

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Pendleton Plan Commission (PC) met on October 4, 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 Hannahrose Urbanski Planning Director, Jeff Graham Town Attorney. Representing the Town via Zoom was Denise McKee Planning and Zoning Administrator

Others present: Marissa Skaggs Town Council President, Bob Sturgeon of 6130 S 425 W Pendleton

III. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 2023 MEETING MINUTES

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

IV. OLD BUSINESS

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC10042023-01: 0 S 600 W and 0 State Road 38. Parcel ID: 48-14-19-200-003.000-013 & 48-14-18- 300-004.000-013. Proposed rezone of approximately 98 acres of Large Lot Agriculture land (A-1) to Single-Family (SF-3) zoning. Franklin Urbahns & Pendleton Development LLC via D.R. Horton - Indiana, LLC by Brian J. Tuohy. **FILED BUT NOT NOTICED. CONTINUED TO NEXT REGULAR MEETING.**

B. Review and vote on possible amendments to the UDO

Hannahrose Urbanski presented:

- MF-2 eaves; pg. 60: Change from 3ft requirement to 12" , as is with other residential areas, including MF-1. (remove 3' row from table); agreed on as written
- RR Zoning District; pg. 23: The UDO does not seem to address property size between .5 acre (SF-1) and 5 acres (RR). Rural Residential could be downsized to 2-3 acres. Madison County does not allow wells on anything smaller than 2 acres. (RR for Fortville is minimum 1.5-acre, RR for Fishers is 1 acre, Hancock county is 2 acres septic, 1 acre if sewer available); agreed on 2 acres with and without sewer
- Chicken-keeping definition; pg. 215: Update definition to "chicken/poultry keeping". This would then include Poultry, fowl, pheasant, turkey, and similar type animals etc. to the chicken keeping category/definition. Not updating any zones this is permitted/prohibited, allowed by right in A-1, A-2, RR, SF-1, SF-2, allowed by CU in SF-3, SF-4 and RC. Would still be limited to six total animals (Chicken-keeping is limited to 6 hens, no roosters, in permitted districts.); discussed and agreed to remove rabbits specifically, and to generalize the definition for small poultry and fowl
- Max gross density traditional subdivision for RC; pg. 147: Move the "max gross density" language for SF-4 (2.5 units/acre for single and two-family; 8 units/acre for multi-family)

- to the Table 5.4 (Traditional development standards table). It is listed in the wrong table; agreed to move language to the correct table (5.4) Additional discussion recommended to review Table 5.4
- Bufferyards for Traditional/Residential Core subdivisions; 147 and 85/86 (Table 3.12 and 3.13): Whether or not to put a number of lots that would qualify a Traditional/RC style subdivision to require a perimeter bufferyard for both the Side/Rear of the subdivision (table 3.12) and from the perimeter roadway (Table 3.13); This bufferyard requirement can be an additional row to both tables, or it can just use the major subdivision requirements once a Traditional subdivision reaches that certain number of lots threshold. Ex: The Arabian Pointe subdivision was only 13 lots and impractical to have a perimeter and/or roadway bufferyard. The Howard Acres property was 150 lots and was practical to install a bufferyard; agreed that bufferyards may be required at the discretion of the PC
 - Attached SF homes (not condos or two-family): UDO does not have specific language to where attached SF homes are permitted, just that they are allowable in conservation subdivisions and count as an anti-monotony criteria. Need to further refine this style housing as there is some existing in Town; numerous examples were reviewed and after discussion was determined that better definitions and examples are needed. Urbanski to collect more information to present.
 - Exterior Materials; pg. 59: Allow EIFS in all districts, reflect so in Table 3.2; agreed as written
 - Architecture standards for accessory structures; pg. 55 (accessory structure standards) and pg. 57 (architecture standards): There are no architecture standards for accessory structures that require a permit. Current architecture standards are for primary structures only. Should zones at least around the downtown area have some material requirements and/or limitations? (RC); agreed to update the architecture standards section "general" and "project eligibility" and correlating table 3.2 to include accessory structures
 - MCCOG I-69 Corridor Plan Update; Urbanski stated that this is in the early stages with a steering committee and assured that this Plan would not supersede the Town's standards, and this is more of a County-wide branding initiative; once an MOU is established, PC will vote on adopting/rejecting; MCCOG plans to conduct educational/informational sessions with PC

Tim Pritchard requested a motion to approve the UDO amendments as discussed. Motion made by Kyle Eichhorn, seconded by Carol Hanna. Roll call vote taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

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

Hannahrose Urbanski presented:

- Page 8 of the Comprehensive Plan currently states: "Planning Area - The planning jurisdiction for this comprehensive plan update is the incorporated area of the Town of Pendleton"
- Recommendation to add the following language to the Planning Area section: "Refer to the 2021 Road Impact Fee Zone Improvement Plan for the jurisdiction of the zone improvement plan"

- This addition of reference is due to the state statute of an Impact Fee ordinance requiring reference to an Impact Fee zone improvement plan in the Comprehensive Plan (IC 36-7-4-1318 Ordinance; zone improvement plan preparation; contents of plan)

Tim Pritchard requested a motion to accept an amendment to the 2018 Comprehensive Plan to add language regarding Zone Impact Fee Plan as presented. Motion made by Brad Ballentine, seconded by Cheryl Ramey-Hunt. Roll call vote taken and all members present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

Public Comments / Discussion

- Bob Sturgeon of 6130 S 425 W Pendleton addressed the PC regarding his concern about the increased and unusual aerial activities at the old airstrip on W 600 S
- Kyle Eichhorn concurred with the concerns and questioned the grandfather clause due to increased level and nature of activity.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by Tim Pritchard at 8:35 pm.

Next meeting November 1, 2023 at 7:00 pm.