

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Pendleton Plan Commission (PC) met on September 1, 2021 at 7:00 pm at 100 W State Street, Pendleton, Indiana. The meeting was called to order by Tim Pritchard at 7:06 pm.

## **II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

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

Representing the Town were Town Manager Scott Reske, Planning and Zoning Administrator Hannah Urbanski, Building Inspector Brett Mabrey, Town Attorney Jeff Graham and Clerk Denise McKee.

Others in attendance were Deb Luzier representing GRW Engineers, Inc. of 9001 N. Wesleyan Road #200, Indianapolis, Indiana 46268, K.K. Gerhart-Fritz representing The Planning Workshop of 7829 Wawasee Court, Indianapolis, Indiana 46250, Edward Wolenty and Lynne Lawyer representing Decker, Lawyer & Maynard of 505 West 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Anderson, Indiana, Ken Remenschneider and Brandon Schreeg representing Kimley Horn of 250 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street, #580, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240, Rick and Jane Cassin of 9 Myrenia Avenue, Ingalls, Indiana 46048, Jeff and Vicky Purdue of 4956 West 400 South, Pendleton, Indiana 46064 and Craig Campbell of 239 S. Main Street, Pendleton, Indiana 46064.

## **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**CAROL HANNA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 4, 2021 MEETING; SECONDED BY JENNY SISSON. ROLL CALL TAKEN AND ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED.**

**CAROL HANNA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 11, 2021 SPECIAL MEETING; SECONDED BY JENNY SISSON. ROLL CALL TAKEN AND ALL MEMBERS PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED.**

## **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. PC09012021-01- I-69 Interchange Master Plan –**

#### **➤ Resolution to amend the Comprehensive Plan – Make recommendation to the Town Council**

Hannah Urbanski reported the following:

- **Project Updates** - Kimley-Horn has completed the final draft of this document. Presentation will be given by Ken Remenschneider of Kimley-Horn.
- **Next Steps** – Review and recommendation to Town Council
- Ken Remenschneider is present to walk Plan Commission Members through the Interchange Master Plan.

Ken Remenschneider representing Kimley-Horn reported the following:

- Kimley Horn was involved with the 2017 Pendleton Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan as well.
- Key points as to why the Interchange Master Plan was developed:
  - Provide community with market based vision around the I-69 Interchange
  - Provide clarification as to future land use
  - Establish uses the community identified as to what they wish to see for development founded on market based vision and analysis
  - Recommendation based on market traction
  - Incorporate stormwater management as increases development value

- Develop park land use
  - I-69 Interchange is in the pathway of development coming out of Indianapolis and Pendleton is very attractive
- Recommendation is to hold onto a percentage of land for future development in order to maximize the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) revenue, if the Town of Pendleton is selective on that particular development.
- Purpose of Plan Development:
  - To encourage planned and prudent town growth based upon market research and planning principles
  - To utilize a deliberate planning process to guide and facilitate desired development in a measured approach that does not compromise Historic Downtown Pendleton
  - To encourage development in the study area to address market-based needs
  - To increase local TIF revenues while preserving a significant portion of interchange area for a landmark project
- Public engagement was held virtually and stakeholder groups involved, including Community and Residential Real Estate Professionals, Interchange Business Owners as well as Residents and Pendleton Business Owners.
- Report provided includes:
  - Detailed market analysis
  - Study area including Quadrant and Development Districts
  - Overview of Quadrant Districts, connectivity pieces, stormwater management implementations and trail systems.
  - Districts include: Falls Pointe Health & Wellness, Advanced Manufacturing & Technology, Future Keystone Development District, Residential Development District, Pendleton Business Park and Multi-Family Residential Districts
- Recommended the withholding of Future Keystone Development District for now until the Town of Pendleton has more rooftops with goal to strengthen the downtown area by continued support of the downtown businesses.
- I-69 Interchange Master Plan includes important connection of project road at Heritage Way to give relief of congestion.

Brandon Schreeg representing Kimley-Horn reported the following:

- Next steps of the Interchange Master Plan, need to look into:
  - Housing options
  - Zoning districts
  - TIF, which is a nice tool that the Town of Pendleton has available that can be used in many ways through bonds, leverage in grant matches, etc.
  - Reevaluation of boundaries
  - Execution of the downtown catalyst project
  - Creating a gateway into Falls Park to increase visibility
  - Enhancement of alleys downtown to dress up and build momentum in the downtown area

Ken Remenschneider encouraged the following focuses once the Interchange Master Plan is adopted:

- Promoting the Interchange Master Plan
  - A lot of interest expressed on both residential and commercial side
  - Need to get the information out as future development will line up with plan for a much faster process
- Expand Tax Increment Revenue Potential
- Launch the Pendleton Technology Hub Incubator
- Establish the Historic Pendleton Revitalization District
- Promote the I-69 Interchange Master Plan

- Create the Plan Development Advisory Team with public private partnerships and roadway/trail connectivity, to name a few

The following discussions took place:

- Town Manager Scott Reske stated the one assignment that should be adopted is the goal to protect the downtown. Reske stated that if take on too much development at the Interchange too soon, The Town of Pendleton will have two downtowns. Reske added that the Plan Commission needs to determine a milestone/point of population growth that needs to be reached before aggressive development takes place in the quadrant districts, so not to harm the downtown businesses. Reske further advised that the population is approximately 4500, but technically around 6000 with the new subdivisions. Reske asked the Plan Commission if the trigger number should be at 12,000 or 20,000. Reske stated that this number should be outlined in the document adopting the Interchange Master Plan, but that it can be adjusted over time.
- Carol Hanna stated that she feel best to set higher number and then lower if deemed appropriate. Scott Reske replied that the Plan Commission may want to adjust according to **where** development is growing or on the **total number** of population. Reske added that the population benchmark can help shut down conversations for development that the Town does not see fit for the Future Keystone Development District.
- Scott Reske stated that TIF money can be spent on downtown projects. Reske added that he is excited about the potential for this land and that the Interchange Master Plan will help the development be more productive.
- Tim Pritchard stated that Exit 214 expects a lot of growth, both residential and commercial. Pritchard stated that this growth will help develop the Town of Pendleton.
- Brad Ballentine asked if the Future Keystone Development District and/or the Advanced Manufacturing & Technology District are potential for incubator sites. Ken Remenschneider replied that technology training facilities such as in Fishers and Indianapolis may be interested in Pendleton. Ballentine asked what incubator sites in Anderson competes against Pendleton. Scott Reske replied that Pendleton is surrounded by incubator sites and that although Pendleton is not competing, Pendleton can definitely jump in. Brad Ballentine further asked if Pendleton will be able to attract this type of development if Fishers have already developed. Reske replied that Pendleton may find that it does not need incubator programs and that the next step is to explore what is best for the Town of Pendleton. Ken Remenschneider added that vendors and businesses are looking into Pendleton for possibilities.
- Edward Wolenty of Decker, Lawyer & Maynard, representing several landowners in the Quadrant Plan, approached the podium. Wolenty stated that he believes that the Plan Commission is not in compliance with State Statute; therefore, any recommendation by the Plan Commission to the Town Council can be voided. Wolenty also asked why there was no outreach to the landowners in the quadrant area. Ken Remenschneider replied that the landowners have been given opportunity to be familiar with the Interchange Master Plan as have held several public meetings, stakeholders have been contacted and public hearings have given opportunity for participation.
- Ed Wolenty asked why he is not on the list of contacts and that no direct contact has been made with him and/or his clients. Tim Pritchard replied that the Interchange Master Plan is a long-range plan and if the landowner does not wish to sell, he/she can stay in place.
- Jenny Sisson asked Ed Wolenty to speak to the Plan Commission before the Consultant.
- Ed Wolenty commented that the Interchange Master Plan does not show Pine Lakes. Tim Pritchard replied that a lot of existing features are not on the map, that the plan is only a plan, not set in stone.
- Ed Wolenty stated that in looking at the plan, it calls for business in the brown area, park in the forest/green area and residential in the yellow area. Wolenty then questioned why the Plan Commission rejected a plan that presented exactly what the map lays out. Tim Pritchard replied that the subdivision plan was rejected as it was outdated and not up to standards. Wolenty stated the Interchange Master Plan seems to outreach for development to come to the Town of Pendleton, but in reality seems to drive it away. Pritchard replied that developments will need to

meet the standards for the type of homes, location, etc and that Pendleton is not trying to drive away development.

- Lynne Lawyer commented that she did not have any questions for now.
- Jeff Purdue introduced himself as a local business man, life-long resident of Pendleton.

Purdue stated that the town predecessor had a big job, but now town leadership has a tremendous job. Purdue commented that he would like to see the Town remain quiet, quant and attractive in the future. Purdue asked the Plan Commission members to take their jobs very serious and to hold on to the reigns tightly. Tim Pritchard commented that that is the very reason why the Town of Pendleton turned down the past proposal and just developed 240 pages of standards.

- Jeff Purdue asked Scott Reske if meetings have resumed with Anderson in regards to the 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension Project. Reske replied that meetings have not taken place since he has been appointed Town Manager.

- Purdue suggested for the Town of Pendleton to hold on tight and not let the community get away from them.

- Tim Pritchard expressed his appreciations for Purdue's comments and stated that the Town of Pendleton wants to protect the downtown as much as possible, but that development is coming fast from I-69 and even State Road 67. Pritchard stated that he hopes that the corridor roads will help keep to the quant town.

- Craig Campbell, President of Redevelopment Commission, commented that Fishers and Geist are coming fast this way. Campbell further stated that the RDC had recommended approval of the Interchange Master Plan as the work in this project is amazing. Campbell encouraged the Plan Commission to approve as the Town of Pendleton needs a plan in place while the Town develops.

- Tim Pritchard commented that the Town of Pendleton now has an approved Unified Development Ordinance and with the Interchange Master Plan, the Town can better manage the growth.

- Rick Cassin approached the podium asking if the Town of Pendleton is looking at the protection of the Town, specifically as to police and fire, as the Town grows. Cassin further commented that he is also concerned that the 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension project will drag business from downtown Pendleton. Tim Pritchard replied that the Town of Pendleton is currently working on the fire territory and going with paid staff versus volunteerism to help cover the needs more efficiently. Pritchard added that the Town of Pendleton is likely to add a second fire station near Maple Ridge Elementary and are also taking over Ingalls Fire Department as have lost volunteers. Rick Cassin asked if the Town of Pendleton is writing grants to support projects. Pritchard replied yes.

- Lynne Lawyer, from Decker, Lawyer & Maynard, stated that she represents three property owners in the northwest quadrant of the Interchange Master Plan map. Lawyer expressed concern that her firm has not been involved with the project nor spoken to by project consultants. Lawyer asked what space was available to develop in the downtown Pendleton as appears no place to occupy. Tim Pritchard replied that Plan Commission wants the downtown business to be prosperous. Scott Reske replied that there are available spaces at the former PNC Bank, Pendleton Avenue and Lumberyard which have not yet been occupied.

- Lynne Lawyer stated that the 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension Project will divide her client's property in half and concerned that there will not be enough space on one side or the other to properly develop. Scott Reske replied that this 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension Project is being developed separately from the Interchange Master Plan.

- Lynne Lawyer commented that they want long-term plan and not sure whom to talk to about the 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension Project. Tim Pritchard replied that he does not think that Anderson knows the point of contact as no funds to support the project. Pritchard further stated that Pendleton also does not have funds for the road extension at this time. Scott Reske added that developers can buy the ground, purchase the right-of-way and put in the road.

- Lynne Lawyer asked if the plan for the road location is a guess at this time. Tim Pritchard replied that the road will likely be placed in the center of both sides. Scott Reske confirmed that

the road will be placed in the center should the alignment study show increased value if divided evenly. Reske also stated that the frontage is most valuable and that Lawyer's client will have it. Pritchard added that Lawyer's client will have four frontages.

- Lynne Lawyer stated that if the land is divided, it will only leave a small piece of land sufficient to accommodate a strip mall/center.
- Ken Remenschneider stated that the Quadrant Master Plan proposes regional stormwater management where one aggregates Stormwater management in one location to lead into creek so to leave more land to develop in the remaining space. Remenschneider also stated that the stormwater management plan will capture the stormwater, hold and then release, so to not cause flooding issue. Remenschneider added that they used alignment to leave 360 acres for residential homes, possibly executive homes. Lynne Lawyer asked what type of homes. Remenschneider replied that it is up to the developer and what they propose. Scott Reske stated that the Planning Staff also has the Unified Development Ordinance as a reference. Remenschneider also commented that the Future Keystone Development District can entertain destination developments such as arenas, etc.
- Lynne Lawyer commented that she questions the composition of the Plan Commission body as making decisions they should not be making.
- Carol Hanna commented that she looks at the Interchange Master Plan as the big picture and not intended to address the specifics. Hanna stated that the plan gives the Town of Pendleton something to work with and helps assess proposals to determine if they are what the Town is seeking, giving a more cohesive plan. Hanna added that it is important to incorporate a population benchmark for the development of the plan and that 12,000 may not be sufficient. Scott Reske added that the town boundaries gives the opportunity for 40,000 population and that Plan Commission will want to keep that in mind.
- Jenny Sisson stated that with utility laws, the Interchange Master Plan is important to address utility needs.
- Jeff Purdue stated that a fortune has been spent on environmental studies, etc on **a maybe** with the 67<sup>th</sup> Street Extension Project. Purdue added that no meetings are being held and no one is talking to him about the project.
- Scott Reske stated that the Plan Commission needs to amend the Interchange Master Plan to address the population benchmark. Tim Pritchard recommended 20,000 as the benchmark.

**Carol Hanna made motion to amend the Interchange Master Plan document to reflect benchmark of 20,000 population total and pass document to the Town Council with a favorable recommendation; seconded by Jenny Sisson; roll call was taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.**

Tim Pritchard thanked everyone for their comments.

**B. PC09012021-02- Street Standards –**

**➤ Resolution to amend the Comprehensive Plan – Make recommendation to the Town Council**

Hannah Urbanski reported the following:

- The new street standards will establish updated minimum construction requirements for street improvements in the Town of Pendleton.
- These standards are written to be applicable to new or improved streets that are constructed as part of a development within the Town and are to be dedicated to the Town for public use and maintenance.
- It is the developer's responsibility to determine the most recent Standards that are required.

- The final draft has been completed by GRW, Deb Luzier who is available online to answer any questions.
- Next steps are to review the document and consider recommendation to the Town Council.

The following discussions and comments were made:

- Tim Pritchard asked Plan Commission members if any questions in regards to the document. No questions were raised.
- Kyle Eichhorn expressed that he has read through the document and that it looks good.

**Tim Pritchard made a motion to give favorable recommendation of the Street Standards to the Town Council; seconded by Kyle Eichhorn; roll call was taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion; motion carried.**

Tim Pritchard called for a brief recess before addressing the UDO amendments proposals.

**A. PC09012021-03- UDO amendments proposals –**

- **Review and propose amendments, these will be voted on at the October meeting and be publicized as a public hearing**

Hannah Urbanski reported the following:

- Access to Excel Spreadsheet available on Google Drive
- Can make amendment as wish when see fit to start
- Not voting on the items tonight, but will go through each item as a review

The following discussions and comments were made:

- Scott Reske stated that it is up to the Chairman as to how they wish to proceed with UDO discussions.
- Carol Hanna expressed concern with making too many changes, unless very clear, as the Steering Committee spent many hours in evaluating how one change of the UDO can affect/impact another part of the UDO. Hanna recommended that the Plan Commission work with the document first to see if any issues before making changes.
- Hannah Urbanski stated that there will be a Quarterly Review at the next regular meeting in October. Urbanski suggested to Plan Commission members that they go through the list of text changes/items and then vote on each at the October meeting. Kyle Eichhorn added that Plan Commission members can go down the list of items with simple yes or no and address at the Public Hearing in October.
- Deb Luzier reminded the Plan Commission members that there are residential districts that currently do not exist on the zoning map. Luzier further advised zoning changes will need to go through the zoning process to achieve what is presented on the UDO.

After discussion of each item on the list, the Plan Commission members determined which items were deemed technical in nature and which line items had questions, requiring more discussion at the October Public Hearing.

The following categories were deemed technical/grammatical errors in nature with full support of correction from Plan Commission members present:

- Access Road (165.H.3.c.i.), Perimeter landscape buffers as common spaces (91 and 164-165), Animal limits on hobby farms (127 table 4.1), Rooster prohibitions –Staff (126-127), Definition of Administrator – Staff (9 [section H.] 214 [definitions])

The following categories were determined to need further discussion at the October Public Hearing with full support from Plan Commission members present:

- Add Text (162), Centerline markers (169-170), Revise major subdivision open space requirements (147 table 5.3), Maximum gross density calculations (147 table 5.3), Accessory heights (55-56), Incoming use of SF front yard plantings (85 table 3.13), Buffers/transitional landscapes (85 table 3.13), Required open space contents [retention ponds] (156-157), 60% on windows is high – Staff (58), Secondary plat back to PC for approval (174), Minimum setbacks and lot sizes for SF-3 and SF-4 (29 & 31)

Jeff Graham advised that a Notice of Publishers Error will be prepared and Public Hearing Notice will be done for the next meeting in October.

The following comments were made:

- Jenny Sisson asked if Planning Department Staff can help guide Plan Commission members through the UDO review process. Hannah Urbanski replied yes and stated that they will update the excel spreadsheet. Urbanski further stated that at the next meeting, the Plan Commission can approve the simple items and then leave the others for discussion.
- Jeff Graham advised that he will prepare a Favorable Recommendation for the Street Standards and the I-69 Interchange Master Plan and get to Hannah Urbanski to coordinate signatures.
- Brad Ballentine stated that the Plan Commission needs to address solar farms and solar wind farms. Ballentine also commented that the Plan Commission needs to protect property values and property health by making sure appropriate controls are in place. Ballentine added that studies have shown a decrease in school enrollment and reduction in school density in solar farm communities. Ballentine also stated that solar farms cannot be built without placing an impact on the community. Jenny Sisson stated that this topic needs to be added to the next meeting Agenda. Hannah Urbanski also welcomed Plan Commission members to send any information or propose amendments in regards to solar/wind farms on the Google Drive.
- Tim Pritchard stated that there is a lot to fix on the UDO, but conversations need to continue and recommends hiring a consultant.
- Brett Mabrey, Building Inspector, shared that he has recently done an inspection of a local business doing a study on the feasibility of solar projects. Mabrey indicated that the business owner had asked about the cost of the permit. Mabrey advised the Plan Commission members that these inquiries are already being presented to the Town of Pendleton.
- Tim Pritchard commented that at the last Plan Commission Meeting, there was mention about an Extraterritorial Study and asked Jeff Graham if this was still being explored. Jeff Graham confirmed yes and advised that the process will involve the County as well.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS**

**No new business to report.**

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned by Tim Pritchard at 9:01 pm.

Next meeting October 6, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

Denise McKee  
Pendleton Municipal Utilities