



Mr. Kirchoff: On page 30 there is a paragraph, the first word is you (Ms. Geisting) speaking, and they give you credit for the rest of that, but it's Mel talking about where we were on an issue. So, not a big deal, but it's conversation attributed to...

Ms. Robinson: Page 30 was what?

Mr. Kirchoff: Page 30, Mary is talking, and she says "right" or something, and then the rest of the paragraph is actually Mel speaking about the issue we were talking about at that time. Other than that, I would move we approve them as amended.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion...

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: A second from Robin, all in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: Opposed? Let the record show that they are approved. I'm going to abstain for I was not here.

## **GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Bahr: Public hearings, tonight's public hearing; They are designed to allow the public input regarding the subject matter.

1. The proceedings are recorded for public record; please come to the podium, located in the front of the Meeting Room, give your name and address and make your presentation.
2. Please make presentations as concise as possible; please try to limit your comments to no more than five minutes and avoid repetition of points made by previous speakers. Each speaker will be allowed to speak only once.
3. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the speakers' sheet provided on the podium.

## **OATH OF TESTIMONY**

Mr. Bahr: First on the agenda is docket PUD-22-059, PP-22-082 and FDP-22-082.

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

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Bahr: Thank you Mel. Thank you, Jennifer, for catching that. My apologies.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Bahr: Eric?

Mr. Berg: I had to make sure I got up here quicker than Amy this time. As the Chair mentioned, this is for three different related petitions for a Planned Unit Development, a Primary Plat, and a Final Detailed Plan. I'll definitely keep this under five minutes. This is located, Smith Road, Township Line Road and Perry on the southeast corner. Currently zoned PUD, from the Herman and Kittle Vandalia Trails Planned Unit Development that was approved by this body and the Council, but did not receive funding from IHCDA, so they have come forward with a different proposal that would not meet that. So, they're looking to change the zoning to something that would meet more of what they're looking to do. The site plan: again, this is the roundabout right up there, ingress/egress here off of Smith. The cross-access easement coming from Perry. That's Samaritan, and I can never remember the name of that development. And also, a future cross-access going north/south to a currently vacant piece of land. In the staff report I did mention that the PUD ordinance needed some work. We did receive revised copies of that over the weekend and it did address the issues we had asked them to address. Over here is the landscape plan. Again, you probably have seen this in your packets, and the three different buildings they're looking to do. I can feel Amy's eyes in the back of my head here, so I'm going to get out of the way here as quickly as possible, to allow her to speak about this.

Ms. Comer Elliott: Okay, so I've never done PowerPoint with arrow keys. I can skip I think a couple of these slides; thank you Eric for the description of the location. Where I will begin to focus – well, let me stop first of all and introduce myself. I am Amy Comer Elliott with the Comer Law Office located at 71 West Marion Street in Danville, and I am here this evening representing Radiant CDC. Marchelle Berry, the lovely lady you just saw up here putting up her pictures is here with the developer. Russell Lewis is our architect, and Nathan Barr is our engineer with Kimley-Horn, and they'll be able to answer all of your detailed questions about more of the development standards and the use. So, this site is about 3.8 acres. The surrounding uses are largely commercial, as Eric stated, to the east. To the west and south is an existing residential neighborhood. North of Perry Road, I believe you all have recently approved PUDs for both the northwest and the northeast quadrants. They haven't started developing yet but they are, as I understand, zoned for mixed use development. There is a Primary Plat submitted with the

request to rezone to a new PUD, to the Winding Way PUD. That Primary Plat divides the property into two lots. You can see them noted as Lot 1 in the dry pond, and then Lot 2 next to the pond down in the very southern portion of the drawing. For Lot 1 we are proposing a maximum of 30 townhomes. They, as you see, are in the northernmost area of the development, furthest from the existing single-family residential homes there. They hug along the northern perimeter and the eastern perimeter. And then of course right across from, sort of in the center to the north and east of the dry pond. And then Lot 2, further south, will be a maximum of three two-story residential duplexes, and those are positioned to be a nice transition between the commercial to the east and the existing single-family homes to the west. Here's a larger rendering of what is anticipated or expected. All the schematics are in the PUD ordinance for this product. Floor plans, both first floor and second floor. This is the rendering of the duplex; also, all of the schematics of which are in the PUD ordinance. The floor plan. The exterior products for both the townhomes and the duplexes are brick masonry, cast stone and fiber cement lap and panel siding. Also proposed – this is a PUD; we do have some open space and amenities that are provided. There will be a playground. You can see the blue line, kind of an arrow, showing you exactly where that is proposed on Lot 1. It will serve the residents of both the duplexes and the townhomes. You can also see the paved walking path. The Vandalia Trail, there's an extension for that along the west, and that walking path will connect with the Vandalia Trail, providing that connectivity. Also proposed is a community building and leasing office. So, in the community center will be office space, a training room, a computer lab and community meeting rooms; and that is the schematic for that. Here is that floor plan showing the training room, leasing offices and the community room, and a patio. These are just close up details of the entrances – I won't spend much time on those since Eric showed those to you. At each entrance we are proposing one of the two signs. The one on the right being along Smith Road for Winding Way Townhomes, and the smaller sign coming in off that easement through the commercial development to the east, directing people either towards the offices and community building or to – it says VOA Homes, the intent at this time is that Volunteers of America will purchase that Lot 2 and they will own the duplexes. Just a couple other highlights that I want to point out; we have been to both TAC and DRC. The roadways within Winding Way are both private and constructed to town standards. The roadways do allow for maneuvering of both emergency vehicles and school bus turnaround. All lighting of course is shielded downlighting and meets the Plainfield zoning ordinance. There are several exhibits in the PUD ordinance, several pages that go through those details and schematics. Streetlighting will be confined to intersections and vehicle access points and be a maximum of 15 feet in height. And there are sidewalks and paths throughout the development. With that, we would be happy to answer any of your questions, and address those of the audience as well.

Mr. Brandgard: I have one question. If that is located mostly in Washington Township, have you reviewed this with Avon Schools?

Ms. Comer Elliott: We did. Thank you for pointing that out. Yes, I did not personally have that conversation; I'd be happy to have the developer come up and give you some of those details.

Ms. Berry: Thank you, my name is Marchelle Berry. I'm with Radiant CDC, 12821 East Market Street, Carmel, Indiana. Yes, we did reach out to the school district. That's a pretty typical process that we do. They are welcome, excited, open about what we're doing here.

Ms. Giesting: So, Family Promise and Volunteers of America have partnered together, especially in the community building, correct?

Ms. Berry: Right, so Radiant CDC, we are the owners; we will always be the owners of this property, so Family Promise and Volunteers of America will own the second...

Ms. Giesting: They'll lease. They'll lease from you or they...?

Ms. Berry: They will – we will be leasing to families in the community. They are our social service partners, strictly our social service partners, so they're going to be providing services to our families that are living there. Volunteers of America will own the second parcel and we will share amenity space on that community building.

Ms. Giesting: Okay. So, then you'll work with Family Promise to find folks to lease these townhouses and homes?

Ms. Berry: Right

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Ms. Berry: Exactly. Part of our funding from the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority is that we always have good social service partners that assist with any kind of needs that we have. But we will continue to be owners/managers.

Ms. Giesting: And is there a limitation to the amount of time a family can own or lease these homes?

Ms. Berry: There isn't. There are annual leases like you would typically always have but you know, we're going to continue to urge the families to – we always want to see them go on to purchase homes, but we're not going to kick them out, but they will have to renew leases.

Ms. Giesting: Gotcha, okay. Thank you.

Ms. Berry: Thank you

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Ms. Comer Elliott: Anything more from me or...? Or anything for our engineer or architect?

Mr. Bahr: Not at this time.

Mr. McPhail: I do have a...can you go back to the site plan there?

Ms. Comer Elliott: Sure

Mr. McPhail: And tell me where the duplexes are located?

Ms. Comer Elliott: Absolutely. That's what the duplexes will look like – they are in the very southern kind of square.

Mr. McPhail: They're Volunteers of America though?

Ms. Comer Elliott: Yes, that's the lot; that is Lot 2.

Mr. McPhail: For some reason I couldn't find that in my materials.

Ms. Comer Elliott: Yeah, so here's Lot 2 – here's the northern perimeter, eastern, southern, western. So, that is Lot 2 right there.

Mr. McPhail: And that's in Guilford Township?

Ms. Comer Elliott: That is in Guilford Township, yes. Yes, maximum of 6 units. And they will – yeah – they'll have connectivity through the whole thing. And then there's an entrance that will direct traffic this way. And as you can see, there's retention for both.

Mr. Brandgard: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bahr: We'd like to open the public hearing and invite anyone who would like to address this Commission regarding this project.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and open it up for discussion amongst the commission.

Ms. Andres: (microphone not on) Eric, you mentioned changes.

Mr. Berg: They were, to put it inelegantly, kind of screwdriver issues where there were slight errors in distances and things of that nature. Nothing that we felt would be anything more than minor changes. That was not exactly the world's most elegant answer, my apologies.

Ms. Andres: Still helpful, thank you.

Ms. Giesting: I have no questions, so are we ready for a motion?

Mr. Bahr: Ready for a motion.



- Chapter 152: Flood Hazard Reduction; and,
  - Chapter 153: Subdivision Control Ordinance
2. Substantial compliance with the primary plat provided to the Commission on October 3, 2022.

Mr. Brandgard: I'll second.

Mr. Bahr: We have a motion, and a second by Robin. Andrew if you would, call the vote.

Mr. Klinger:

- Ms. Andres – yes
- Mr. McPhail – yes
- Mr. Kirchoff – yes
- Mr. Brandgard – yes
- Ms. Giesting – yes
- Mr. Bahr – yes

The Primary Plat PP-22-082 is approved.

Ms. Giesting: And finally, I move that the Plan Commission approve FDP-22-059 requesting Final Detailed Plan review for approval for Winding Way, a multi-family residential development, finding that:

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

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

1. Subject to the Town Council approving the Winding Way Planned Unit Development Ordinance.





determine who goes first but given how fast Amy moved up here before, I'm going to make sure I move out of the way pretty quickly unless there are any questions for me.

Mr. Tuohy: Good evening Mr. President, members of the Plan Commission. Thanks Eric. For the record, my name's Brian Tuohy. My address is 50 South Meridian. Looking forward to hearing from Mel Daniel tomorrow on that introduction I just received. I'm sure it will be pithy and well worded. So, I'll introduce our team, so Derek Naber is the Vice President of New City Development – that's the folks who are doing the Hobbs Station Development. And then Neil Kippenbrock is from Kimley-Horn. He's an engineer; he's involved in this too. And then the folks from Avenue Development will address the development plan approval. I'll just take small piece of the change in the ordinance. Just to remind you all, this is Hobbs Station. It's a PUD that was approved. There's about 86 acres I think, in the development. It's kind of divided up into two different areas. Tonight, what we're seeking is a modification, I would say a slight modification of the language to allow for some development in the side yard of this area where the senior living facility is. And those side yards, what we're asking for is they be allowed to be used for sidewalks, pathways, and in this case a driveway separating two lots. So, the area that we're focusing in on tonight is that Hobbs Station mixed-use, so that's in that yellow area sort of at the southern end of the site. Of course, you all know what's around; there's Bo Mar PUD to the west, Westmere to the north, and then retail and other developments along the south side, and to the east is the Adesa industrial development, and then also eventually an industrial development in Hobbs Station. So, where we're focused, as Eric said, is down in that left-hand corner where – we're not changing the use because these folks are here with a senior living facility which was approved in the original Hobbs Station PUD approval. This just sort of lays out how that was approved. This area here shows what's been, I think, before this Plan Commission and has been approved in terms of some multi-family uses and single-family uses. And then over to the right there, some industrial uses. And then this development is a senior living facility which these folks will describe. I believe it's a 3-story 80,000 square foot building, and it's right there in the white outlined area. And as Eric said, there's a driveway at the south end, at the bottom of that white box area. The worry was, the way the PUD is written, you couldn't put a sidewalk or a driveway through there without amending the PUD, nor along the east side, and they plan to do that, so, in order to accommodate that, which is this area here – you can see it says "future access drive" – will come along the south side of where this senior living facility will be. And then there will be another access drive, you can see, going between Anthem Avenue at the top there and the bottom where that arrow was there. This will allow those to be used for driveways and sidewalks and pathways. We respectfully request that we amend language that says, "the minimum 10' yard separating the buildings shall be maintained as open space and free from buildings and structures." We would amend that to say, "the minimum 10' area separating buildings within that mixed-use district could include, may include interior access driveways, sidewalks, or multi-purpose pathways." And that's part of this senior living facility development. So, with that, depending on how you all would like to do it, I would think I would segue into turning it over to the folks who are seeking the development plan approval so they can show you what they are planning on developing on this site. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Kwapis: Good evening members of the Commission. My name is Matt Kwapis, I'm Senior Vice President of Development for Avenue Development and I'm excited to be here with you tonight to share with you our senior living project within Hobbs Station. I'll be very brief on the introduction of our team. Avenue Development, we're a boutique real estate development firm and we specialize solely in seniors housing and medical offices, and the senior housing component of our practice makes up about 85% of what we do. To date we've developed over 1,300 units of senior housing across ten states, and we are very happy to have one in our relative backyard here in Plainfield. Our operating partner – we are the real estate developer, but our operating partner is Randall Residence. They are a third-generation senior housing operator. So, if you are familiar with senior housing, being a third generation in that category means you were basically there at the beginning. In fact, the current CEO of Randall Residence grew up literally in an assisted living facility in Michigan, that his mother and grandfather ran. They are a regional operator located in Michigan but have buildings in the greater midwestern area. This will be their second property in Indiana. Our architectural partner is Arc Design out of Indianapolis, and Kimley-Horn who is also the civil engineer for the Hobbs Station project is our civil engineer on this project as well. And they are in the audience today if we should need them. Just a quick kind of orientation. I think Brian did a pretty good job of reorienting us to the Hobbs Station location. We're just on the northeastern side of the town, and specifically within the master development, we are kind of smack dab in the middle. We view ourselves as really that point of transition from the mixed-use district that that we lie in, and the residential district that's right to the north of us. Kind of recapping our site plan here: 2.34 acres, 83,000 square foot, 3-story building – memory care being on the first floor with the amenities and entrance area, and then second and third floor are your assisted living units. There are about 100 parking spots which is plenty for this type of use, as our residence very likely will not be driving, so this is really just a staff and visitor parking lot.

Ms. Giesting: And how many residents do you see being in this facility?

Mr. Kwapis: It's a 90-unit facility.

Ms. Giesting: 90?

Mr. Kwapis: Yep, and so the breakdown is 64 assisted living units and 26 memory care units.

Ms. Giesting: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Kwapis: Here is just kind of a quick perspective of the project, and aerial. And really, as I mentioned before, the architectural intent of this project was to be that transition point from the mixed-use commercial district to the residential district, so we really do see that. That was very intentional in the way we designed this. This will be a very amenity rich community. It will have various dining options, outdoor courtyards, activity spaces, community gathering space, theater, salon – pretty much all encompassing within the community itself. And just a quick overview of

the materials planned for the project. We've got a mixture of stone and brick veneer, fiber cement, wood, cast stone, vinyl storefront and regular windows, and shingles for the roof. Some more exterior renderings and some different shots. As Eric mentioned, this is kind of from the interior parking lot looking into our entrance. Here are some of the shots both from Pearson Parkway and Anthem Parkway. And really, that's the overview. Happy to answer any questions; we wanted to keep it brief for you.

Mr. McPhail: Where's home in Michigan?

Mr. Kwapis: For our operating partner? Just outside Kalamazoo in Lawton.

Mr. Bahr: Very good, thank you.

Mr. Kwapis: Thank you.

Ms. Giesting: So, Eric, I do have a question for you. So, with the setbacks and the sidewalk and the changes in the PUD do we feel like you have a positive outlook on that? You don't have any concerns about...?

Mr. Berg: No, it was staff that brought this to their attention.

Ms. Giesting: Okay. Okay, so you're all good with...?

Mr. Berg: Yes

Ms. Giesting: ...the changes they've made? Okay

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. We'd like to open up the public hearing and allow any individual that would like to speak on behalf of the project to approach the Commission.

(Brief pause)

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

Ms. Andres: I had just a couple of questions, and this might be something for the developer – or Eric. One is, I see a note on our comments, that we're still working through the signage plan, is that right? Have we received anything yet?

Mr. Berg: (indicates "no")

Ms. Andres: Any thoughts from you all on when we might...?

Mr. Kwapis: Yeah, so the greater Hobbs Station development is working on a signage package that will kind of speak to the theme of how the signage should be for kind of throughout the

entire master development. So, we are kind of holding off on that for the moment until we have the opportunity to make sure that we're consistent and cohesive with everything else that's going on there.

Ms. Andres: So, the signage for this, you're holding off on until you get the signage package...?

Mr. Kwapis: Correct

Ms. Andres: Okay

Ms. Giesting: But your intention is to comply with...

Mr. Kwapis: Yeah

Ms. Giesting: ...whatever parameters are put on to the signage?

Mr. Kwapis: Yep. We've been obviously working hand in hand with the Hobbs Station developer and provided input on what we would typically see for this type of use, and they've been good about working with that.

Ms. Andres: Okay. What's your construction timeline do you think?

Mr. Kwapis: As far as duration, or just getting started?

Ms. Andres: Both

Mr. Kwapis: Yeah, so, we are hoping to get started in the spring – great time of the year to get going – and then we anticipate about a 14–15-month build.

Ms. Andres: And then I had seen some comments in here about wall units for mechanical. Can you just talk about the screening that's planned. I know that there was some ground screening. What about the screening on the building?

Mr. Kwapis: So, the second and third floor units are architecturally screened with grills, so you won't see any of that. And then the rooftop units you will not see. We are adequately below the roof structure, so you won't have anything there. And then on the first floor with the HVAC units, we will have to put an architectural screening on those as our first line of defense of kind of making those blend in with the exterior. And then to the extent that we can, we're going to provide landscaping buffers as well, throughout the first floor.

Ms. Andres: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Kwapis: Yep, thank you.

Mr. Bahr: Any comments?



Should we also add to that then, the signage when it comes in? Or will that be enveloped within the PUD afterwards?

Mr. Berg: When the sign package comes in that will be another amendment to this Planned Unit Development.

Ms. Andres: Got it. Thank you.

Ms. Giesting: And I'll second that motion.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion, and a second by Mary. Andrew, if you would, poll vote.

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

FDP-22-083 is approved.

Mr. Kwapis: Thank you all.

Mr. Bahr: Very good. Thank you. Good luck. Number three, requesting a continuance to November Plan Commission.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, I'll be up here for these last few items and Andrew has already told me that I need to work through these pretty quickly because he's got some things that he wanted to do tonight. So, I'll be brief in my comments. This first one, TA-22-089, the staff and ordinance committee had been working on a set of revisions to these sign regulations for the past few months. We went ahead and scheduled this for a public hearing because we thought we were at a point where we were ready to move forward because of the notice requirement, the 10-day notice to get that in the newspaper, we thought we had enough time to make some last minute revisions but we ran into a little bit of a snag because the person on staff that was helping us with this had an unforeseen setback, so we want to request a continuance to have some additional time to work on the changes.

Mr. Brandgard: I would move that we grant the continuance to November Plan Commission.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second

Mr. Bahr: Motion and a second – I assume we can do a voice. All in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: All opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Motion carries.

Mr. Whaley: With that said, we will come back to this in just a few minutes, and I'll go through some substantive changes that we've been working on, just so you all have an understanding of some of the bigger changes that would be a part of these regulation amendments. Alright, the next item on the agenda is a request to amend the Zoning Code to establish Article 6.2 for the Master Plan process. As I explained in my report, we currently have seven different zoning districts which all have Master Plan processes described within those districts. What we're essentially doing is taking that language within those districts and combining it into a single article within the zoning ordinance, and those districts will point to that article. The language within each of those districts is largely the same when we do a side-by-side comparison, and that was available on the website for you to take a look at. In some respects, as time has gone on, the districts did get a little more wordy and it was just copied from district to district. So, you will see that there's a little variation in the length of those but it's largely the same language that currently exists today. Basically, with that what we'd be doing is looking for a recommendation on that text amendment, to the Town Council. So, TA-22-090, we'd be looking for a recommendation to the Town Council, either favorable or unfavorable, or no recommendation, on these amendments. But you would need to hold a public hearing first. With that, I'll get out of the way while you do that.

Mr. Bahr: We would like to open the public hearing for TA-22-090 – The Master Plan Process, an allow anyone to approach the Commission and address their questions.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and turn it over for discussion amongst the Commission.

Ms. Andres: I think it's a great idea. The more we can consolidate, the better.

Mr. Daniel: (microphone not on) I will make a quick comment. I got to this late because I went on vacation. I apologize to the staff that I didn't get to it earlier. This is another substantial



improvement to our ordinance. Once again, they're doing a good job of simplifying and improving the Plainfield zoning ordinance. This is another improvement as well...

Ms. Giesting: Can you turn on your...

Ms. Andres: They want to get that on record.

Mr. Bahr: You need to say that again.

Ms. Giesting: You might have to repeat yourself.

Mr. Daniel: I'd be happy to repeat that. I'll skip the vacation part, but I did get to this late and it is another effort by the staff to simplify our process and improve our process. I think it's an excellent change and I fully support it. I think once again, it improves our ordinance and simplifies the process for everybody.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you Mel.

Mr. Daniel: Well done.

Ms. Giesting: Does this require a motion for a favorable recommendation? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Whaley: A recommendation, the type is up to you. We would prefer favorable, yes.

Ms. Giesting: I'll make a motion for a favorable recommendation for TA-22-090. Does that satisfy your requirement?

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion and a second, and I assume that we can do a voice vote? Yes, thank you Mel. All in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: All opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Motion carries.

Mr. Whaley: Okay, the Land Use Matrix, TA-22-060: staff did go back and remove all language pertaining to accessory dwelling units within the amendments that we had presented to you last month. I believe that satisfies the concerns, at least for now. As I indicated in my report, we'll probably be revisiting this issue, at least in the discussion phase when we talk about accessory

uses, since it would be an accessory use as an accessory dwelling unit, at least to continue that conversation from last month. What we would be looking for here would be another recommendation to the Town Council, favorable recommendation preferred, to forward the amended TA-22-060 back to the Town Council with a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Andres: Do we need a hearing on this, or no? Just a motion?

Mr. Whaley: Just a motion.

Ms. Andres: I will move that we present TA-22-060 to the Town Council with a favorable recommendation.

Ms. Giesting: I'll second.

Mr. Bahr: We have a motion and a second. All in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: All opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Motion carries.

Mr. Whaley: So, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, I just want to quickly walk through some of the substantive changes of the sign regulations that the committee has been working on for the past few months. You may recall that the Town Council had passed a moratorium on pole and pylon signs to give us an opportunity to take a look at these regulations and create a set of amendments for you all to consider. The highlight of this is that we've taken what's currently a 41 page document and condensed it down to 12 pages. That was largely done because we reordered and restructured the way that the regulations are applied within the sign code. Currently it is by zoning district, so there's a lot of text repetition. What we've done is instead regulate by sign type which allowed us to have a lot less repetition within that document and be a lot more focused in the provisions that we're putting forth. We also were able to take a lot of the information and put it into charts and tables. Again, just an overview of what we're looking at here with ground signs. The current ordinance classifies ground signs as a variety of different types including pole and pylon signs within that category. It's currently limited to 35' tall and about 600 square feet in space, for various types of signs. I've got a couple of examples on the top. The one with the center missing is the Target sign, something that's currently here in Plainfield – it's been like that for quite some time – and the other is an example on the right, of something that doesn't exist in Plainfield, but could under the current regulations because there is a bit of a back door process which would allow someone to plat property just for the sole purpose of getting a pole or pylon sign onto that property. And you could end up with a situation like that where you have two large signs. What we're proposing instead is to restrict the height

of signs to a maximum of 10' for ground signs, and that would be for multi-tenant, and then 96 square feet in size. So, it is quite a bit of a reduction, but we think, from a staff standpoint – and I think that the ordinance committee agreed – that this helps with decreasing sign clutter; it gets the signs closer to the ground where people can see them a lot better, instead of being really tall up in the air. It just visually presents a lot better in the Town of Plainfield.

Ms. Giesting: So, would this be going forward or would current signs...?

Mr. Whaley: This would be going forward.

Mr. Kirchoff: You can't do retroactive.

Ms. Giesting: Bummer

Mr. Whaley: Any change that we present and gets adopted would be...

Ms. Giesting: From that time forward, okay.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, so what's existing today can continue but would be non-complying.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Whaley: Any thoughts or feedback on this type of reduction in size?

Mr. Bahr: I think it's nice.

Mr. Brandgard: I'm in favor.

Ms. Giesting: Me too.

Mr. Kirchoff: Have you had a chance to bounce it off any local businesses?

Mr. Whaley: We haven't talked directly to local businesses; we've talked with some of the sign companies. The sign companies obviously would prefer to sell and draw as large of a sign as possible, but what they have said that they're experiencing is cost is a sever limiting factor on the size of signs, so they are also starting to see now that signs are starting to come down in size.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Bahr: I would think maintenance would be easier too.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, you don't have to get special equipment out there to switch each panel.

Mr. Klinger: As maybe evidenced by that Target sign that's been like that for weeks and weeks, if not months.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, that's been like that since at least the winter.

Ms. Andres: We've had some discussion too, just that if we move to this type, looking at landscaping around them, and just that visually it requires less because it's more visually pleasing at the bottom, and those types of things too. So, I think it's a great change.

Mr. Whaley: Well, paired with that reduction size, we did opt to include some language for a new program called "augmented ground signs". This is something completely new but basically what it's designed to do is encourage creative design and flexibility in the code, and it provides some additional allowances for size and height if you meet certain criteria in the design of the sign. There are some examples on the right-hand side. One would be if the sign is architecturally compatible with the building and is coming through the Plan Commission, and the Plan Commission could decide to grant approval for an increase in size using this augmented sign program. Do you have any reactions to this?

Mr. Brandgard: I think it's a good move going with that; give it a little creativity, it certainly doesn't look the same.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah. Again, we wanted to be flexible and offer some options for creativity and encourage that whenever possible. Another thing that we discussed in relation to ground signs was landscaping. Landscaping over the years has been pretty hit or miss in terms of ground signs. What's required is that you provide six evergreens with each ground sign. You have to have at least six. You can see in the upper left-hand corner, they did the six small shrubs in the front, put a couple of shrubs on the outside. The Walmart Neighborhood Market sign – and I forgot to look at this as I went by today – but they have six, I think those are Junipers that have spread out at the base of the sign and actually grew up to a point where they're covering that signage, so it was no longer effective with it being that low to the ground. I think that they, based upon the street view image that I saw, they ended up ripping all of those out. So, we need to follow up with that and see what the status is on that property.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, I'm pretty sure that none of those are there anymore.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: I'll just make a comment along that line. I see a lot of signs where required landscaping has obscured the signs.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: So, I think that puts the ordinance on us somewhat, of controlling what landscaping goes in.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, and as I said, it requires six evergreens...

Mr. Kirchoff: If any

Mr. Brandgard: If any, yeah.

Mr. Whaley: Six evergreens is what it is currently and as you said, those do grow over time and it's going to obstruct the sign. One of the things that we talked about was that we think that the initial intent was to try to provide something that's aesthetic but also to shield any ground mounted equipment that might be associated with the sign. Now with today's technology, most of that equipment is going into the sign instead of being on the outside. So, what we've done is instead of requiring the evergreens, it's encouraged, and it's also required to be used in situations if there is equipment. So, if there's a utility box on the outside of the sign that providing the electricity, then it would need to be screened with evergreens. But the rest of the landscaping would be up to the individual property owner. And as you can see, I think these were approved with an alternate landscape plan because I don't see the evergreens – at least that's my hope. But we do have a couple of examples on the lower left that where there aren't any evergreens, but there are some nice landscape features around that sign. I think it really compliments it. And then the Kingseed on the lower right-hand corner, they do have some evergreens. I think it was a part of their landscape package for the parking lot screening, but they do have some other landscape items up front that again, presents a really nice look for that. This was a topic that we talked about at length with the committee so I'm interested to hear what feedback you might have.

Mr. Kirchoff: I just know signs have been a pain in the neck for a lot of communities, and when I was involved with the chamber, I heard that a lot. I just think we need to be as – I don't know what word I want, but I think we need to be flexible when it comes to signs.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, I'd like to see creativity used when it comes to landscaping on the base of signs, if it's required. But the ordinance, as I said, just has a basic one size fits all approach. And I think there's a lot more creativity – the landscape designers don't get points for the different plants that they use that are not evergreens. So, it really doesn't incentivize them to do something different, unless they just decide to do it on their own. And plus, if you have a ground sign that's fairly low to the ground, and you install a nice decorative base, it's difficult to ask them to effectively cover that up with landscaping.

Ms. Giesting: Well, I appreciate all of the work the committee has done, and you're looking to improve the aesthetics of signage in the town. What I've seen so far looks good, and I like the big ideas that you've shared with us.

Mr. Whaley: I've got just a few more and then we'll be done.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Whaley: Building signs: these are currently referred to as wall signs. Currently you're allowed to go up to 10% of any wall façade. Now, on a relatively small building that could be a fairly

appropriate sign for just a single use site. But even at 10%, that tends to be a pretty large allowance. When you get up to the larger industrial buildings, which we do have a few here around town – this example in the upper right-hand corner, that building would probably be allowed somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,600 square feet of signage on the building, based on that 10% calculation. So, what we've done instead is put forth a sliding scale based upon the size of the building. As you can see, it starts around that 7% and then it goes down from there based upon the size. We did a calculation of permits issued over the last two or three years, for signs, and the vast majority of the ones we issued permits for fit within this scale that we established. So, there's a lot of information there. You can certainly take a look at that and get back to staff if you want, but if you have any additional reaction to establishing this type of a sliding scale, we certainly welcome that feedback.

Mr. Klinger: So, this – I don't have a question about this but seeing that big rooftop makes me wonder, did you guys also address rooftop signage?

Mr. Whaley: Yes, rooftop signs were removed. I believe that was a program that was put in place several years ago but never actually got used by any of the businesses. And I think there was a requirement that it had to have "Plainfield" in the language, and that would run afoul.

Mr. Klinger: Oh, right. Yeah. I thought Duke did one on a building.

Mr. McPhail: They talked about it, but they never did do it.

Mr. Klinger: They never actually did it? Okay.

Mr. Whaley: With that said, I know that Hobbs Station is working on their sign package and at one point in time they were talking about some sort of a decorative roof sign that you might see in an industrial area. I think of – Andrew would be familiar with this, probably no one else would – but I think of like the GE sign in Ft. Wayne that has become somewhat of a landmark for the city because of its visibility and old character. I think they talked about doing something like that. I don't know if they'll bring that forward but since that's a PUD, they're allowed to write their own sign standards, so you might see something like that from them.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah, if you agree that it's an iconic type of thing, then you can approve that.

Ms. Andres: (inaudible) rooftop sign, the GE rooftop sign.

Mr. Klinger: Not the way that I was just referring to, but it is on the rooftop of the GE building – well, it used to be – but it's upright, I don't know, it's lit up. I don't really remember all that much. But I was referring to about rooftop signs was actually putting a sign on the rooftop, visible from an airplane.

Ms. Andres: Oh, okay.

Mr. Klinger: Since we're in the flight path we thought some of these bigger buildings, they might want to put signage on there, but apparently nobody ever took advantage of it.

Mr. Brandgard: We did it because somebody came in and asked for it.

Mr. Klinger: That's right. I thought Duke – yeah, somebody had come in and asked.

Mr. Brandgard: Duke asked for it.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: Kevin could you go back to the slide there you had of the special signage, the walls and that type?

Mr. Whaley: Which one?

Mr. McPhail: Yeah, that one. You know, we tried to get language in there – you tell me, you take any one of those and you tell me, is that a sign or is that a wall with a sign on it? So, I think the language we've got clarified that (inaudible) wall area.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: And then some of those special, like Hendricks Regional there, that's the corporate logo, so you've got to have an exception I think for some of those type things. I think we addressed all those, but somebody will challenge them, maybe.

Mr. Whaley: Two more things. Canopy signs: the current ordinance in the sign regulations basically allow canopy signs on any canopies within the Town of Plainfield but then when you go to the architectural standards for fueling stations, that prohibits canopy signs. So, we looked at that and thought if it was appropriate to prohibit signs on canopies for one type of use, it's probably something that should be extended to all canopies throughout the town and not treat them differently based upon the use of the property since they are similar in terms of design and configuration. We do have an exception in here for height limitation which could be a requirement imposed on a canopy for safety, and then also the signs which are 2 square feet or less. So, if you think about a bank for example, it might have the little digital sign for the drive-through lanes to indicate when they're open or closed. If it's 2 square feet or less, that would be excluded from that. But your digital readouts of fueling station prices or just general signage meant to identify the business would not be allowed on the canopy itself.

Mr. Bahr: I'm trying to think of the type of businesses that actually have the canopy. I mean, definitely gas stations.

Mr. Whaley: You could have banks. You could have hotels when they have the porte-cochere, the entry to the hotel; they might want to put some signage on that, for example.

Mr. Bahr: Right

Mr. Whaley: Carwashes, drive-through facilities for restaurants sometimes have canopies that you go underneath.

Mr. Kirchoff: Some churches do.

Mr. Whaley: You can certainly think about that and contact me if you have any questions. Window signs: we actually discovered not that long ago that there are three sets of regulations and three different processes within the ordinance. If you go to the exempt section, it's 50% maximum coverage. If you go to the temporary signs, it's 25%. And then if you go to the TC District/Town Center, there's a limitation of 15% which I don't think has ever really been enforced. What we did was basically limit it to 25% for window coverage, thinking that that's probably a more appropriate amount; 50% tends to be pretty large for windows and when you have bigger windows that is just more area to cover with clings and things of that nature, like the ones shown in this photo.

Ms. Giesting: What we're looking at would be out of compliance?

Mr. Whaley: That picture, if it was 25% - it's hard to say looking at this because I can't see how tall those windows are. Let's just say we assume those windows up there are exactly the same size as the bottom set, so that would be covering 50% of that window area.

Ms. Giesting: Gotcha

Mr. Brandgard: You know, part of what's always bothered me with the stuff on the windows – we require buildings a certain amount of different architectural coverage on them, and glass is one of them, and when they cover up the glass, it's no longer glass. So, it's...

(Brief pause)

Mr. Whaley: Any other comments about that?

Ms. Andres: (microphone not on) (inaudible) from a safety perspective too. I mean, you can't see what's going on inside (inaudible). So, (inaudible) up to the business themselves but I would think it would help to have at least some of it open and visible too, rather than covering the entire windows. So, I support the...

Ms. Giesting: With this proposed – so, it wouldn't matter if it's temporary or if it's permanent, it's 25%?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah

Ms. Giesting: Okay



Mr. Kirchoff: So, what's the different between putting curtains on the inside?

Mr. Whaley: So, I think the difference would be is the curtains being in the interior of the structure is something you can control the amount of light that comes in and out of the building, depending on the tenant. Those can be changed out pretty easily. When you take stuff like this and put it to the exterior, as Robin indicated, the windows are no longer capable of being a window. It's almost like taking a building downtown and boarding up the windows. It changes the outside appearance of the structure.

Mr. Brandgard: And I think part of it too is, you know, we have a signage ordinance that only allows so much signage on the building.

Mr. Kirchoff: Right, I understand that.

Mr. Brandgard: That's all signage, so that's more than we allow. That's a way of getting around our ordinance, by using windows as sign boards.

Mr. Kirchoff: I understand that but I'm not sure I understand what you were just trying to tell me.

Mr. Whaley: About the difference between window clings and curtains and blinds?

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, why do we care?

Mr. Whaley: That's a good question. That's why I'm asking you. Do you care about this?

Ms. Andres: Well, I see the clings as more external, and the curtains are more internal – would be a general distinction in terms of sometimes you don't really notice if something's on the interior as much when you're outside. But these are clearly intended to be visible from the outside.

Mr. Kirchoff: I understand that.

Mr. Brandgard: I'm thinking along the lines – you know, we have the fast food with a brick wall, and they want to put signage up to advertise what they have in there. We don't allow that.

Mr. Kirchoff: No, I understand.

Mr. Brandgard: I don't see any difference between that and putting that same signage covering up the windows, personally.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, as you can tell (inaudible) for. I hear from businesses a lot, so...

Mr. Brandgard: I do too.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah

Mr. Whaley: Alright, well those are the big-ticket items on sign changes. No further action at this point other than if you have feedback to give us. We've got a few additional amendments to make and get it cleaned up. The last item on the agenda that we have is the 2023 public hearing calendar. This basically was the addition of one day in the schedule. I think we just moved it from 2022 because it works. So, it's largely the same as 2022. But unless you have any feedback, we would welcome your consent to adopt the 2023 calendar. If you need more time, that's fine too.

Mr. Brandgard: Based on what I've seen, I consent.

Ms. Giesting: So, do you need a motion?

Mr. Brandgard: Probably just consent.

Mr. Bahr: Consent

(Consent is given)

Mr. Bahr: You have what you need.

Mr. Whaley: That's the last agenda item I have but the last item I need to point out is that this is Mary Giesting's final meeting with the Plan Commission this evening. I do want to say then even though you've been with us a short period of time, I've appreciated your collaboration and the questions that you ask in these meetings. I can tell that you're engaged. It's difficult to find quality people who are willing to dedicate their time and energy to participate in these types of processes. So, I really appreciate everything that you brought into this.

Ms. Giesting: Thank you, it's been certainly an honor and a privilege to serve on the Commission. We're looking forward to going back to our little 80-acre farm in Shelby County. However, we will miss Plainfield and all of the leadership that the town, Commission, Town Council provides. This is a wonderful community and it's because of the leadership in this room and outside of this room that makes it such a wonderful community. So, it's been a privilege to live here, and I thank you. And I'm sure whoever takes my place will do just as good a job. So, thank you very much.

Mr. Kirchoff: How long you been in Plainfield?

Ms. Giesting: 14 years (inaudible), so we'll miss it, miss it a lot. However, I leave three children and five grandchildren (inaudible).

Mr. McPhail: You'll be back.

Mr. Bahr: You will be.

Ms. Giesting: All the time. Thank you, Kevin.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Brandgard: With that, I move we adjourn.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion...

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Bahr: And a second, so approved.

DocuSigned by:



7F4D04129B54495...

Mr. Steve Bahr, President

DocuSigned by:



963ABE261770430...

Mr. Andrew J. Klinger, Secretary