I. CALL TO ORDER

The Pendleton Plan Commission (PC) met on October 6, 2021 at 7:00 pm at 100 W State Street, Pendleton, Indiana. The meeting was called to order by Tim Pritchard at 7:00 pm.

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Commission members present were Tim Pritchard, Kyle Eichhorn, Carol Hanna, Brad Ballentine, Jenny Sisson, Connie Shultz-Heinz and Cheryl Ramey-Hunt. A quorum was established.

Representing the Town were Town Manager Scott Reske, Planning Director Kayla Hassett, Planning and Zoning Administrator Hannah Urbanski, Town Attorney Jeff Graham and Clerk Denise McKee.

Others in attendance were Edward Wolenty representing Decker, Lawyer & Maynard of 505 West 9th Street, Anderson, Indiana.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

CAROL HANNA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2021 MEETING; SECONDED BY KYLE EICHHORN. ROLL CALL TAKEN AND ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. PC09012021-03 - UDO amendments proposals

> Review and vote on amendments

Tim Pritchard announced that the UDO amendments that will be reviewed and voted upon at this meeting are the same amendments that were reviewed at the September 1, 2021 meeting.

Kayla Hassett reported the following:

- Hannah Urbanski and Kayla Hassett attended two conferences this past week, APA
 Conference and State Preservation Conference, in which both placed a high priority on
 Zoning.
- At a national level, it is expanding choices through UDO of new zoning districts, such as greenspace and dense walking areas.
- Overall, Pendleton is ahead on these topics of discussion.

Tim Pritchard opened the Public Hearing to discuss the Unified Development Ordinance.

Hannah Urbanski reported the following:

 Hannah Urbanski presented the UDO amendment proposal worksheet, available in Google Drive

The following comments were made and discussions took place:

- Tim Pritchard stated that he is okay with approving all items noted as "Okay" on the worksheet, such as buffers, roosters and definition of administration.
- Brad Ballentine stated that the only "Okay" item he does not support approving is Item #3
 in regards to roosters. Ballentine expressed that he does not feel that roosters are that
 much of a nuisance. Tim Pritchard replied that the Plan Commission can address
 roosters as needed as go forward. Kayla Hassett stated that if the town receives a noise
 issue complaint, it would go before the Pendleton Police Department.
- Carol Hanna stated that she supports making as few changes of the UDO as necessary.

- All board members expressed agreement to not change treatment of roosters under the UDO at this time.
- Kyle Eichhorn discussed Item #5 and suggested placing animal limits on hobby farms as
 feels there should be a cap as could get out of control. Eichhorn suggested measuring of
 neighboring property with consideration of 1 square foot per 1 animal. Carol Hanna and
 Cheryl Ramey-Hunt expressed agreement in holding off and revisiting discussion at the
 quarterly review meeting. Eichhorn agreed that the Plan Commission can always look
 into later if becomes an issue.
- Kyle Eichhorn recommended approving line Item #6 in regards to Centerline Markers as written. All members agreed to approve as written.
- Edward Wolenty representing several clients west of the downtown portion of Pendleton, asked for the full definition of the difference between a hobby farm and farming location.
 Kayla Hassett read the definition of a hobby farm as outlined by the UDO.
- Kyle Eichhorn raised question as to line Item #7, specifically as to whether text should be added to the entrances to major subdivisions, noting the Access Control Management Ordinance may already address. Members agreed to not change and leave on the list for the quarterly review meeting.
- Hannah Urbanski stated that she and Kayla Hassett will keep Item #8 on the list and
 revisit at the quarterly review meeting. Item #9 will also be left as is, leaving at maximum
 15 feet and revisit at quarterly meeting, if necessary, and if variance trends show the
 need.
- Kyle Eichhorn suggested revising Item #10, specifically as to the major subdivision open space requirements, suggesting a bump up by 10% each on Table 147. Brad Ballentine added that drainage ponds should not be included in the open space requirement. Kyle Eichhorn stated that the UDO pushes for higher than what is available at Carrick Glen. Hannah Urbanski stated that drainage can count in the open space, but has to be in the areas of the open space. Urbanski added that retention/detention ponds do count, but cannot count for more than 20% of the open space requirement. Item #10 in regards to revision of major subdivision open space requirements was agreed to be approved as written.
- Item #14 was eliminated from list.
- Kyle Eichhorn pointed out typo on page 147 of the UDO; Hannah Urbanski will correct regarding Table 5.3.
- Item #26 regarding minimum open space in major residential subdivision was agreed to be approved as written.
- Kyle Eichhorn expressed concern that the UDO, in reference to line Item #11 on the
 worksheet, is inconsistent and not practical when it comes to the maximum gross density
 calculations. Eichhorn proposed a more realistic density number by lessoning the
 amount of homes/units per acre. The following comments were made:
 - Tim Pritchard suggested revisiting at the quarterly review meeting as top homework project.
 - Brad Ballentine expressed support of the proposed revision as recommended by Kyle Eichhorn and address per variance requests later.
 - o Kayla Hassett expressed concern about using the Variance process and prefers having good numbers. Hassett also added that she agrees with all of the numbers except for the last two categories. Hassett stated that she believes MF-1 should reflect 3 units per acre (Sf/TF)/6 units per acre (MF) and MF-2 should reflect 4 units per acre (SF/TF)/8 units per acre (MF). Brad Ballentine asked for support of these numbers. Hassett replied that Plan Commission should allow higher density for multi-family projects as they must incorporate parking requirements, setbacks, open spaces and address a lot of other parts and pieces to get approval. Hassett read the definition of the Multi-Family 1 and stated that it is less dense than traditional apartment complex. Hassett also added that rental single-family homes are becoming more popular with small gate house and

new ideas coming up. Brad Ballentine expressed more comfort with Kyle Eichhorn's numbers. Carol Hanna stated that she wants to be more adaptable to the multi-family projects.

All members present expressed agreement with approving Kyle Eichhorn's numbers except for Mr-1 and Mf-2 in which they will change to reflect numbers outlined for these categories as presented by Kayla Hassett. Item number will also remain on list for review at the quarterly review meeting.

- Item #12 as to incoming use of Single Family front yard planting will be amended as written on the worksheet.
- Item #13 as to buffers/transitional landscapes for AG will also be amended as written on the worksheet.
- Item #15 as to secondary plat back to Plan Commission for approval will remain the same in the UDO for now, but will add to list for quarterly review meeting. The following comments were made:
 - Connie Shultz-Heinz stated that she heard that the new section for Huntzinger Farm will only offer electric for heat source and not offer natural gas, in that these changes were forced by the Planning Department. Kayla Hassett replied that this is not correct and that she has not heard from Christian Rector of any changes to utility plans since the 2004 submissions. Brad Ballentine asked if the town was obligated to require both electric and gas to be offered. Tim Pritchard and Kyle Eichhorn replied that it is up to the developer's decision.
 - Connie Shultz-Heinz stated that she heard that the water table at Huntzinger Farm was too high to allow gas utility and that the Planning Department was requiring 9 feet ceilings. Shutz-Heinz commented that the Plan Commission should be made aware of these discussions. Kayla Hassett replied that these conversations had not taken place.

All members agreed to keep Item #15 as is and review at the quarterly review meeting if not working well.

- Item #16 as to minimum setbacks and lot sizes for SF-3 and SF-4. The members agreed to approve the following changes:
 - o Add "per unit" in referencing 7,200 square feet "per unit"
 - o SF 1-2-3-4 rear setback set at 25 feet
 - o SF 3-4 side setback set at 10 feet
- Item #17 was discussed in not giving double credit for larger trees as the Town Council
 has stated that they wish to see larger trees. All members present agreed to not give this
 double credit and remove from the UDO.
- Item #18 in regards to minimum plant size, the board members present agreed to approve a minimum of 2 inches in caliper.
- Item #19 (Irrigation requirements), Item #20 (Garage door direction) and item #21 (Open space requirements Table 5.4) were all agreed to be stricken.
- Item #22 as to open space requirements Table 5.6 was agreed by all members present to approve as written on the worksheet.
- Item #23 as to the definition of mound measurements was approved as written, but definition of undulating will be placed on the list for the quarterly review meeting.
- Item #24 (Text removal), Item #25 (SF/TF Standards) were stricken.
- Item #26 (minimum open space-major subdivision) and Item #27 (berm height/buffers/landscaping requirements) was agreed by all members to approve as written.
- Item #28 as proposed by Town Planning Staff was agreed upon by all board members to approve, setting front setbacks at 25 feet on homes in SF-4 with front load garages and for homes with rear/side load garages setting front setback at 10 feet.
- Item #29 as to text addition proposed by Staff was agreed upon by all members present to approve as written.
- Jenny Sisson asked if visuals can be added to the UDO. Hannah Urbanski added that she is working on adding 3D visualizations and also will add to the zoning section as well.

• Tim Pritchard asked if there was any public comments; none made.

Tim Pritchard made a motion to accept proposed amendments as stated at the meeting in regards to the UDO changes (see attachment for summary); seconded by Cheryl Ramey-Hunt; roll call was taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.

Tim Pritchard closed the Public Hearing and reopened the regular Plan Commission Meeting.

Other comments shared include the following:

- Carol Hanna stated that the Plan Commission will want to add Wind Farms to the
 quarterly review meeting. Hannah Urbanski stated that this will be discussed as well as
 extraterritorial. Jeff Graham added that the Madison County Planning Commissioner is
 not against looking for justification and Graham will get with Kayla Hassett on details as
 to why it is a good idea for both the town and the county.
- Hannah Urbanski added that the quarterly review meeting will be held in January 2022.

V. NEW BUSINESS

No new business to report.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by Tim Pritchard at 8:30 pm.

Next meeting November 3, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

Denise McKee Pendleton Municipal Utilities

Approved at Ostaber PC meeting rows 3-19			THE PERSON NAMED IN			
Approved at October PC meeting rows 3-19			STATE			
	a	seque in Merit and be in common and comment and assert great the transfer of branching comments. Sequent his request analogue for the comment of the commen		Office II	IC 991 person	120C-91-01 example
Buffers for limited access roads and milroad buffers adjacent to residential	165.H.3.C.L.	The above proposal would also apply to the buffer strip requirement for limited access reads and retired buffers adjuncts to restdensist, local of to persons (FOR) (OR) considerable language content and as followed in restdensist of districts. This rips plaid but nonmon serve, or through person of a pinned ince and shall be designated on the plait.	¥	Cally	10-531	mooree 10-14-2021
Definition of Administrator (STAFF)	9 (section H.) 214 (definitions)	"The Planning Director or a person designated by the Planning Director"	Ð	as written	approved 10-6-21	approve 10-14-2021
	04:-931	Add to section c.*New that they will not be d and section c.*Cerral 1. Contentine multiple 1. Contentine multiple Contentine Multiple Contentine Multiple b) At both mind of sic Bach Centraline Maria dislogate or removed	u	La Company	10 to	100/e/FO
rhe mijor subdivision open space requirements	347 table 5.3	White a block White a bloc	2	n with	approsed 30-6-21	appress 10-14-2011
admuning group descriptions	347 table 5.3		ע	uspan II	12-901 panade	1200-91-01 mouldes
coming use of SF front yard plantings	85 table 3.13	existing-SF to Incoming SF currently requires no front yard plenting-fourfeward. Should consider at least type one buffer because we are a tree city USA location	ש	as written		
heffers/transitional landscapes for AG	85 table 3.13	Add AG use to table 3.13. Also, all incoming uses should provide at least type 1 buffer to AG use to provide transition from less interes to more interes use.	ā	as written	approved 10-6-21	approve 10-14-2021
nimum setbacks and lot sizes for SF-3 and SF-4	29 & 31	o saff mare verbuse / 75 wide serback is not must fer both o 2000 the known better the 2000 the known better 50 of 2000 the known better 50 or 50 of 2000 the serback and out about the serback and out the serback and out the serback and the serback	BB, CSH, and KE	SF3.4 will have alde setbacks at 10° and mar setback at 35°		10.14.2021
Double credit for larger trees	08	No double credit for larger trees. Town Council has stated they went larger trees	K	as written	2	approve 10-14-2021
simum plant size	08	Evergreen; minimum of ER in height. Omemental: minimum of 2 inches in caliper	2	at written	approved 10-6-21	approve 10-14-2021
Open space requirements table 5.6	180	minimum open space for overall development requirement Should refer to Table S.3 (based on lot stat) ALSO max number of lots based on Table S.3 "maximum gross density"	Æ	as written	approved 10-6-21	approve 10-14-2021
fine mound measurements	B4 table 3.12 and 89?	Manamental Minimum mound hightrequiments established herein are measured eithe lowest einestien of the region of a susselling about, The resistant mound helds requiments are measured at the "year" of the mound. All mound hights are researed from the highest of; 31 pilosest read centering grid; 31 natural edisent, prote; or 3) researed to; pad grade.	.	Untilpin 18	uppressed 10-6-21	120£91-01 anadda
nimum open space- major Res. Subdivision	147 Table 5.3	Use "anialises lot size" instead of "evenge lot size"	2	as written	approved 10-6-21.	approve 10-14-2021
erm height/ Buffers/ landscaping requirements	84 table 3.12 and 89?	See proposed changes in Amendments feedback Details (in G-drive, amendments folder)	ž	11 written	-	approve 10-14-2021
front yeard setback for SF-4 (STAVF)	н	the commit front year estacked for local etwel in this clients down not coincide with the way the mot of the district is not up, Propose 10 fact estimate interest.		on homes in st-4 with front load garages, front setbeds will be 25', on homes with rear and side load	FEG.	
d bace (STAFF)	150	Add sentence to the "Intert" portion of Conservation Subdivision septenting more in depth about what the conservation district messer, it does not correctly explaint this is authorision to meant to cluster homes closer to allow for maximum open.				Threat or soudde
(Lincold man pp	95	Must see an experiment of common hands and see a consequence of the co			Personal 1-6-2-1.	