

## I. CALL TO ORDER

The Pendleton Plan Commission (PC) met on September 6, 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, Carol Hanna, Jenny Sisson, Cheryl Ramey-Hunt, Andrew Holloway, Brad Ballentine. A quorum was established.

Representing the Town in-person was Denise McKee Planning and Zoning Administrator. Representing the Town via Zoom was Jeff Graham Town Attorney.

Others present: Marissa Skaggs, Cameron Valentine of 852 S Broadway, Charles and Sharon Breese of 300 Pearl St, Sandi Butler of 346 Pearl St, Brady Davis of 471 E Madison St

## III. APPROVAL OF JULY 2023 MEETING MINUTES

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

## IV. OLD BUSINESS

## V. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC09062023-01: 0 Madison Ave. Parcel ID: 48-14-21-700-002.000-013. Rezone of approximately 40 acres of Large Lot Agriculture (A-1) property to Residential Core Conservancy (RC) for the future site of a housing subdivision. Howard's Rolling Acres LLC via Joe Calderon. **WITHDRAWN**

B. Review and vote on possible amendments to the UDO

Denise McKee presented:

- Accessory structure standards, missing language; Pg 55: Add language to accessory structure standards that states, "In all zones, accessory structures that require an ILP must be placed to the side or rear of the primary structure, not to pass the front facade of the primary structure."
- Fence height in industrial zones; Pg 56: Change the allowance for fence heights in LI/HI to be 8ft instead of 6ft to allow for enhanced screening and security due to the typically heavier uses in these zones; This would not change the allowance of any prohibited materials
- Eaves clarification; Pg 60: Language in UDO states "Eave Measurement. The eave/overhang shall be measured from the supporting wall and determined after installation of any masonry"; Clarification on 3' eave requirement in GB, HB, MF-2, and I zones; does not seem practical. See examples in G:drive, it appears that most of these are not 3', but do have some sort of eave to avoid the undimensional look; recommendation to remove 3' requirement
- Lot size for attached SF homes: more research to be done on other developments
- Exterior materials; Pg 59: Prohibited materials list
  - Standing Seam Metal Panels should be clearly defined to differentiate "exposed" fastener vs "concealed" fastener; exposed is more of a ribbed barn metal with a

visible screwhead, and with concealed fastener the screwhead is not visible; Pritchard indicated most places prefer the concealed fasteners; recommendation was made to make this clarification to Standing Seam Metal Panel

- EIFS is also a very typical material used by all sorts of commercial/industrial and can be a variety of colors/patterns/shapes; suggest allowing EIFS, but perhaps limiting certain unfavorable styles: more research to be done
- McKee asked the Board to review this list to determine consistent, practical materials for use
- To be reviewed next month

C. Review and vote on amendment to 2018 Comprehensive Plan to add language about the Zone Impact Fee Plan as reference material

Denise McKee presented:

- When the Road Impact Fee Plan and Ordinance was approved, it was adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, however it needs a formal action to place it into the Plan
- Seeking the Board's approval to add in a reference to the Road Impact Fee Zone Improvement Plan into jurisdiction of the Comp Plan
- Per Jeff Graham the Park Impact Fee Plan does not need to be included due to their unique governing body structure

**Tim Pritchard requested to table this item until specific verbiage has been reviewed**

D. Update: MCCOG I-69 Corridor Plan

Denise McKee presented the update:

- Hannahrose Urbanski and Scott Reske are part of the Steering Committee, developed and led by the Madison County Council of Governments
- Have been meeting about every month since the Spring of 2023
- An overlay of the I-69 Corridor Plan, with the intent of creating a branding/theme for the corridor in the County; to govern basic development standards along I-69 through Madison County (exits 214 - 226)
- This does not trump the Town's I-69 Plan, but is intended for long-term planning and setting common standards and layering of projects to maximize funding, i.e. frontage road extensions
- The Committee is utilizing Pendleton's UDO as a reference

Discussion / Questions

- Brad Ballentine questioned what the real objective is; Tim Pritchard reiterated this is more for long-term projects and making the most of funding opportunities, setting common standards; this does not replace or supersede the Town's I-69 Plan
- Jenny Sisson stated her opinion that this Steering Committee needs to be discussing strategy for common standards for industry development
- Denise McKee said the steering committee is currently in planning stages, gathering ideas, clarifying vision, and then as it becomes more concrete with a solidified purpose and goal, there will be meetings and public hearings on matters; McKee indicated this committee is not for land-use control but more for standards and highlighting Madison County; Sisson stated it should be for more than that
- Ballentine asked that the actual area for this committee be defined by the next meeting

- Marissa Skaggs reiterated that this committee's idea is not about land-use or zoning, but more about transportation, signage, shared projects for funding etc.
- Rachel Allen of 415 E Madison St shared her concern with branding to be like northern areas of the County, and how Pendleton can maintain its identity
- Mckee reaffirmed that this is more focused on a County theme as travelers pass through, but each community can highlight their own individuality

Denise McKee presented an additional update:

- Block 1 of the secondary plat of the Kulkarni property has been approved by the Technical Review Team; this is on the northeast side of the Heritage Way round-about; two parcels
- Developer will be providing the beginning development of the roads, but it will be very minimal, basically the stub-offs
- Site development review will need to be completed by the purchasers of each property, and they will need to develop the roads

Kyle Eichhorn added a separate comment: looking at our zoning ordinance and minimum lot sizes, for Ag and RR, and how 3-4 acre country lots are becoming very popular, it does not seem that our UDO facilitates a mechanism to do a 3-acre SF lot; example is a farmer that would like to parcel off 2-3 lots out front but retain his farm ground, the AG minimum lot size is 40 acres, RR is 5-acres. Eichhorn recommended a discussion for next month's meeting to address this.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned by Tim Pritchard at 7:55 pm.

Next meeting October 4, 2023 at 7:00 pm.