

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Pendleton Plan Commission (PC) met on May 3, 2023 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 in-person were Tim Pritchard, Kyle Eichhorn, Brad Ballentine, Carol Hanna. Attending via Zoom was Andrew Holloway. A quorum was established.

Representing the Town in-person was Hannahrose Urbanski Planning Director. Representing the Town via Zoom was Jeff Graham Town Attorney.

Others present: Mike Bond of 6150 S Fox Ct

III. APPROVAL OF APRIL 2023 MEETING MINUTES

Tim Pritchard requested a motion to approve the April 2023 Meeting Minutes; motion made by Kyle Eichhorn, seconded by Brad Ballentine. Roll call taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. I-69 Interchange Master Plan future expectations – discussion only

- Hannahrose Urbanski opened the discussion stating that it may be appropriate to have a consultant review the Market Study
- Urbanski stated that the focus should be on the SW Quadrant; that is the area in question
- Carol Hanna pointed out that the verbiage in the Plan does not seem to match up with what the original intentions were for that quadrant
- Brad Ballentine inquired about how to find a qualified consultant, are there community planning matrices that provide a population to amenities equation, what amenities and support services are needed to achieve growth, community needs versus community wants
- Tim Pritchard stated the population is needed to draw the larger commercial development; the Keystone District development is on hold until 20,000 population mark
- Urbanski indicated there may need to be discussion about the Keystone population threshold; that it should not compete with downtown, but have a completely different vibe to complement
- Ballentine stated that there is no land for future downtown development, parking is an issue, and asked what do we have in downtown that attracts people and what is needed in downtown to make it a destination and maintain integrity
- Urbanski said moving forward with the Keystone plan may be the first step; she would like to revisit the RDC minutes from the development of this Plan as they may provide some background and the steering committee's direction; she will check with Scott Reske about an assessment of the Plan and the relevancy of it and move forward with amending with the RDC if needed
- Kyle Eichhorn summarized that moving forward, the staff can explore this and if an RFP is necessary then the PC can authorize an RFP
- Mike Bond inquired about architectural standards coming into Town from all directions and if that is something part of this plan; Urbanski stated that is in the UDO for future developments

- Ballentine suggested that the Keystone study be done in parallel with Downtown preservation study; how to continue to maintain, grow and enhance it as the Keystone development begins
- Urbanski referenced the Downtown Revitalization Plan from 2015 that they are looking to do a partial amendment on, and this could address components of the Keystone plan
- Pritchard indicated that the Riverfront District development may gain momentum; Urbanski said that is a Downtown Revitalization tool, but that would be up to Town Council to put it in place or not
- Eichhorn referenced access into downtown; there are good north/south entry points, but not east/west with roads that back up into town; Urbanski added the north Heritage Way would be developed first, funneling people off at that point before downtown; next would likely be the extension to the south towards Fall Creek Dr, lastly would be the 67th St extension which will not get started until the Keystone District begins developing
- Ballentine asked if there are developments that we want to pursue and be proactive; targeting what we want/need to be an anchor development; we have missed too many opportunities by not being proactive; Urbanski said the Keystone Plan will be a document that we can take to developers that we want, but we are lacking incentives that would need to be added
- Urbanski said she will do some research, get a list of consultants together, since this would not be using State funding an RFP is not necessary but we can put feelers out for potential consultants

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Vote on possible amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance

Hannahrose Urbanski presented:

- Microbrewery Definition (definitions section) – currently no definition; suggested: “A small brewery concentrating on limited quantity, high quality beer, that generally produces fewer than 15,000 barrels of product annually. Most product is sold for consumption on the premises, and may also include an on-site tasting room(s), bar, and/or restaurant”
Urbanski will do more research to further define, referencing brewery license and number allowed
- Mural Signage (Chap 3) - HPC discussed recommending an amendment to PC on allowing mural signage in DB zoning: “Size: determined/permitted via HPC by COA process - must be removable and utilize a vinyl/canvas or similar material. Cannot actually be directly painted on the building; No EVMS or EVMS components are permitted; Sign must be placed on the primary structure” PC agreed that if the HPC reviews then they support it
- Multi-Family Development (Pg 197) – the applicability standards should be changed back to the original standards: “The development or modification of property for uses other than agricultural uses (excluding confined feeding operations), single-family, or two-family residential require development plan approval”; should be amended to return to this text; Kyle Eichhorn questioned definitions of dwellings, Urbanski recommended to put this on hold for further research of dwelling definitions
- Dryvit (Pg 59) - Amend to instead list "EIFS" in the table vs Dryvit as this is a brand name. DB allows up to 20% EIFS, reflect in table as well, and add EIFS to definitions
- Major Subdivision Standards (Pg 146) - Maximum gross density standards for SF-4 Multi-Family are missing; they were listed in original UDO document passed 9-9-21, but were eliminated 10-14-21; MF is allowable in SF-4, therefore it needs a density standard to be built to, should it be incorporated into a subdivision; PC recommends 8 for density

- Exterior Building Finish Materials: (Pg 59 Table 3.2) - Change title of table 3.2 from “Prohibited Material” to “Exterior Materials”; was recommended to change the title to “Exterior Materials”; there was discussion regarding vinyl, prohibiting or allowing a specific percentage; Tim Pritchard suggested an asterisk with special notation about approval; Urbanski suggested she do some work on the wording and the PC members do some homework on material types prior to amending
- Conservation Subdivision: (Pg 149 Table 5.6) Remove A-2 and RR from permitted districts list; Remove 3rd bullet point from maximum number of lots section pertaining to septic allowance
 - Urbanski presented information on Conservation Subdivisions:
 - For example, a regular 100-acre subdivision is divided into 100 1-acre lots for 100 houses; a Conservation Subdivision would take that 100 acres and put 100 houses on ½ acre lots in a tighter cluster, leaving 50 acres open space; these subdivisions have smaller lots, more dense style, conserving open, nature space which is usually transferred to a land trust or donated in order to protect the green space
 - The current Residential Conservation Subdivision has no density incentives
 - Minimum open-space is at least 50% of entire property regardless of lot size
 - Kyle Eichhorn referenced CS from Zionsville and Fishers, both UDO’s established a baseline density based on what could be fit under the standard zoning, and that became the max density; the incentive is that the builder can spend less on expenses by developing half the infrastructure on half the land; Eichhorn suggested removing the reference of the purpose being to provide density incentives; the incentives are preserving green space, consolidated infrastructure, providing community areas
 - Eichhorn indicated that Fishers had a 20% decreased lot width and setbacks; we could have a stronger incentive to reduce the lot size and reduce setbacks
 - Urbanski said land preserved as open space is put into a trust to prevent further development; Jeff Graham agreed this can be accomplished with proper language
 - Urbanski indicated there is homework to do to determine the yield plan, minimum percentage of open space, percentage of lot size reduction
 - Urbanski stated what she has researched indicates anything that is utilized for stormwater drainage, utilities etc. cannot exceed 25% of the required open space
 - Brad Ballentine inquired about the reference to septic system allowance; it can be removed due to being irrelevant since sewers would be required with this kind of subdivision
 - Urbanski recommended the amendments to Table 5.6, and in the meantime, will work on stronger language for CS

Tim Pritchard made a motion to approve the amendment to Table 5.6, removing A-2, RR and bullet point for septic systems; amendments to Table 3.2 to change the title from Prohibited Material to Exterior Material; amendments to approve the submitted UDO recommendations as discussed. Motion seconded by Kyle Eichhorn. Roll call taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Plan Commission
May 3, 2023
Page 4

Meeting adjourned by Tim Pritchard at 8:41 pm.

Next meeting June 7, 2023 at 7:00 pm.