

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 lessening 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.
 - 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. Shultz-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:
 - Add "per unit" in referencing 7,200 square feet "per unit"
 - SF 1-2-3-4 rear setback set at 25 feet
 - 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

[illegible]