Plainfield Commons plat.
2. It is in the public interest to vacate all or part of the plat because: the Sila Capital property will create an entirely new plat separate from the Plainfield Commons plat.
3. The value of the part of the land in the plat not owned by the petitioner will not be diminished by vacation because: the Plainfield Commons plat will remain in-place but will remove the Sila Capital property in order to create its own plat.

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

1. This plat vacation will not be recorded or take effect until the Secondary Plat for Apex at Perry Crossing has been approved and provided all necessary signatures for recording.

2. The applicant will provide a voluntary commitment to improve the existing roadways (Block A), which at a minimum would include:
 - a. Collect core samples to determine pavement and subgrade integrity.
 - b. Provide engineering review & recommendation on pavement rehab, including limits for full depth pavement patching. Some drainage might be necessary.
 - c. Mill and resurface entire vacated sections.
3. The Apex at Perry Cross Secondary Plat will identify the new extension of City Center Way as a Private Street to be constructed to Town Standards to the extent possible.
4. Apex at Perry Crossing Secondary Plat will include 'documentary assurances' that all Private Streets are to be maintained in compliance with the Town of Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Mr. Slavens: Did you want #5 to be, "subject to legal review"?

Mr. Brandgard: Okay

5. Shall be subject to legal counsel review.

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Slavens: A motion from Mr. Brandgard, a second from Mr. McPhail. Andrew, could you do roll call please?

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Mr. Slavens – yes

VAC-21-091 is approved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Slavens: Old business/new business - I know you sent an email about the...

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, shortly before this meeting I did send an email to all Plan Commission members with an attachment for an order of the Plan Commission, determining that an amendment to a Declaratory Resolution, approved and adopted by the Plainfield Redevelopment Commission, conforms to the Comprehensive Plan, approving that Resolution. I believe you have received some of these in the past; this is an amendment to that Declaratory Resolution to add the Hobbs Station area as an Allocation Area within that Economic Development Area. I don't know if Andrew has anything he wants to add.

Mr. Klinger: I don't really have a lot to add, unless you have questions. The idea is to create, to add in some of the property that would be part of the Hobbs Station Development that's not currently in the Economic Development Area, but then also create a second Allocation Area specific to Hobbs Station Development Area, separate from the existing Allocation Area for the Ronald Reagan Economic Development Area. The amendment also adds in a couple of other properties; what we refer to as the Swaley property which is up off of Smith Road and AllPoints Parkway there. That's been a donut hole, really, that recently the town was able to annex that property, and we'd like to include that in the Economic Development Area as well.

Mr. Slavens: Okay, so do we need a motion to approve the amendment?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, it would need a motion to approve.

Mr. Slavens: Okay

Mr. Kirchoff: So moved.

Mr. Slavens: We have a motion.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Slavens: A motion from Mr. Kirchoff, a second from Mr. Brandgard. All in favor, please say aye.

(All ayes)

Mr. Slavens: Any opposed? Okay.

Mr. Whaley: All right, thank you for accommodating that within the schedule. Up next we do have the draft 2022 calendar. Typically, this time of year staff begins to work on the calendar for the following year, and as we started to work through looking at the schedule of 2022, we tried to make some adjustments to see if we could find ways to improve the process wherever possible. One of the things that we did within the calendar is more visual in graphic than it actually is in process, although process does sort of back feed into that. I think it was a couple of years ago, prior to me joining the staff, you guys decided to create what's called the "FReD", which is the File Readiness Determination process. This is intended to be sort of an opportunity for applicants and our petitioners to present their projects to staff so that we can take a look at them, whether it's at a concept level or at a full, ready to file level, to determine that the project is actually ready and in complete form to be docketed on the agenda with the Plan Commission. We've tried this out for the past couple of years, trying to refine the process as we go, and it's taken a little bit of an education process to get some of our frequent flyers adjusted to how the process works. And we're still learning about the process and making tweaks as we go as well. But what we want to try and do with this calendar is to try and separate that out visually a little bit so that process, even though it's tied to the overall approval of, interview of, petitions that come before you, it's separated out a little bit so that it remains in some process. And the idea here is to try to keep applicants focused on that left side of the calendar until they're actually at the point where they're ready to fully submit their information, and then it can be docketed to come before you. Part of this related to what we talked about earlier with the notice that gets sent out to the surrounding property owners. Currently, if you look at the calendar at the top, which is the 2021 calendar, we do have the legal notice deadline listed there, and often what happens is if someone submits a petition to the town and we begin to go through that review process where it goes to the Design Review Committee and through TAC, you know, sometimes those projects are not fully ready; the FReD is not functioning the way I guess it was initially setup, and we're trying to make it function the way it was intended. The difficulty with the current setup that we have, is often staff is the one responsible for providing that notice to the petitioners and the petitioners to send it out. Under this new format, if we get the FReD working the way it is intended to, we want it to, the idea is that when we know that a project is ready to be docketed, we can actually turn that responsibility over to the applicant as soon as it's ready and get that information out sooner. So, that's part of that.

Mr. Kirchoff: But you're still only showing 10 days' notice.

Mr. Whaley: It's 10 days of a deadline, that's the deadline that they would be required to meet by the Rules of Procedure, but the idea is that we should be able to provide them with a form letter...

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, but back to Rich's point...

Mr. Philip: But also, I think, and I'm not an expert in this, I think the postal service has announced that service is going to get worse starting in October.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Philip: So, research it and find out, because if they couldn't get a certified mail in a week within Plainfield, you know. Mel, legal be what it is, but if it doesn't work, it doesn't work.

Mr. Daniel: Yeah, and I will say one thing in defense of what has occurred here, that's also why they have signs on the property.

Mr. Philip: They do.

Mr. Daniel: And I assume the neighbors, when they look over at that property, they can see a sign on that property saying there's going to be a public hearing. So, I mean, that's why they do – I mean, you've got notice in the paper, we've got certified mail, we've got notice on the property itself. So, the town – you're right, it's all legal. And I appreciate the frustration these people have when they get a certified letter the day before the hearing, but on the other hand, you know, I find myself saying they see that sign over there on that property saying there's going to be a public hearing on this property, and maybe find out what's going on.

Mr. Philip: But it's also a complicated place we're in, right. We're talking about redevelopment downtown and there's going to be a lot of our existing homeowners going to be impacted by all this stuff, and they shouldn't feel like they don't know what's going on. And that's why I made my statement earlier about this Woda Cooper project. The town had their hand in it that far and this much, you know, to not engage the community around them a little bit more, doesn't feel good to me, okay. And that's why I made the statement that I did, and that's why I'm reiterating it still, on the record, okay. I'm sorry to be so repetitive. But also, there isn't a local paper anymore, so now you might be buried in the notices in the start – I read them, but that makes me weird – and so, there's not a local paper anymore and this service isn't doing us any favors in how they're operating at this point in time, and I'm afraid that if I was some of the people that were in the room for this that works great on screening things on your phone and telling you what's going on, probably wasn't perfect for that, okay. And I'm not saying that there's great solutions; I think this is hard, but I do think that as much as you could put things in the applicant's hands ahead of that 10 days, early in those 10 days, tell them what these experiences are, I think it's going to be really, really important because people shouldn't walk out of here thinking this got ramrodded through on them, okay. And I know there's always some of that, I get it, I'm a big boy, but as much as we can conduct this stuff out in the open, it makes a big deal. And I know I'm beating a fence with people on it who agree with me, but I think every now and then it's got to be called out.

Mr. Bahr: Yeah, and as hard as it is to agree with Rich, you know, I mean – and Mel, we're in a legal world, an attorney told me once, we were fighting a lawsuit, "Just because it's legal, doesn't mean it's right". And if we have some of these cases like tonight, like Rich pointed out earlier, have the neighborhood meetings or whatever, in advance. I think we also need to encourage the applicant to do such, beforehand. If I was the individual sitting in the audience, I wouldn't feel good; I don't feel good now.

Mr. McPhail: Well, you know, and I agree with everything you're saying, but I honestly do not believe that those ladies didn't know before today, that there was a public hearing. They came up here with a burr on their tail, you know...

Mr. Philip: They also didn't walk out of here understanding that this process isn't even close to done.

Mr. McPhail: Oh, I understand that.

Mr. Philip: All we approved today was a PUD.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Philip: There's a whole lot of work that has to, needs to happen, that their voice can be heard.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Kirchoff: And I would say, on behalf of the petitioner, they have a really good history on their prior projects, of neighborhood communications, so I think the same thing will happen here.

Mr. Brandgard: But that usually happens when they have something to show for what they're doing, not at the zoning area, the plating side.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: When they bring something in for us to approve to build, that's...

Mr. Kirchoff: Bottom line is, we want to do what's right.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Kirchoff: I think we're all saying the same thing, just what's the best way to do it.

Mr. Bahr: Right

Mr. Kirchoff: That's the bottom line.

Mr. Bahr: Yeah

Mr. (?): I agree with that.

Mr. Bahr: The general public doesn't know the difference between what's going on tonight and what's going on next month, or two months from now.

Mr. Kirchoff: There's times I don't.

Mr. Bahr: They see a public hearing, they see a picture, they think that's it.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. Daniel: (microphone not on) I think one of the primary solutions to this, one of them is, hand delivered notice. (inaudible) post office (inaudible) I don't know how many people we're talking about (inaudible) one property owner or two property owners (inaudible) project. My guess is – and you gentlemen would know more about that than I would – but my guess is you're not looking at maybe 10-15 things; just go put it in their door or whatever else. I know you're not legally required to do that, but it's an extra step to try to get people notice.

Mr. Brandgard: I think a big part of the problem we're having, just like the gentleman that lives in Danville, and he owns the property here, he said he got his – well, this issue, when you take something to the post office here, it goes downtown...

Mr. Smith: Right

Mr. Brandgard: And then it's processed and sent back here. But you're right, it's coming down to we've got to go back to the old-fashioned delivery, or some such thing, to make sure people get a notice of what it is. I also agree with the other half, is sometimes we don't do a very good job of explaining the process of what we're doing here.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: And that's – maybe, as we go forward, we ought to have a preamble to our discussion, of what it is.

Mr. Kirchoff: Where are we in the cycle.

Mr. Brandgard: Where we're at in the cycle, what it's for.

Mr. Philip: I think that would be valuable.

Mr. Brandgard: This comes up time after time.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, it does.

Mr. McPhail: They have to sign for that certified letter, don't they?

Mr. Philip: They do.

Mr. McPhail: So, how do we know that the post office didn't try to deliver it before today?

Mr. Brandgard: Well, that's not the point right now.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, I know. So, maybe a different process is better, I don't know.

Mr. Philip: Yeah

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, one of the modifications we'd make is – you have January 2, 2023 – that will be a holiday because January 1st is on a Sunday, and we would be closed on Monday.

Mr. Berg: You're not willing to make that sacrifice?

Mr. Kirchoff: You probably will be here Eric.

Mr. Brandgard: Oh, he'll be at home with his fancy headset.

Mr. Kirchoff: So, you might want to make that the 3rd – no, make it Thursday then.

Mr. Slavens: Thursday

Mr. Philip: It would be Thursday.

Mr. Brandgard: Or just in general, look at all the dates and make sure...

Mr. Kirchoff: I checked the others.

Mr. Brandgard: Okay

Mr. Philip: Is that 2023?

Mr. Whaley: I will certainly get that updated, and I will – I do hear all your comments and I appreciate all the feedback in terms of notice. One thing that we had talked about was with this calendar for 2022, if you look at the light blue which is the column of the last day for docketing – so, in theory what would happen on that date is someone would be submitting a fully complete application to us, and we would have seen that within the FReD process on the left-hand side there; if we know that it's complete, we can turn that information over to the applicant, in terms of the public notice, and begin the review process, and by the time we get to that TAC meeting in the second column a couple of weeks later, we could have that set as a deadline for sending out the public notice, and that should be right at about a month, for delivery. Now, with that said, I will add that Terry Jones, our Code Compliance Planner, has made some attempts to send certified letters to certain property owners who are having some code compliance issues, and I believe we're still awaiting delivery from – was it back in May?

(inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: It's been a while, so... There's an element of no matter how much time we add to this, there's still a potential for the post office to not get those letters delivered, but we'll certainly try wherever we can.

Mr. Jones: Excuse me, I would be remiss, I know some of you on the Council know this, but as Kevin said, as a person who sends out multiple certified letters for returned receipt, I sent some out in May and they still haven't been received, let alone returned back. The odd thing is, just as you found out tonight, that Danville got it quicker than somebody in Plainfield; the same thing has happened with letters that I've had. So, I sort of feel like, from the town's perspective, we're on the side of that developer; we can't really take action until we get that notice in their hand. And so, really, to be thinking about these, is really probably appropriate because there may come a time, we could have somebody standing here a month after the meeting that we had the hearing and they still haven't – maybe they heard it through the grapevine that somebody got a project approved and they never received notice, even before the 10 day period, you know, when the person sent it out. And you're right Rich, I talked with a person yesterday on the terms of anonymity, from the post office, and they said that it is probably going to get worse, and they don't have an answer.

Mr. McPhail: But I get my junk mail.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, we get the junk mail.

Mr. Whaley: So, it sounds like we'll be looking for (inaudible) see if I can do hand delivery. The other change within the calendar that I had referenced in the planning report is that we are looking to DRC meetings from Tuesdays to Thursdays, to correspond with TAC. The thought here is that an applicant coming through this process would want to get all the comments from the reviewing committees at the same time. This should benefit applicants who have to travel from out of town. Obviously, that's not as big of an issue now that we have the ability to do virtual meetings, but we're going back to more in person, so I think that this would be beneficial for those situations in particular. And then also, the situations that we tend to run into when you have those meetings on different days, the petitioner will get one set of comments, they'll quickly try to get those incorporated into their plans and revise, and then we're in the situation where we're constantly getting revisions and trying to get those out to each committee, which causes some frustration. Hopefully this will allow those to be consolidated into a single day. It also adds a little bit of time, in terms of space, between the DRC meeting and the filing deadline, which gives us a little bit of extra time to get those more thoroughly reviewed and have more comprehensive comments. We did check with the DRC members to see if they were okay with that shift and all the feedback that we got was yes, they would be willing to meet on a Thursday instead of Tuesday. Anybody have any questions about that?

Mr. McPhail: Well, Kevin, going back to a couple of Rich's comments – would it be proper that some place on our communication with these developers, that we have it put in there that we highly recommend they meet with the neighbors prior to a public meeting?

Mr. Whaley: So, that kind of ties into another thing that we can talk about here real quickly, but you'll see next month – we wanted to sort of get your feedback on this calendar before we presented the next thing, and that is that staff has been working on a development guide, which is a quick reference handout that outlines all of the processes that we have and presents it in a nice visual form. It provides quite a bit of information to help people who are new to the process understand how these processes go, and then also people who are accustomed to the processes, help them understand it better. We're getting new Plan Commission members; it's going to be a good document that we can hand out to folks so that they can get acclimated to what it is that we do here. So, we can certainly incorporate that recommendation into that. You know, typically in the past when we have met with petitioners, we have made recommendations on big projects such as the big subdivision that was just approved off Hall Road last month, I believe that they had a neighborhood meeting, and that was partially recommended by staff. We try to make that recommendation; I'm kind of surprised that Woda, having gone through this so many times, didn't do that, but I'll take responsibility for that, we didn't think to make the recommendation.

Mr. Philip: Well, and I know I was harsh but – not really, but...

Mr. Whaley: But it was good comments.

Mr. Philip: But Robin's right too, there's an interesting line between – you know, they don't own the property yet, we hadn't rezoned it yet; they probably were thinking that it wasn't time yet, and the alternative is that then the neighbors all roll in here going "what's going on?" and feel blinder than I think we want our community to feel. And I think that's the hard part, and if we want transparency, I think earlier is better. And you'll take a few arrows, I get it. And I also understand that they want to be smart but...

Mr. Kirchoff: To me, the humorous part is, how many weeks have we been cleaning up that site?

Mr. Bahr: Yeah, they know.

Mr. Kirchoff: And wouldn't you think they would have some idea that something was going to happen?

Mr. Bahr: Yeah

Mr. Philip: And I agree with Mel, the moment those signs were posted out there that should have been – you know, I would have at least called the town and said you know, what's going on with these signs that are out here.

Mr. Brandgard: I had a call about six weeks ago, about what our intent was for that site, and I told them, what we're showing tonight is what we're planning. It's going to be a higher level of quality to this area.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, it is.

Mr. Daniel: (microphone not on) One thing you did mention Rich, and Robin has also, by far the greatest majority of that misunderstanding is on zoning.

Mr. McPhail: Yep

Mr. Daniel: They don't understand, on a zoning petition, maybe somebody comes in here with preliminary plans but none of that means anything; all they're asking if for rezoning, and I do think that that's a good place for some kind of preliminary statement, that the only issue here tonight is the use on that property, the zoning use, there will be public hearings on this later.

Mr. Smith: With all the details.

Mr. Whaley: Well, in this particular case it was a final detailed plan, so the plan that was approved tonight was the plan that they will move forward with on construction plans.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Whaley: The only other public hearings we would have on this would be the for the plat, because it still has to be platted. And typically, with these tax credit housing projects, the timelines that they're under, and not owning the property yet, we do allow them to come through the PUD process without platting, so they can get that approval and...

Mr. Brandgard: Well, they already, they've already filed.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: With the state.

Mr. Philip: With the state, financing.

Mr. Whaley: So, if they get the approval from the state, they'll come back and they'll purchase the property and plat it.

Mr. Smith: The other thing you might be able to do in terms of notice, is if there's some way to get the yard signs out earlier. I don't know if you have a timing on that, how you work that, push that out as far as possible. Then if the letters don't go through, you know, that's something.

Mr. Brandgard: One of the issues you have with walking around is that we have no record that anybody received anything.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. Daniel: You mean if you hand deliver it?

Mr. Brandgard: Hand deliver, yeah, there's no record to show that we noticed anything.

Mr. Daniel: That's exactly right, and if the community ever decided to do that you've got to be very careful and make sure that it's understood that that is an accommodation that's a courtesy that's not required, and if they didn't get one of the hand delivered notices, you know, that's not a grounds for anything, the town's just trying to do their best to get the word out. It doesn't create a legal standard that everybody has to get a hand delivered letter of notice.

Mr. Smith: Putting it on the website may or may not help some people, though some people aren't going to get that either.

Mr. Brandgard: Well, there's a lot of people who don't...

Mr. Smith: Live on the internet.

Mr. Brandgard: ...live on a computer either, or even have one.

Mr. Smith: Nope, nope.

Mr. Kirchoff: Or the Plainfield app.

Mr. Smith: Or the Plainfield app.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Smith: I know – you can try, but it's...

Mr. Philip: You know, having said everything we've said Kevin, I think the planning department and general development services has done a really nice job. The things that we're looking at, and how this is organized, things that Eric's walked us through for the years that Scott and I have been on here, because we joined at the same time – you know, it's a big movement, in a fairly short period of time, on a relative scale, okay, and I'm deeply appreciative of that, okay. And so, we're talking about fine tuning it at some level. Things aren't broken by any stretch of the imagination, we can always do better, right, continuous improvement, all that good stuff. You'll want to do better, but again, I'll beat the drum on what we're talking about, particularly around downtown redevelopment stuff, is huge, culturally, for this community, and as much as we can sharpen our pencils, sharpen our view on what we can do better, I think it will pay in the long run. It won't be easy and there will always be somebody upset, I get all of that stuff; I worked for utilities for 37 years, but it's still, what I think. You know, I'm not somebody that's going to sit up here and polish your apple very often, but I greatly appreciate what you guys do.

Mr. Whaley: Well, thank you, I really appreciate that feedback.

Mr. Kirchoff: And are we done?

Mr. Whaley: I think that's a nice segue to our last...

Mr. Kirchoff: I think we need to express our appreciation to our chairman who's leaving us.

Mr. Brandgard: Yes

Mr. Kirchoff: And the work he's done over the years. How many years has it been?

Mr. Slavens: I don't remember, I've lost count.

Mr. Brandgard: The fact that you've lost count is good.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, we appreciate your service.

Mr. Slavens: I appreciate the opportunity to serve, it's been an honor and privilege to serve, and I look forward to serving in any capacity that I can as we move forward.

Mr. Klinger: I was going to say, let's be clear, he's only ending his service on the Commission; we're going to expect some more from him still in other areas, wherever we can find it.

Mr. Brandgard: He's going to stalk the ground for annexation.

Mr. Slavens: Exactly

Mr. Smith: There you go.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, good work, thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you, appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. Whaley: Well, with that said, I'd like to also express my appreciation for your service to the Plan Commission. Obviously, I've only been here for a couple of years, but I've come to really appreciate your guidance as a chairperson, and your participation on this Commission, so thank you.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you

Mr. Whaley: It's been a pleasure working with you. With that said, the Town Council did appoint a replacement for Scott, not that he can ever be replaced, but someone to fill his position when he does leave, and that is Dr. Mary Geisting. Hopefully she's still here...

Mr. Slavens: She didn't run, she didn't run away yet.

Mr. Whaley: Is there anything you would like to say?

Mr. Brandgard: Well, the best thing is, she's still smiling.

Mr. Whaley: Do you want to come up and say a few words?

Ms. Geisting: (Not at microphone) I am looking forward to serving with this group.


Mr. Whaley: Okay, that's all I had.


ADJOURN

Mr. Slavens: Motion to adjourn?

Mr. Brandgard: So moved.

Mr. Slavens: Thank you everybody.

DocuSigned by:

7F4D04129B54485...
Steve Bahr, President

DocuSigned by:

965ABE261770450...
Andrew Klinger, Secretary