

PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION

October 4, 2021

6:30 p.m.

Mr. Bahr: We would like to call the October 4th Plainfield Plan Commission meeting to order.

ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Mr. Bahr: Let's take roll call.

Ms. Robinson:

Mr. McPhail – here

Mr. Brandgard – here

Mr. Smith – here

Mr. Kirchoff – here

Mr. Bahr – here

Ms. Geisting – here

All are present except for Mr. Philip.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Bahr: If you would, join me now by standing for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bahr: Approval of minutes from the September 9, 2021, meeting. Any additions?

Mr. Kirchoff: I move we approve them as submitted.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: We need a vote, thank you.

Ms. Robinson:

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

And I don't think she can vote today, correct?

Mr. Kirchoff: Correct

Ms. Robinson: Okay

OFFICER ELECTION(S)

Mr. Bahr: And Officer elections; somebody's going to have to fill me in on...

Mr. Brandgard: We need to fill the President position.

Mr. Kirchoff: I thought we talked about waiting.

Mr. McPhail: This would just complete the current term, right?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, so since Scott Slavens has resigned from the Plan Commission and he was the President, his position is currently vacant. So, you would need to elect a new president; currently Steve is the Vice President, and he is filling in this evening.

Mr. Kirchoff: Steve, are you willing to finish out the term?

Mr. Bahr: Sure

Mr. Kirchoff: Then I would so move.

Mr. McPhail: Second

Mr. Bahr: Voice vote?

Mr. Kirchoff: You can just – everybody in favor.

Mr. Bahr: Everybody in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: Those opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: I will carry out the term.

Mr. McPhail: We need a Vice president now.

Mr. Whaley: That is correct.

Mr. McPhail: I would nominate Bruce Smith.

Ms. Geisting: I second.

(inaudible)

Mr. Brandgard: That was quick.

Mr. Bahr: All those in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: Those opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Bruce will now be Vice President.

Mr. McPhail: Just think, we get to do this again in January.

PUBLIC HEARING GUIDELINES

Mr. Bahr: Public Hearings are designed to allow public input regarding the subject matter.

1. The proceedings are recorded for public record purposes; please come to the podium, located in the front of the Meeting Room, give your name and address and make your presentation.
2. Please make presentations as concise as possible; try to limit your comments to no more than five (5) minutes and avoid repetition.
3. If possible, please designate a spokesperson for groups supporting or opposing same positions.
4. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the speakers' sheet provided at the podium.

OATH OF TESTIMONY

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

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. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Daniel: Mr. Bahr, we have a new member this evening and I believe she has not been sworn in yet, is that correct?

Ms. Geisting: That is correct.

Mr. Daniel: Well, if you'd like to step down here.

(Ms. Geisting is sworn into the Plan Commission)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you and congratulations.

Mr. Bahr: Mary, you'll be a wonderful addition to the Commission.

Ms. Geisting: Thank you

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Bahr: First on the agenda is FDP-21-101 – Metro Air East 7.

Mr. Berg: Mr. President, if we could do all of these presentations as one...?

Mr. Bahr: Please

Mr. Berg: You'll notice that contrary to the rules of procedure, we are having the final detail plans prior to the Planned Unit Development modification; that is because the exhibits for the modification are reflecting the Final Detailed Plan. So, we just want to make sure that if a change needs to be made, it could be reflected on the PUD. Kimley-Horn is here today to discuss this. We're looking at Building 7, which is in the lower right-hand side of both of these. The image there on the left is the original that was approved with the Planned Unit Development. You'll notice this is a larger building that was approved; that's why they're coming again, that's why they're coming in to have this amendment. They are adding some trailer parking there to the – I should mention that plan left is north – so, they're adding some trailer parking to the east, or slightly, on the illustration, above the building. You'll also notice that just kind of the difference there in Plainfield Road was able to be adjusted because of the difference in the retention area. Building 9, which is also in the northeast, or upper left of both of those, it's the larger building; there are some minor changes, like more trailer parking. Another difference from the Final Detailed Plan, this was built from south to north, instead of north to south, and there's one fewer entrance onto Plainfield Road. Again, the Planned Unit Development, we need to make sure that the final product of these two exhibits, B & C, should you choose to approve the Final Detailed Plans, we need to make sure that it reflects the reality on the right, instead of the original proposal. What we're seeing is that when these get financed, if there's even the slightest difference, we're getting bogged down in a whole bunch of emails and letters from lending companies. So, we're just kind of trying to, for lack of a better phrase, make sure that we're using our time properly, and not getting into these types of emailing back and forth about a parking space, or a building that's 3 square foot smaller than it was designed for. Building 8, there is a modification on that that could be approved via an ILP, to add some fencing and a gate, but there was some concern about some stacking, so the applicant is here, and I believe that they are prepared to offer a commitment, that if that building does change hands to another tenant, that they'll remove that. We're not as concerned about the gate because there's not a high-traffic use, but if it did change to a higher traffic use, it would be a concern that we would have stacking onto Plainfield Road. So, we've worked together with the applicant to achieve what we think is an equitable decision. And with that, this is probably my longest presentation in months, so I'm a little winded, so I'm going to turn this over if there are no further questions.

Mr. Bahr: Good evening.

Mr. Sheward: Good evening, my name is Bryan Sheward, I'm with Kimley-Horn and Associates, I'm the Civil Engineer on the project; our offices are at 250 East 96th Street, Suite 580, in Indianapolis, Indiana. Tonight, I'm here representing Strategic Capital Partners, specifically John Cumming, sitting behind us. Also, here to answer any architectural questions that I might not be able to answer, if you have them, is Paul Meier with JRA Architecture, Paul's back here as well. As Eric, or Mr. Berg had mentioned, there's really three petitions. I've got them stacked in order

here, based on the agenda. So, going first here on the screen is just highlighting – north is up here on the screen – you can see existing Building 9, which is on the right-hand side, or the east side of the screen. The blank spot on the hard corner, northeast corner of Stafford and Reagan, is what was preplanned as Building 7, which we're coming forward with a Final Detailed Plan for. And then just north of that is existing Building 8, which Mr. Berg mentioned, the fencing item which we'll get to. I should mention, before I go on, that this was a Master Plan development, so the detention basin in the southeast corner was planned with enough detention for the full build out of the park, so the improvements that we're noting, there doesn't have to be any modification to the detention in the corner of the site. First up is Building 7 – north arrow now facing to the left, on the side of the screen – this is a zoom in, it's a single-loaded speculative industrial building. I think you'll see from the elevations that I'll get to, that there's a heightened architectural component to this; there's certainly quite a bit of glazing on the corner, that was a big deal, coming into Plainfield from the south. The changes that Eric had mentioned, the building grew slightly in width, that was one change. The square footage of the building is slightly larger than what the original PUD had noted. It's less than I think the 75,000-ish threshold of where the traffic study update is needed. If you had seen – Mr. Singleton had written a small, short blurb at the time, saying that this was still in substantial compliance with his traffic study. The second change is this addition of the trailer spots shown, both proposed and future, if they were to essentially stack them. There's trailer parking here; that really fits into an area of the site that can't frankly be used for much else, so that's another modification. The two yellow highlights were just two items that I wanted to point out. One is the pedestrian connectivity; that was a comment that we had got on our initial submittal, so we have a sidewalk connection up to the path on Ronald Reagan Parkway, as well as a sidewalk connection down to Plainfield Road, so it should be adequate sidewalk connection for pedestrians. As well as we understood it was an important item to make sure that trailers couldn't be seen from Stafford. And so, we've shown an 8-foot wood screen fence on the south side that wraps around the entry drive at one of the ingress/egress locations. And that's positioned up above the drive itself, so as you're sitting at the Stafford and Reagan intersection, diagonally to the northeast, you should not be able to see past the building and fence to see any trailers. Nor if you're driving down Stafford, should you be able to see those trailers parked in the back as well. Landscaping conforms to the PUD. There're 3-foot berms with Level 3 along Plainfield Road, and a Level 4 along Reagan and Stafford, as well as the fence along the Stafford stretch. Architecturally, this is just a quick highlight, but this bottom right image is what you'll see on the southwest corner of the building, which is the closest to the intersection. And then the respective rendering, you can get a sense of what that corner would look like, which we feel looks quite a bit like an office corner, as opposed to what you might see around town at other speculative warehouses. So, it's definitely a heightened architectural feature on the corner of the building. Switching to Building 9 – Building 9 is existing, this is an addition to the north side of the building, about 250,000 square feet. It's much of what you see to the south. The courts, the drives, basically everything stretches to the north, up to the north property line. In addition to the improvements on the north side, there's additional parking added on the south side for automobile parking; that was also Master Planned previously, for detention. I think that should cover the site plan for 9. Landscaping, it's meeting the PUD

requirement, for landscaping around the entry point of the parking areas. Architecturally it matches the same color palette and style of the existing building, as it expands to the north. This is a rendering from I believe is the northwest corner, looking at the building expansion, and you can see an office corner there. So, you'd be on Plainfield Road, looking southeast. And that's – I guess going back to follow up on maybe what Mr. Berg had mentioned: the existing Building 8, there is an existing tenant on the south side of the building. There's a perspective tenant looking at the north side of the building; they are a low truck turnover type of use, so very few trucks in and out per day. But it's important to have a secure court for the type for use that they have, so what we've done is we've moved – they want to have a secure, gated back area, roughly where I'm pointing – we've moved the gate far enough away from the entry drive that exists today, so several trucks can stack and not back up into Plainfield Road. We feel, with a low truck expected turnover that they have at the facility, that there shouldn't be any stacking back into Plainfield Road. I guess I'll make a commitment, on behalf of John, unless he throws something at me, that we would agree to have a commitment to remove the fence if the tenant were to change, or the use were to change; that can go on the record. That's all I have, if you guys have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: Thank you, being that this is a public hearing, is there anyone present that is opposed to, against, or in favor of the project, that would like to address the Commission?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: That portion of the public hearing is closed. I'll open it up for discussion.

Mr. Smith: I think the only (inaudible) really, was concerning the berms and screening. As long as we're confident that we're well screened on the intersection (inaudible). (inaudible) particular attention to the house; there's still a residence there, one house still on that property. It looks like there's a fence part way up if I saw that correctly – there's a fence part way up...

Mr. Brandgard: It goes up and it wraps around.

Mr. Smith: So, you feel the house is pretty well screened?

Mr. Sheward: We feel so; we know that the proposed driveway there matches the driveway to Building 9 across the street, so from a traffic perspective, you want that. It's next to the driveway in their home, certainly close proximity to it, in an effort to match the curb cuts. And we knew that practically speaking, when trucks exit, their headlights are going to swing around, and we didn't want it to go right into their house; that's why that fence wraps around over to where that curve ends, which is past where their house is (inaudible). This type of fence wouldn't be a shadowbox with gaps in between, it would be board to board, to make sure that doesn't...

Mr. Smith: Solid

Mr. Sheward: Solid, yeah.

Mr. Smith: The view from the intersection, Reagan/Stafford intersection, is that Level 4?

Mr. Sheward: It is Level 4 landscaping along Reagan and Stafford, with a 3-foot berm. And on top of the berm will be an 8-foot fence.

Mr. Kirchoff: So, where is the fence then?

Mr. Sheward: Sorry, I'll go back – it's noted there, the 9-foot wooden screen fence, and then it's highlighted yellow around...

Mr. Kirchoff: No, I understand that; in relation to the landscaping.

Mr. Sheward: Oh, the intent is to put it on top of the berm and have landscaping on both sides of it; we want to try and place the fence as high as we could, for the screening.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Smith: The fence will be covered somewhat with landscaping?

Mr. Sheward: Absolutely, yeah, it'll be a 3-foot mound with a fence on top, and there will be landscaping on both sides. Obviously, we have to stagger the landscaping back a little bit, but yeah.

Mr. Smith: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Kirchoff: Ready for a motion?

Mr. Bahr: Ready for a motion.

Mr. Kirchoff: I move that the Plan Commission approve FDP-21-101 requesting Final Detailed Plan approval of a 322,875 square foot single load speculative industrial building on a 23.17-acre parcel zoned Metro Air Business Park, Phase 2 Planned Unit Development within a Gateway Corridor, finding that:

1. The Final Detailed Plan satisfies the Development Requirements and Development Standards specified in the Metro Air Phase 2 Business Park PUD Ordinance.
2. The Final Detailed Plan accomplishes the intent set forth in Article 6.1 of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

3. The Final Detailed Plan provides for the protection or provision of the site features and amenities outlined in Article 6.1 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.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: We have a second by Robin, call the vote.

Ms. Robinson:

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Ms. Geisting – yes

FDP-21-101 has been approved.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Kirchoff: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve FDP-21-100 requesting Final Detailed Plan approval of a 252,747 square foot expansion on the north side of the existing Metro Air Business Park Building 9 with additional trailer parking spaces, loop drive, and automobile parking on a 41.50-acre parcel zoned Metro Air Business Park, Phase 2 Planned Unit Development within a Gateway Corridor, finding that:

1. The Final Detailed Plan satisfies the Development Requirements and Development Standards specified in the Metro Air Phase 2 Business Park PUD Ordinance.
2. The Final Detailed Plan accomplishes the intent set forth in Article 6.1 of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.
3. The Final Detailed Plan provides for the protection or provision of the site features and amenities outlined in Article 6.1 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.

Mr. Smith: Second

Mr. Bahr: A second by Mr. Smith, call the vote.

Ms. Robinson:	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Mr. Smith – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Bahr – yes
	Ms. Geisting – yes

FDP-21-100 has been approved.

Mr. Kirchoff: And finally, I move that the Plan Commission certify the zone map amendment PUD-21-102 requesting modification of the existing Metro Air Business Park Phase 2 Planned Unit Development with a favorable recommendation.

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

1. Substantial compliance with Exhibits B and C as approved by the Commission.

Mr. Brandgard: Second

Mr. Bahr: A second by Mr. Brandgard, would you please call vote?

Ms. Robinson:	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Mr. Smith – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Ms. Geisting – yes

PUD-21-102 has been approved.

Mr. Bahr: Now it's official, good luck.

PLAN COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Bahr: Next on the agenda, Plan Commission discussion.

Mr. Kirchoff: Actually, old business.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Bahr: Old/new business: update on Nature Park (South of I-70).

Mr. King: Good evening, my name is Ryan King, I'm a landscape architect with Butler, Fairman & Seufert, and for the last year I've been working with south of I-70 working group, here in Plainfield, to develop a Master Plan for the approximately 2,000 acres that was acquired from the airport in 2018. So, since 2019 we've been working with an overall goal of creating a regionally significant nature park to provide a net benefit for the bat habitat, south of I-70. That with our overall goal for those 2,000 acres, we started a public involvement process to get the public's input and feedback as to what they would like to see happen in regard to that overall long-term goal. What we presented to the public were three different, smaller goals – beneath that one – and that is to provide a net-benefit to the local bat population, create that regionally significant nature park destination, and then expand access in the parklands, in general, to the trails and points of interest. To do that, we held two public outreach meetings that were concluded in the month of June this year: one at Sodalis Nature Park, and one at the Rec. Center. Those were held a couple of weeks apart, at different times; one was an open-house style, and one was a presentation style, just to maximize the way we reached out to the public. On June 8th we had 20 attendees, and June 16th we had 16 attendees. We had people attend a virtual option meeting, to view it online, and then our most successful outreach was a public online survey that had over 300 responses. We had great feedback on that; overall 98% of the feedback that we received was positive, in regard to the long-term goal for the land south of I-70. It was a 10-

question survey that was our most popular response, and it was an opportunity for the citizens to describe what their priorities were for a nature park, and what they would like to see most. One of the questions that we asked was, did they think it was important to access park facilities and nature in their community, and 87% of the people responded that that was very important. That carried over to another question, “Do you think that providing access to nature is a good investment for the town?”; an overwhelming 98% said that that was positive to them. The last question gave an open-ended opportunity for the citizens to respond, in detail, what they would like to see. This word cloud just gives a generalized depiction of some of the things that people responded to in that question. There was lots of hiking, access to nature, biking, family activities; they want to be able to connect to nature, interact with it, have a place to escape to within town limits, and overall, it was again, very positive. So, with the public feedback begin gathered, analyzed, and then applied to what we have found on those lands, we've come back with some focal points for the conceptual design as we continue the master planning process. You can see the list here: regional destination, create public access, and then an emphasis on nature stood out. So, to start the conceptual design process we looked at what opportunities, what activities, what kind of character we would like to have in this master plan, and that started with us breaking down the 1,700 acres into several park districts that make the master planning process and conceptual design process a little more manageable; it also allows us create activities, programming approaches, and just an overall design theme for each area, in a little bit more detail. You can see the seven different areas that we broke it into, based mostly on geographic boundaries that are located with White Lick Creek running north/south through the properties, as well as a variety of private parcels surrounding the area. The current Sodalis Park expands from the existing park to Sodalis Park north, with a focus on highly programmed activities, access to geographic features, and expanding on the activities that are currently available at Sodalis Park. To the very far north end, Sodalis Wetland Park: wetland habitat viewing, boardwalks and overlooks, this is an area that is very far off from any programmed or planned park space right now, so a little bit of a unique opportunity to do something and potentially connect under I-70, through the hospitality district north of I-70. White Lick Reach would be an area with access to the east fork White Lick Creek that runs north/south. It would also be an important connection to the core of the park, up to the wetland park. Sodalis Park West, an area that is mostly existing tree mitigation areas, would be good for expansion of the existing maintenance trails into public pathways, for wildlife viewing and passive recreation. And then much similar activities would take place in Sodalis Park South, which is an expansion of Sodalis Park across White Lick Creek to the south, and to a large wetland mitigation area that was previously established by the airport. The Grail area, isolated from all other parts of the park, is mostly canopy trees and deadwood; that's high-quality habitat for bats and other animals, so it would be a high-value area where we would minimize pedestrian traffic and access for any vehicles. And last, Nature Park Friendswood to the east, that is also a large mitigation area established by the airport, and one of the major goals would be to protect that canopy and to control access. I know that was a lot, really fast, for as much land as we're covering, but we're really very early on. We've completed the site inventory, we've completed the public outreach, and we are currently analyzing that and developing these concepts. The first step was to break that down to more manageable park areas; this master plan

for 2,000 acres has become seven individual park plans that we'll be working through. You can see that we have a long way to go, but our goal is to have a final master plan ready in the spring of 2022, a draft master plan at the end of 2021. The next time we come up to you guys, we will have a lot more detail, conceptual designs, and a little more building footprints, activities, programs, things like that, more final drawings to present. This is just an update to let you know that the Working Group has been making progress, the public's been reached out to, and so far, overall, the feedback has been extremely positive. If you guys have any questions, I can answer them the best I can.

Mr. Bahr: The survey, you had over 300 responses, how did you reach them?

Mr. King: We worked with the Town of Plainfield's Stephanie Singh; she helped us advertise on social media to get that survey link out, and then I think it was also sent out in the town's newsletter with the utility bills, that we were having public meetings and an online survey. For about a month before the first meeting we were working to reach out to as many people as possible.

Ms. Geisting: So, the master plan that you presented is for 2,000 acres – the current park that is there now, how many acres is it?

Mr. King: 210, I believe.

Ms. Geisting: Holy moly, okay.

Mr. Brandgard: Ryan, I have to thank you for the presentation. Obviously, this has been going on since 2018, and has become a lot larger project than any of us envisioned when we started. I think it's (inaudible) – we've got to satisfy the bats, Fish & Wildlife, as well as ourselves in what we ultimately end up with. I think we've made a lot of good head road in working with Fish & Wildlife; it's been a good process, although lengthy.

Ms. Geisting: Well, it's much needed, and it will be a valuable attribute to our community, that's for sure. I like the way that you've broken it down into projects, so that you can get your arms around it as you move forward, excellent.

Mr. Smith: (microphone not on) (inaudible) see this from the same (inaudible) as (inaudible) Park.

Mr. King: Absolutely, I think that's a really good example as a precedent, as to what the final goal would be; something similar to that, a locally owned state park size, self-sufficient nature park.

Mr. Smith: (microphone not on) (inaudible) I'm wondering about (inaudible) structures (inaudible) once in a while I hear people say (inaudible).

Mr. King: Yeah

Mr. Smith: (microphone not on) Is there any way we can, any way we can improve (inaudible)?

Mr. Brandgard: Which lake are you talking about?

Mr. Smith: Well, I've only ever seen one...

Mr. Brandgard: The reason I ask is most of the lakes in there, you can't see.

Mr. Smith: Well, and maybe that's that answer. Maybe we link them together in a better way. The one that's closest to the main parking lot is the only one I've ever seen.

Mr. Brandgard: Oh, the one in Sodalis.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Smith: It just seems like sometimes people say that they'd like to see that a little cleaner; maybe there's something structurally we can do.

Mr. King: I do know that water quality was reviewed a while ago, as one of the town's first action items when they took ownership of the park. I'm not sure what the results were; I think there was a chemical imbalance that was causing a lot of algae and growth in there. It's been regulated since then, but we haven't looked at water quality as a priority since then.

Mr. Smith: Well, it's something to watch, something to think about as we go forward.

Mr. King: Absolutely

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) (inaudible)

Mr. King: All right, I'm looking forward as well. Scott Singleton has some update items on transportation that he'd like to discuss as well.

Mr. Kirchoff: And Ryan, could you share this with us?

Mr. King: Yes, I can send this presentation to...

Mr. Kirchoff: Because you kind of flew through some of these slides, and we can go back and look at this. There're some really neat things that we're thinking about doing.

Ms. Geisting: That's a great idea Bill.

Mr. King: Yep, I'll send that out.

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you

Mr. McPhail: You know, you and Robin have thousands and thousands of hours into this project, and it's good to see it where you can present all your work.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yep

Mr. McPhail: Because I know how difficult it's been, so...

Mr. Smith: What's the Plan Commission's role going to be with this park? Just advisory in a sense, or...?

Mr. Brandgard: I think just now, informational. It's a park area so it's...

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, we may be involved – we may need to do some rezoning out there, or overlays.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Kirchoff: So, we may come back to you with some overlays, protection around the creek, that kind of thing. And then pretty much, this is over simplifications, but if you take the current Camby Road, which we're going to straighten out, generally the majority of the property north of Camby will be an industrial park, and the property more south will be park land, although there is some there. We'll be talking about some zoning and area of protection on that line. Is that fair?

Mr. Belcher: (not at microphone) Bruce, there could also be some structures (inaudible) plan.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yes

Mr. Belcher: (not at microphone) (inaudible)

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, my answer was an over simplification, other than it being a park...

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah, and obviously, we will look for areas for projects, as you indicated, but we'll also, we'll want to be talking about phasing because we can't do it all at once, and so we'll have some sort of prioritization and phasing that we would come and let you all know.

Ms. Geisting: Is Fish & Wildlife heavily involved in what's going on here?

Mr. Kirchoff: That would be an understatement.

Ms. Geisting: Is that an understatement, okay.

Mr. McPhail: They've virtually controlled that area for years. The airport just rolled over and...

Ms. Geisting: Gotcha

Mr. McPhail: It's been tough...

Mr. Brandgard: It's been tough.

Mr. McPhail: ...to get them to listen to common sense.

Ms. Geisting: Bill, you did all that, right?

Mr. McPhail: Bill, Robin, staff, Mel's firm, and about a thousand other people.

Ms. Geisting: Oh, that's good.

Mr. McPhail: It's been a real challenge. And what do we think we're going to end up with, about 800 acres on the north side?

Mr. Belcher: (not at microphone) (inaudible)

Mr. Kirchoff: And we're in conversations with them; it's ongoing.

Mr. Brandgard: And that's really part of where Plan Commission will come into effect. We envision some other controls beyond the development up there.

Ms. Geisting: I see, excellent.

Mr. Kirchoff: And roads and streets.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) (inaudible)

Mr. Singleton: Roads and streets, well this is definitely a related topic, and so I gave this presentation to the Town Council on Monday, and some of the members here with you, and members on the Council thought it would be a good idea to just fall back, right in behind the I-70 presentation – I'm sorry, the nature park presentation – because they are interlinked here with what we're doing with some of the road planning in this area. As many of you probably know, we entered into an agreement with INDOT, as part of a transfer, to bring what is old S.R. 267, now referred to as Quaker Boulevard, into our jurisdiction. That was that last section of old S.R. 267 that INDOT had retained after divesting some of it to the County and some of it to Avon, some of it to Brownsburg. We spent some time getting that worked out, but part of that process there is a funding mechanism that kicks in, and two projects were identified as part of that agreement. One of those projects is to take S.R. 267, S.R. 267/Quaker Boulevard, due south along what would be the western edge of what you just saw as Sodalis Nature Park. I can show you kind of what that project looks like, although it's not really – like I said, it wasn't really designed to kind of be for this purpose. This area here is roughly the area that Ryan was talking about, that nature park area. And so, currently Camby Road is up just north of the park area; we have the intention to straighten that out. County Road 750, which is the road just where old S.R. 267 does a 90-degree bend and goes over to Indiana Avenue and goes to Mooresville, at that intersection is where we're talking about starting to bring Quaker Boulevard due south, and looking to bring it over to

67, and really provide another alternative route for the traffic that uses County Road 750 to go over to the Camby area. It's a very heavily travelled road for an old county section, and we're really trying to find a way to divert some of that traffic around the park, that way the park can be enclosed and operated more like what was described, as a state park, where you have controlled access, and you don't just have through traffic running through it. That project was on the INDOT list, now, I will tell you, this presentation was designed the present to Council with how we're going to spend those funds from INDOT. We had to select some projects, we had to propose a cash flow curve of taking down some of the money that INDOT has offered to us, as part of the relinquishment, but it doesn't necessarily have to correlate to those projects specifically, as we got into more detail in the study. It kind of depends on the scope of the project, and whether it make sense to use federal funds. I can tell you that there's a lot of other activity happening that will affect you guys; you're talking about projects coming forward. We started talking about these things when we had the Trescott MOU; I started laying out some of those different items that we had been looking at and continue to look at. So, what this slide shows are projects that you're – with the exception Mary, who's relatively new – you've probably seen a lot of these things before. Over to the top of the screen, of course that is the most recent project, a roundabout at Hadley and Moon Road. Here shaded in yellow we're showing you the Trescott Development. That's several residential homes that that got approves by this body. As part of that we talked about the construction of Hackamore Road, which is highlighted here in yellow; part of that is being coupled with that development, part of it is expected to be constructed in the future. That is designed to be a new east/west carrier to carry some of the traffic that goes on Hadley Road. Stoplight, we are proposing that gets installed at the intersection of County Road 675 and Hadley Road, so that is underway, and that's part of an MOU that the staff is working with Pulte on. Here in yellow, we are looking to expand the current northbound left turn lane. It's a single left turn lane that backs up in the evening hours, we're looking to expand that to two left turn lanes that will shorten the length of that queuing, and so hopefully will not be sticking out into traffic any further, so that will help. Here in the red and white area, of course, is the public project that has been underway for all this season, which is to expand the capacity of this intersection and add a new traffic signal. These improvements are being made in anticipation of what Mr. Kirchoff talked about, the 800-acre industrial development that's likely to happen here south of I-70, and the added traffic that will be using that, as well as any traffic that gets generated by the park. And then these other two yellow lines represent the two projects that we had on the list with INDOT. Number 2 is the project that we just talked about, with rerouting Quaker Boulevard to the west of the park, eliminating the need to use County Road 750 as kind of a (inaudible) to get to Camby. And then Number 3 is a project that came out of our Thoroughfare Plan, which was a new I-70 overpass. And it's drawn just like this on our Thoroughfare Plan, which is just a modeling connection to show some way to try to get traffic on the south side of I-70 across the interstate, so that as this traffic develops, it isn't all required to go up to Hadley Road, and potentially overwhelm this intersection; it will bring some of this traffic from the south. Those two combinations are projects that have been discussed before. So, those are all things we're doing, and that this body is readily familiar with. Then you've got INDOT, they're out there doing their work as well. Right now, I can tell you they're expecting to replace the bridge that carried Center

Street over I-70. They recently approved funding to do another added travelling project, along I-70 between S.R. 267 and S.R. 39. Of course, you've already got the new interchange going in at S.R. 39. So, that project has been awarded funding; it will be five or six years before we see that construction get underway, but all of the steps are being made to get that started. In 2024, they've expressed interest in expanding the rest area, which as you can see with our Project Number 3 that we have been kicking around internally here, that has the potential to affect how we approach that project, as well as how they might approach their rest area, so that's going to take some coordination. And then the life of the bridge at the old S.R. 267 interchange, it comes due in 2030. I know that sounds like it's far away, but it's really not when you start talking about these types of projects. And so, there's a good chance that that interchange project could move up, because it makes a lot of sense to do it while you're doing an added travelling project at I-70. So, we would not be surprised if those things start to coalesce and start to merge together with similar timelines. Right now, that project has not received funding, but it very well could. So, we're faced with all these different projects that are going on, and then we've got this relinquishment money that we talked about. So, we've got the Projects 2 & 3; there's also needs to do intersection improvements at Hadley and Quaker Boulevard. Several different options have been looked at in the past. We show an oblong circle there because we think any improvements that we do at that intersection, we'd really have to be looking at the intersections adjacent to those because of how they rely on each other, so that's a pretty significant improvement. We have kicked around a collector distributor option to INDOT, which they have initially kind of seen issue with because of some environmental issues, but we are going to study it further on whether we can carry – basically what we're trying to do is carry some of the traffic that would otherwise go to that intersection at Hadley and Quaker and then down Hadley Road, carry them along I-70 a little further, through the interchange, but as part of that interchange, move them off and on to Center Street. And then, as you can see with the red line, with the new extension of Hackamore Road that we've already started to get underway, that allows that traffic to get to the area that we're concerned about, very much like Project 3 would do, but not by using the Hadley Road Corridor. And so, on and off, that sort of half interchange design of a collective distributor is something that we want to pursue but again, we got push back from INDOT initially, so we're going to continue to have those discussions, but that's what that's representing. And then of course many of you are familiar with, may not be familiar with, there's a manual out there, a design guideline of other Gateway designs that we had at S.R. 267; those improvements were pushed back a little bit because of the interchange (inaudible). We saw no reason to invest in those types of improvements as part of the Quaker branding, but those will come back into play if INDOT does elect to do an interchange improvement project, we'll try to coordinate all that as well. And then similarly there's conversations with our investment in the nature park, of another pedestrian crossing. Now the interchange is likely to bring that pedestrian crossing across that bridge, but that might not be the ideal solution, but it might not be the ideal solution. The town may be merging those two together, the pedestrian bridge and gateway (inaudible) something that gets worked out. These are just big picture conversations that we're talking about, and what this was for was to allow the Council to approve the contract, to bring some technical expertise to start coordinating all of these things with INDOT and give us a little more meat on the bone to

give to them with the benefits of all these items. I skipped one item here, when they do add the travel lane, we do have plans to create an underpass pathway at White Lick Creek, similar to what we have at U.S. 40 underneath the bridge. The right time to do that is when they're down there on I-70 adding travel lanes and widening that bridge, to prepare to get that ready to be installed. Again, this is more about the contract purposes, how we get there, about how we're going to kind open it up to market to get some ideas to justify what the best solution is for the problem that we want to solve. That problem, as we've talked about, is the development areas south of Hadley Road not overwhelming the Hadley Road Corridor, not overwhelming that intersection, and getting all of that traffic moved around in a way that can get to the interstate as it needs to, without taxing the system beyond the level of service that we all expect.

Mr. Kirchoff: And can you back up one screen? Steve, I thought this would be of interest to you when we were talking about offloading Hadley.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) (inaudible) Scott and I talked briefly...

Mr. Singleton: We've had a fair amount of conversations over the years. Steve's a great sounding board when we have some of these challenges because obviously, he lives in one of the congested areas there.

Mr. Bahr: Yeah

Mr. Singleton: So, nothing to approve, and it's not directly related, I just wanted to jump in behind Ryan to kind of share this and just kind of give you guys some big picture items that we are looking at. There will be some fairly significant changes in the next ten years. Along with the nature park, we could see some significant alterations in this area.

Mr. Bahr: Very informative.

Ms. Geisting: Thank you

Mr. Singleton: Any questions?

Mr. Bahr: You've got a lot on our plate.

Mr. Singleton: I'd tend to agree.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Singleton: Keeps me busy, I like it.

Mr. Brandgard: What it is, his plate filled up and we gave him a bigger plate.

Mr. Smith: I think he has a platter.

Mr. Singleton: Thank you

Mr. Brandgard: Thank you Scott.

Mr. Smith: That's a lot.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Housing Diversity Presentation.

Mr. Whaley: I'll go ahead and give an introduction to this. Several months ago, myself, Eric Berg- Senior Planner in our planning section, as well as our Economic Development Director Todd Cook, and our Building Commissioner, Ed Rudolphi, all participated in a diversity inclusion training called "Strategy Beyond Training" which involves six different sessions. This is part of the town's overall diversity inclusion program. This program was provided by Tapestry Solutions, which was the consultant that was selected to do the training. The program was built upon a format that was developed by the Center for Global Inclusion, which provides a set of benchmarks for organizations to go through different categories and assess how that organization is providing inclusion. As I said, we participated in this training session in the second cohort to do so; the first cohort involved Tim Belcher and Scott Singleton from Development Services, and we went through these different benchmarks of different categories such as supplier diversity, communications, all different manner of diversity inclusion categories that the town is currently working to provide, to address these systems of diversity inclusion. One of the challenges, or homework assignments that we were given was to basically put people that worked in the same department together into a work group, and then focus on developing our own diversity inclusion strategy, which would be incorporated into the town's overall strategy. With Tim and Scott having gone through the first cohort and focusing on how the department could make improvements to diversity inclusion, our group decided to take somewhat of a different approach. We thought about the idea of – with the additional population coming into the town, and the population that we currently serve, there's certainly diversity among that entire population – what we wanted to do was find a commonality in all the different groups within the town, that served that diversity, and we looked at housing as being a basic need that everyone had regardless of your sexual orientation, race, gender, political affiliation, basically anything you could use to classify someone into different categories and have diversity; everybody all has that some need of having housing. We all have different needs in terms of what it is that we are looking for, in terms of that structure that gives us that housing need. Eric gave a presentation to that group, and I wanted him to give a presentation to the Plan Commission as well because it's a very important topic as we look to the future and try to make sure that we're meeting the housing needs of the population that we have today and beyond. We want to make sure that we have different options available to people so that we can have as a diverse population as possible for the town. So, Eric is going to go ahead and give that presentation now.

Mr. Berg: These are the benchmarks – we looked at some stuff, as Kevin said, and my thought was, we're not really in marketing or customer service, and we don't have a lot of impact on benefits, but what we do is we take developments from dirt to turnkey. So, we thought it's

probably best to stick with what we know what to do, and of course we're planners, so we decided to rewrite the rules and do it anyway. One of the things that we found out in the housing study in 2018 is that our product is varied and diverse. You're probably looking at this and saying, why is there a whole bunch of empty space on this screen if we're doing good. Well, the problem is that the housing study said that our future housing demand, we're not meeting it. They're saying housing cost is growing faster than incomes, smaller households are growing, new rental product: we're not aligning with the need, lower income segments are going to be where we're going to have our growth and remaining more on the lower end, lower priced rentals and higher priced rentals. So, those are challenges, and something I've learned in my six years here is that the town attacks challenges. So, here we are trying to do it. And it's important to do this because we have customers; people who come, they shop here, they live here, they pay taxes, and having a diverse profile of homes and units allows for a churn. You get the family that is suddenly empty nesters, and they want to sell that house and move to something smaller, or vice versa. Creating that "churn" where people are moving from one home to another as their needs, as their incomes, as other circumstances come into play, it's important; if you have one general product, it's not going to work that way. So, we came up with a goal. It's a long goal; I like to just go down to the bottom in the red part there, because that's short enough for me to remember, "Approving the largest possible type of housing product at the widest possible range in prices." Doing that allows us to create that "churn", it allows us to have a market for everybody, from the people starting out, to the people who are looking to downsize. So, this is where we stood in 2018. If you look at our income, it's a fairly decently spread of income ranges. The owned product tends to skew more towards household making over \$50,000 per year; rental tends to skew more to those making less. There's some foreshadowing there. Trenches A and B there, the blue and the peach, those are aimed at the people making less than \$50,000 per year – and you want to keep an eye on those. So, what we've seen since this study is that only 9% of those units are hitting those markets, and what they're projecting is that we're going to need 61%. So, we're a little low, hopefully we'll get some help from "churn" as people move into units that are more expensive, that they're units will be able to be sold to folks looking at that... you're looking at me quizzically Bill.

Mr. Kirchoff: What are you saying here?

Mr. Berg: I'm saying that what we've had approved since the study, the values are much higher – at \$50,000, you're looking at 50% of what we've had approved; 30% household income looking at \$75,000-\$100,000.

Ms. Geisting: Is this just for rentals?

Mr. Berg: No, this is rental and purchase.

Ms. Geisting: Okay

Mr. Brandgard: Just as a thought, you know, we've had an awful lot of housing bought up and turned into rentals instead of owned. How are you playing that into this? That has a...

Mr. Kirchoff: This is new construction.

Mr. Berg: This is new construction. But that is true Robin...

Mr. Brandgard: But it plays into the overall picture.

Mr. Kirchoff: Sure

Mr. Brandgard: Instead of just looking at this.

Mr. Berg: Yeah, and we don't really have a good way of showing that at this point. We're still looking at that, trying to figure out...

Mr. Brandgard: I only say it from the standpoint – you know, we say we don't have a lot of low-income housing; the problem is that the low-income housing we have is all rentals, and everybody is living in it.

Mr. Berg: Yeah, I can't disagree.

Mr. Smith: Do we have a mechanism to say how many units are rental, other than the census?

Mr. Berg: We did look at that; it is somewhat unscientific, the methodology that I used a couple years back; it was simply looking at the address and seeing whether the mailing address of the tax bill was the same.

Mr. Kirchoff: Couldn't the county help us with that, from a rental standpoint?

Mr. Brandgard: Well, it's an interest to the county too, because a rental property caps at 2% instead of homeownership of 1%.

Mr. Kirchoff: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: We should be able to capture that somehow through...

Mr. Kirchoff: That's what I'm saying, I bet you the Assessor's Office...

Mr. Smith: It could be important to us and the schools.

Mr. Brandgard: The point I was trying to make is, we're not building new but we're taking old and turning it into something else.

Mr. Berg: And not us. Not us, us, but the market.

Mr. Kirchoff: The community.

Mr. Brandgard: The community.

Mr. McPhail: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: Which is what you're portraying, but that's...

Mr. Berg: The study said they we're looking, that we needed between 3,300 and 9,200 units in the next 20 years. Sound like a lot of units, doesn't it?

Mr. Brandgard: No

Mr. (?): Wow

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Berg: By this time next year we'll probably have seen 3,400 units. And the next five years after that...

Ms. Geisting: Does that include apartments? So, an apartment is a unit, correct?

Mr. Brandgard: Yes

Ms. Geisting: Okay

Mr. Berg: About half of the ones that we've approved, maybe a little bit more, have been homes.

Mr. Brandgard: Single-family

Mr. Kirchoff: So, are you going to get to any idea of, any analysis of what the market should have?

Mr. Berg: It gets...

Mr. Smith: We're getting there.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Berg: I've only got 10 slides, so...

Mr. Kirchoff: Thank you. You're on 9, so you're out of luck here.

Mr. Brandgard: I was going to say, obviously you didn't put a number on the slides.

Mr. Berg: That was my goal because if I told you the number, you'd be waiting for it. We're looking for a roughly 50/50 split – this is total number here, so it will recede, potentially. A lot of this is

projections based upon what we've heard. Largely looking to be largely multi-family. Again, we're not – we're estimating that it's going to be pretty low on what is needed. Again, we're hoping that "churn" will help. Why aren't we hitting the numbers? Well, there's cost – land is growing in value, lumber is easily growing in value. Ever since they started this in the 90's, they've said they don't have enough labor. And you know, if a developer can't make a profit – they have to keep the lights on and that type of stuff, so they've got to make some money. We're seeing three different types of developers. You've got the nationwide guys, like Pulte, Lennar; the regional, Ryan Homes, Rebar. And then you've got the locals, the local developers. Your nationwide and regional folks are going to be the big family subdivisions, multi-family. We're seeing large groups in the regionals, but what we're really not seeing is infill, the smaller infill sites, and that's going to be the "mom and pops" that are going to be doing a lot of that. So, we've got some areas where it doesn't make a lot of sense for the big guys to come in there and do these projects. So, how do we incentivize? Not necessarily incentivize with money, but how we get this rolling? Well, one way is to change our regulations. Perhaps we allow Accessory Dwelling Units; that will allow people to create another unit on the site. An example of that would be, perhaps you've got elderly parents who are looking to create another unit to get some income. Other ideas: create a Form Based Code that will make it easier for people, for developers to do projects, so long as they're strong controls in place to make sure we're getting the quality we deserve. And that's something that this Board and the Council has always said; that we don't have a problem with density, so long as it's married to quality. So, that's something that we're looking at – infill standards, if you have to negotiate or work hard to do an infill development, you're not going to do it. If we can make it create standards and make it easy for a developer to know, okay, I have to do A, B, and C in order for this to work, then we'd make it a lot easier. Market Based Parking solutions, we've brought this up at times; we're very overparked in some areas. All you need to do is drive to any of our shopping centers, anytime around that's not Black Friday, and you'll see that we have a lot of asphalt. If we can create ways to minimize that asphalt, we're going to see the cost of development go down because it's between \$5,000 and \$10,000 for a parking space. And that's space that can generate a lot more tax money and a lot more revenue for owners and their businesses. A lot of these ideas, should they go forward, are going to require you folks, the Council and the Commission, to approve. We can start them as a pilot program; obviously we'd want to flesh them out a little bit more than bullet points, but if you're liking what you're hearing, we can work on it and bring some further ideas. What's the cost? Well, it's really minimal at this point. We're looking at a lot of this stuff with the Consolidated Development Ordinance anyway, so we're not reinventing the wheel on that. How will we know if we succeed? Well, we'll start to see results; it's pretty simple. What do we do if we succeed? Obviously, we look to expand it. At the same time, if you have one thing that succeeds, that doesn't mean that you separate your shoulder patting yourself on the back and you just keep doing that; you continue to benchmark other communities that are doing well, and we keep bringing ideas to you. We've got a lot of idea hamsters that are running around the hamster wheel, and you know, we like to bring stuff to you. What do we do if we don't succeed? Well, obviously we curl up into a ball under the table – oh, no, that's not what I wrote – we keep looking for additional ideas because the problem is not going to go away. So, what we wanted to do tonight is let you know that we see an issue, and

you see it, you didn't just discover this this morning. You've seen this, you've read about it, but these are some things that we're looking at to try to alleviate some of the issues. And as Robin said, there's some externalities, you know, such as companies out in California and other places that are buying up a lot of homes before they even become available on the market. I'm not sure what we can do about that, but we can try other things to try and bring up the supply of homes and units in a wider range. To summarize this, we find the lowest cost, highest reward solution, and then repeat. Any questions, comments?

Mr. Brandgard: I'd like to comment that – thank you for doing that. One of the things that's made this town what it is, is our ability to innovate and try and do new things that others haven't done yet. That's good and bad, but so far, it's been successful, to understand the problem and then attack it. A part of what you get into is, the developers we have come in, are coming in and building what the marketplace seems to want versus us telling them what the marketplace wants. There's a fine line between all of this and we have to work through it.

Mr. Kirchoff: And that's part of my question. We have the conversation recently – and maybe it's just me, but it seems like we're getting an awful lot of multi-family. When will the market say...

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) (inaudible) where are they going to (inaudible), and where's all the (inaudible). I'm not expecting you to have the answer, but you have to look around and wonder. I mean there's several reasons why Plainfield, but Plainfield doesn't have the jobs that we're talking about, for the developments that are coming (inaudible). (inaudible) development (inaudible), so we're (inaudible).

Mr. Kirchoff: (inaudible)

Mr. Brandgard: I think the other part (inaudible) Bill just said, you know, no matter where you go, everyone wants to know when we're getting another restaurant, when are we getting another store, and multi-family, the folks that live there, generally have more expendable income to support restaurants and stuff like that, than a homeowner does.

Mr. Kirchoff: I can remember conversations over the years with the School Corporation, their concerns about multi-family. So, we talked about that; we're limiting, they're mostly one bedroom, some two bedrooms, very few three bedrooms. So, hopefully that's not having a negative impact on the School Corporation that they used to see. Is that a fair assumption?

Ms. Geisting: That's fair, and I don't think it is having a negative impact. I think more folks in society are looking to rent, and that the units that we've been building have been high quality structures, place to live. So, I feel like people who are coming to those places are substantial folks who are contributing to the community. So, as of today, I don't see it having a negative impact.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Berg: Bill, I'm going to jump on your questions. I think what we're seeing, and what I've been hearing, is that the price of the land, and the size of the land, has been difficult to develop into single-family.

Mr. Kirchoff: Economically

Mr. Berg: Yeah. So, I think – I mean, that's what I've been hearing. I can't empirically prove it, other than conversation. So, I think that's been where that's coming from.

Mr. Brandgard: I think another part is looking at demographics, and where the "kids today" want to live, work, and do, and they don't want to buy – you know, when I grew up, the first thing you wanted to do was go find a house any buy it; today, that's not the way the marketplace is working. I think a lot of what we're seeing here for new housing, and maybe the high-end apartments, is the kids have grown up and started families and now, oops, we've got to go and do something different, and they're ready to settle down and do it.

Mr. McPhail: You know, one of the things that amazes me, you know, we've got some really nice housing stock in Plainfield, somewhere between 1,000-1,600 square feet homes, but they don't build those anymore. You know, these folks move out of a 1,000 square foot apartment and they want to move into a 3,000 square foot house.

Mr. Smith: Right

Mr. McPhail: And there's nothing in between.

Mr. Smith: No, because they've got a lot of stuff to put in it.

Mr. McPhail: And everything we're looking at – we're working with a group now that wants to build some townhouses, and they're all three bedrooms.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: You know? You know, 1,700 square feet, and I just don't understand that. I grew up in a 600 square foot house.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, is it fair to say that – my recollection was the housing study said we were weak on both ends; lower income, lower cost, and higher.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, about equal.

Mr. Kirchoff: Is that still generally true?

Mr. Berg: We're getting a lot more on the higher end right now.

Mr. Kirchoff: Okay

Mr. Berg: The farthest is to the point where it's almost over the mid-range. So, I mean, when I started here six years ago, we weren't seeing that type of development, and we are now. Some of that is just natural inflation due to scarcity, but some of it we're seeing 4,000, 5,000, 6,000 square foot homes.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah, I think in some of the areas that we've approved, the range of houses, they're not building the lower end; they're building the higher end houses.

Mr. Berg: When you see a \$350,000 home in Del Webb – I'm not ripping Del Webb; I'm saying that those were, my recollection is that those were going to be smaller homes around \$200,000.

Mr. Brandgard: Well, I have to say – six years ago, I priced at Del Webb, and it was \$350,000, the way I would have wanted it built, and that has to do with what's inside of it.

Mr. Smith: Yeah – well, some of this price creep probably starts with the cost of the land. The rule of thumb used to be about 20-25% of the ultimate cost of the house started with the cost of the land. You had a \$50,000 lot; you'd have a \$200,000-\$250,000 house.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Smith: Well, but the land has crept up, and up, and up, so it just builds on the ultimate cost of the whole thing. Personally, I wonder if our housing stock needs more of the townhomes. Maybe that's an area that is a little bit of a transitional step; out of the apartment and into a townhome – you know, because you've got two kids now and you need at least three nice bedrooms – before you go into a bigger suburban house, if that's your goal. Maybe that's an area that we can (inaudible) more.

Mr. Brandgard: Well...

Mr. Smith: They'd be quality though.

Mr. Brandgard: We have been working with developers to try and bring townhouses.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Brandgard: And there are only some that will agree to put a few in to see what happens.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: Part of what Eric went through there, you know, changing some of our ordinances and making it easier – we do have one tool that we can use today, and that's PUD – that's the only way we can get there until we change some of those things.

Mr. Smith: That's pretty true, yeah.

Mr. Berg: We're going to continue to bring ideas to you, not just on this but other issues, because you know, this is a community that sees the problem and resolves the problem. You know, we want to be a part of the solution, and not just throwing stuff at the (inaudible).

Mr. Smith: Do we actually – we don't have an ordinance that specifically that labels infill development, do we?

Mr. Berg: No

Mr. Smith: I don't know if anybody else would think this is helpful, but that would be an easy place, some low hanging fruit for us here.

Mr. Brandgard: Well, define "infill".

Mr. Berg: That's a good question.

Mr. Smith: Yeah

Mr. Berg: I mean, you could define it any number of different ways.

Mr. Brandgard: I'm just saying define it; I'm not sure what "infill" is exactly.

Mr. Berg: I mean, it could be a vacant piece; it could be a redevelopment piece.

Mr. Smith: Right

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. McPhail: It's a challenge every day.

Mr. Berg: That's why we keep coming to work every day; it's not dull.

Mr. Kirchoff: Good work.

Mr. Bahr: Very good, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Always a good discussion.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Now going to calendars.

Mr. Whaley: So, staff is continuing to work on the 2022 calendar. At the last Plan Commission meeting we did have some discussion about the issues we run into with public notice. We were trying to find ways to add some space into the calendar to allow additional time for notice. As we started to take a look at what's actually required by the rules of procedure, as well as the current format that we have, we came to the conclusion that we're really packing a lot of different activities into the 37-day window that is prescribed for most types of projects that have to come

through the process and come before you guys. I've highlighted in the yellow box, basically from the filing deadline to the public hearing, the different activities that we have taking place. You can see that we have a TAC meeting, as well as the DRC, Design Review Committee, and then we have the resubmittal deadline. With that resubmittal, that's when we're taking the information, posting it online and then finalizing the staff reports and getting that information out to you all. In that process as well, we also have the public notice, which required by rules of procedure is a minimum of 10 days. We've put 15 in the calendar to have additional time but it's still not meeting the needs to get that notice out in public, in terms of the courtesy notice that gets sent to surrounding property owners. Again, that's largely due to issues with the post office. We tried to find some additional space to sort of move that bar, if you will, to allow more time for notice to get delivered, but as you can see, looking immediately to the right of that left side of the yellow box, there's a lot of review that also has to take place in that same period of time. So, as we add the additional time for notice, it compresses that left side of the box for review, and that ends up causing more issues for staff, as well as the Design Review Committee. That has to go to the DRC so that cuts down on the time, so that cuts down on the time we can spend getting those reports ready and out to them, as well as publishing that information on the website and getting the agenda prepared and sent out. So, those are the challenges that we have in that 37-day process as I mentioned in my report, it's really a one-size-fits-all approach. We built the calendar around the 37 days approach, but the rules of procedure had identified that major residential subdivisions are up to 60, but that's not something that we account for in the calendar because currently it's just that one-size-fits-all approach. We also talked about in the report how there are certain types of projects that can take a lot longer than 37 days, depending on the complexity, the size of the project, the type of project, the simple reason for example, like the one we had on 319 South Center Street, or a few years before that we had one on Smith Road that was an existing structure; those were simple rezones so you didn't really necessarily need a whole lot of time to prepare paperwork and get the information out for those. But projects like PUDs, like with Hobbs Station, that was a fairly significant regionally impactful project that took several months, and I'm sure Kent can attest to the time that staff, as well as he, and Robin as well, took meeting with the developers on that project and working through that PUD. But the expectation that we're conveying with the current calendar, by having that filing deadline and that leads you to the public hearing, is that a lot of these things can be accomplished on 37 days, but that's just not always the case. The FRED, File Readiness Determination process, was introduced a couple of years ago as an option process to try to get these projects in a "readiness" state so that when they submit for the filing deadline, it's basically ready to launch, if you will, in terms of going through the review process with TAC and DRC, and then getting to that state where it can be sent out to the public for notice. In terms of the calendar that we currently have, there's heavy focus on the deadline. Often what we run into is that developers will approach staff, and they're trying to get a certain public hearing date. With the way the calendar is currently formatted you look at the current public hearing date that you want to try and be in front of you all, and then you work backwards to that filing deadline. It makes a lot of sense to do it that way but sometimes that creates issues because we'll receive applications that occasionally aren't ready to go through that process, and that creates some difficulties for staff in terms of managing those expectations with

the applicants. Also, in terms of the staff review time for the DRC meetings, even with having that 15-day or 10-day notice period for providing notice to surrounding property owners, it still compresses things on that side of the box in terms of us actually being able to review projects. If we get several projects in a month it could be rather difficult to get those fully covered and reviewed and sent out to the DRC and TAC. One of the solutions that we came up with and discussed at the last meeting to create more space in that box, if you will, is to combine the DRC meetings and TAC together, so that as an applicant comes through the process, they can get comments from all the different review groups at the same time, which is especially beneficial if you're from out of state. Obviously, we do have the ability to stream those meetings now, and interact virtually, but if you're coming to the Town of Plainfield, that's extremely helpful to be able to do a one-stop-shop, if you will. And also it would cut down on – what you'd see in the past is an applicant will get some comments back from TAC and we've already got the information posted on the website, ready to send out to the DRC; DRC gets the information and the applicant has given us an updated set of plans based on TAC because they're trying to address those concerns, and then they get to the DRC – and I'm sure Bruce can attest that we've had meetings in the past where the DRC will bring up issues to the applicant based upon the staff report, and they'll say, well, we already addressed that or you're not looking at the most recent information. So, that kind of causes some confusion at times as well. What we are recommending to the Plan Commission in terms of an overall process is – because of the varying complexity of projects and the (inaudible) is, we'd like to go ahead and formalize the Filing Readiness Determination process, and have that be uncoupled, or separate from the actual docketing of a project. When a project is docketing it means it's scheduled for a public hearing, and regardless of the complexity of a project, or the type, they all fall under the same format in terms of posting the information online so that the public can have access to it in terms of the final plans, getting the public notice out, the notices that get sent to the surrounding property owners, the signs that go out – like I said, each project is going to follow that same timeframe regardless of the project type. Really what changes and varies is what's to the left side of the green box which is basically getting a project to a state where it's ready to be docketed so that the public can have an opportunity to review the plans and provide their comments, whether that be in the form of written comments to staff, a phone call, or coming to the actual public hearing. Currently, as I said, the review with the Design Review and TAC is bundled into that 30-day process, and there are times when projects come through and they don't necessarily need the entire 37 days – the flip side of that is that there are projects that need much more beyond that. So, what we are proposing to do is basically come up with a tiered structure where some of these meetings are uncoupled from the 37-day process. In the top row, if you will, you can see that underneath the docketing we just have that box colored in. As I said, with 319 South Center Street or the Smith Road rezone, if it's a simple project it can be docketed fairly quickly and get in front of you all. If it's a development plan, you can jump down to the second row, you're looking at a minimum of one TAC meeting and having to go to the DRC. And then as you go further down those rows you can see that you're adding more to the project as it gets more complex, or it also depends on the applicant and their stage of readiness when they first approach staff. This takes into account the possibility that the applicant could just be coming to staff to just discuss a concept, for example, and they're not

ready to submit a full set of plans for regular comment, but they want to get staff's input and feedback. So, if that's the case, then that process would end up being longer, by their own doing, by selecting to go through that concept plan. Jumping back here, again, this divides the – this is sort of the real world process in terms of what's happening now with the conceptual phase where applicants are coming to us to get that initial input, and then the review phase where it's more formalized; you're providing a full set of plans to staff, and that's going through TAC as well as the DRC to get those comments provided back to the applicant, and then they turn around and incorporate those comments into their designs and provide the full set of plans for the public to review, which is in that docketing phase on the right hand side. We would anticipate that with some additional time built in for public notice, the docketing phase could be about 23 days, possibly 24 because 23 puts it on a Saturday. We might want to have that final day be on a Friday at 5:00 p.m., but with electronic submittals, that's not as important as it used to be when you had to actually drop off the paper sets of plans to Town Hall before the offices closed; we have some options in terms of flexibility when it comes to that. This provides an example of what the segmented calendar could possibly look like, the left-hand corner where it's yellow, you have the initial concept discussion. And then the right-hand side would be the process. And then down in grey, that's your actual public hearing calendar where a project is docketed and ready to come to you all for consideration. So, this represents (inaudible) what we've done in the past, but this does give you an idea of what this could look like with different calendars associated in process. I would imagine that the first reaction that some of you might have is that this seems a little bit more complicated, but as we considered this and thought about the perceptions from the applicant's standpoint – again, if you're coming in and expecting to have a project approved within 37 days and it's significantly complex, or you're not ready in terms of your state of readiness, that creates a false expectation. We're just trying to communicate how this process could transpire, when you lay it all out in front of applicants. And if you are supportive of this type of concept, or some variation of it, it would be incorporated into a development guide that we are currently preparing, which would get even more detailed and descriptive in terms of what all these different types of review would mean. I know it's probably difficult to read the dates on the calendar; we didn't want to necessarily want to focus on dates at this point, but we filled in some, just to give it some visual representation.

Mr. Brandgard: I think the concept is good, and again, I don't think we said you had to do something a certain way, but at the same time, I don't want to build any delays in the process, anymore than we have to. I mean, one of the things that we're known for is we're able to get a project through the system and out fairly quickly. I don't disagree with you; some go faster than others, but we've got to recognize that in the process and make the developers understand that. But I don't want to create a process that's going to slow things down either.

Mr. Whaley: Yes, I appreciate that. When we looked at this, we tried to make sure that we were getting the ability to have projects come through, that were of the medium level of complexity, to come through at about the same timeframe that we're operating under now. It's just that when we separate these things out, it creates the focus more on, again, the concept phase, the readiness phase, and the actual coming to the public hearing, as opposed to just filing an

application and saying okay, I'm ready to go to the public hearing. So, we tried to make sure that it was flexible, but that it maintained that relative quick approval process for simpler projects, simpler to medium.

Mr. McPhail: Kevin and I have had some conversations and, you know, I agree with what Robin said. You know, and there are some projects that we can get through quickly, but there's too many times though that we're issuing continuances because they're not ready. And how do we structure this thing – and some of them are not ready because they weren't even close to meeting our requirements, or they're just incompetent and they don't know where to go.

Mr. Kirchoff: Well, that's...

Mr. McPhail: I don't know how to solve that.

Mr. Kirchoff: We shouldn't allow a public hearing on that.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, on that subject: this evening we were standing out in the hallway before the meeting and I had some people walk up, that were looking for this meeting. I asked them what petition they were here for, and they said Saratoga Village because they had heard that that project was going to be in October, at the October meeting. That project went to the Design Review Committee and the DRC gave some feedback to the applicant, and the applicant decided to pull the project back and continue to work on the designs, and they've also met with Kent about some of the designs of those townhomes. So, that was really their own choice to pull that back, but I think that they made a wise decision because the neighbors have a strong interest in what's going to happen on that property.

Mr. Smith: (microphone not on) And that actually happens fairly regularly.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah – but by this point, when it goes to the DRC, they would have filed the application, hit that filing deadline, and that filing deadline has the associated public hearing with it. So, if we can try to uncouple that a little bit, maybe make the DRC a prerequisite, in a case where it's required, to actually submitting that filing application to be docketed, then that would hopefully help manage some expectations a little bit better, but still keeping the majority of projects about the same level that they are now, in terms of timeframe.

Mr. Smith: (microphone not on) (inaudible) public notices (inaudible) to save on time. (inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: I know that having that additional time is certainly beneficial to neighborhood groups and affected property owners. I know there was – obviously you all will know what I'm talking about – up on Township Line Road, that's in the county, that notice was provided fairly early and that gave the town an opportunity to provide a response to that project, because of that time.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) What are you asking us (inaudible)?

Mr. Whaley: At this point we're just looking for feedback on this concept of separating out these processes to different calendars. Obviously, the calendars would still be grouped together so it's possible to determine what the overall process would be for a project coming through. But again, this represents a departure from sort of everything being grouped together on a single calendar in the format that we used in the past, which obviously has some benefits to it, but I think this would help direct some of those expectations, in terms of applicants and staff.

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

Mr. Whaley: That would be through staff. As I said, we're working on a development guide – which if we can get some feedback – we'll incorporate that into the guide and show you what that would look like (inaudible) instructions to applicants (inaudible).

Mr. Brandgard: You might put a check in that, that the development requires conversation with the property owners around it.

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, and that was...

Mr. McPhail: We really need to encourage that.

Mr. Brandgard: Yes

Mr. Whaley: That was another comment that we keyed in on last time, that these projects would benefit from having a neighborhood meeting. You know, when you factor in a neighborhood meeting, that can add in additional time as well.

Mr. Smith: Absolutely

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) I think that (inaudible) approve the process (inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: So, this process, the effect on the neighbors would be that it's going to provide additional time for the delivering of the public notice. And also, I can certainly put the signs out sooner. But by focusing on having project readiness, once the project gets to that docketing date, we can have that information released to the applicant, and they can send that notice out. The way that it's currently set up, when the application goes through the resubmittal, you have to look at that and make a determination as to whether or not we can actually release that docketing number. And because that's happening so close to when the public hearing is, that cuts down on the amount of time that we have to provide the notice because were still determining the project readiness of it at that point, because that's not a requirement that you have to go through; you could submit an application at the filing deadline and we have to treat it as though it's headed to a public hearing, and a lot of times we can't make that determination until we get through that Design Review Committee and the TAC process as well.

(Brief pause)

Mr. Kirchoff: Moving right along.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah – I'm not disagreeing with where you're at, we just need to figure out how to get it done.

Mr. Whaley: If there aren't any strong objections to pursuing this type of calendar, what we can do is submit a (inaudible) to you guys which, that's what this is, it's sort of a working document; we can make sure that the dates are lining up with the calendar properly and that it looks good, and we can submit it to you via email. And if you would, just give us individualized feedback, we'd appreciate it.

Mr. Smith: I always do – with the DRC – I always do like it if it's already been filtered through TAC Committee. It appears, that's what I see here happening again. I'd much – I'd really like to have their input first, I mean, the technical feasibility and the roads, and anything else around it, streams and stuff. I always like to know that that's already in shape.

Mr. Whaley: Getting into TAC earlier, is generally better. There's a lot of things going on that ends up saving the applicant time and heartache (inaudible). Any other feedback on this?

(inaudible)

Mr. Brandgard: Now, before we adjourn, do we need to do anything relative to Hobbs Station? Do we need to extend the time under agreement?

Mr. Whaley: Yeah, we've got two more (inaudible) real quick here...

Mr. Brandgard: (inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: The first is what you just mentioned. A few months ago, the Hobbs Station rezones came through to the Plan Commission and as a part of that project, you had placed a condition on the approvals, that the developer and the town reach a Memorandum of Understanding. I was going to say MOU, but then I realized we have a new person, so I spelled it out.

Ms. Geisting: Thanks

Mr. Whaley: A Memorandum of Understanding within a 90-day period – and from what I understand, the town and the developer are very close to reaching that agreement, but we have reached the end of the 90-day period. So, an extension would be required for the condition of that approval.

Mr. Brandgard: I would move that we do so.

Mr. Kirchoff: I second

Mr. Smith: Did we want to put a new time on it?

Mr. Brandgard: It is, 30 days.

Mr. Smith: Oh, sorry, right you are, yeah.

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Do we need a vote?

(yes)

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) All in favor?

(All ayes)

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Any opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Whaley: All right, and then the last thing is, last month the Plan Commission approved an order regarding the Ronald Reagan Corridor EDA; legal counsel has been working on the document and has some changes. And I'll turn it over to Mel now because he's more familiar with it than I am. Do you want to give a quick summary of what we're looking to do here?

Mr. Daniel: (inaudible)

Mr. Whaley: Okay, Cam Starnes who is working on the development, should have made some changes to that Order that you approved last month. And basically, the Order was recognizing that the amendments to the Ronald Reagan Economic Development Area, that the Redevelopment Commission approved, is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Through talking with Cam, it sounds like there are just some minor changes to that document, and he thought it would be appropriate to have the Plan Commission basically confirm that approval of the Order.

Mr. Kirchoff: Of the RDC – basically, what happened is we've added some property into Ronald Reagan, and moved (inaudible) some others out; the Bond has to be reassured that what we moved out doesn't impact our ability to cover it. That's layman's terms.

Mr. McPhail (?): So moved

Mr. Brandgard: I'll second, the Revised Order of the...

Mr. Kirchoff: Ronald Reagan Corridor EDA.

Mr. Brandgard: Yeah

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) (All in favor?)

(All eyes)

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Opposed?

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) Anything else sir?

Mr. Whaley: All right, that's all I have this evening, (inaudible).

ADJOURN

Mr. Bahr: (microphone not on) With that I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Kirchoff: So moved

Mr. Brandgard: Second

(inaudible)

DocuSigned by:



7F4D04129B54495...

Steve Bahr, President

DocuSigned by:



965ABE261770430...

Andrew Klinger, Secretary