



Meeting Minutes

Whitestown Plan Commission

Date: 05/08/23

Time: 6:30 pm

Location: Whitestown Municipal Complex, 6210 Veterans Drive, Whitestown, IN 46075, (317) 769-6557

Call to Order

6:33 pm

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

- Danny Powers - **absent**
- Dave Taylor
- Steve Milstead - **absent**
- Andrew McGee
- Nathan Harris
- Lauren Foley - **absent**
- Phillip Snoeberger
- Staff:
 - Desire Irakoze and Jill Conniff,
Planning Administrators
 - Jon Hughes, WPC/WBZA
Attorney

Jon Hughes noted that because of Commission attendance unanimous votes will be required.

Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda by Harris. Second by Taylor. Motion passes 4-0.

Motion to approve the 04-10-23 meeting minutes by Snoeberger. Second by Harris. Motion passes 4-0.

Public Comments for Items Not on Agenda N/A

Presentations N/A

Unfinished Business N/A

a. **PC23-001-PP Peabody Farms West** – This item will be continued.

b. **PC23-010-ZA 750 South Rezone**

- i. **Lindsey Phipps** - Strong Box – Went over map, site plan and renderings for proposed development. Went over list of commitments given. Noted that they help a neighborhood meeting on April 18th at the Nese Apartments and listened to concerns. Went over changes such as added screening.

- ii. **Jill Conniff** – Staff Report - Staff is providing a favorable recommendation for the County Road 750 S Rezone Docket PC23-010-ZA. The applicant is proposing to rezone the described area from the Agricultural (AG) Zone to the Light Industry (I-1) Zone.
The Whitestown Plan Commission and Town Council shall pay reasonable regard to the five decision criteria when taking action on all rezoning acts. Because this is a legislative act, the Plan Commission can require that certain commitments be made as part of the Rezone action. Staff's recommendation to the Plan Commission finds the Rezone complies with the following requirements in accordance with UDO Section 11.16 I.
 1. **The proposed rezone is in compliance** with the Comprehensive Plan;
 2. **The proposed rezone is appropriate** given the current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;
 3. **The proposed rezone proposes** the most desirable use(s) for which the land in each district is adapted;
 4. **The proposed rezone conserves** property values throughout the Jurisdictional Area; and,
 5. **The proposed rezone demonstrates** responsible development and growth. The proposed rezone is in compliance with the Land Use Map and Special Development Area 8 in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezone meets other goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan including bringing a diversified business base that does not currently exist within the Town. While the site is surrounded by Agriculture uses, the Comprehensive Plan foresees this area transitioning to allowing for institutional and industrial uses as the Ronald Reagan Parkway is constructed. In conjunction with the proposed commitments, the rezone will have heightened architectural standards and other restrictions that will enhance the surrounding area. The addition of light industrial uses and limited site access will not harm property values. The rezone demonstrates responsible growth by meeting the demand for a diversified business base and requiring additional transportation/street commitments. If Plan Commission provides a favorable recommendation, staff recommends adding the following conditions:
 1. The following uses are not permitted:
 - a. Service Station, Local
 - b. Auto/Boat/Light Truck Sales or Rentals
 2. Motorcycle/ATV/Lawn Care Sales or Rentals is a permitted use.
 3. All uses are subject to the following outdoor storage requirements:
 - a. outdoor storage must be in conformance with UDO Section 3.8
 - b. outdoor storage areas must be screened on all sides at least 8 feet high with a solid wall, fence, or landscaping, or a combination of these elements. A wall or fence must use materials consistent or complementary to the principal building. Chain link fencing is prohibited.
 - c. outdoor storage is only permitted on the interior of the site, not fronting CR 750 S or CR 450 E

4. All uses are subject to the following outdoor display requirements:
 - a. outdoor display area must be in conformance with UDO Section 3.8, D.
 - b. outdoor display is not permitted in parking stalls or in drive aisles
 - c. outdoor display cannot be left out overnight or during non-business hours
 - d. outdoor display is allowed up to 5% of the tenant user square footage
5. Access points to the site shall be limited to the two approximate locations as shown on the 2022 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Special Development Area 8.
6. All site lighting shall be coordinated throughout and be of uniform design, color, and materials.
7. The maximum building footprint is 40,000 square feet.
8. The maximum building height is 40 feet measured from the eaves.
9. The proposed structures must comply with UDO Section 9.7 Industrial Architectural Standards in addition to the below:
 - a. Building facades, which are 240 feet or greater in length, shall be designed with offsets. Offsets shall be a minimum depth of 4 feet and a minimum aggregate length of 20 percent of the horizontal plane of the overall Building Façade.
 - b. The main building entrance or tenant space pedestrian entrances shall be defined and articulated by architectural elements such as projections, lintels, pediments, pilasters, columns and other design elements as appropriate.
 - c. All pedestrian entrances must be covered.
 - d. If pre-cast or architectural concrete is used it shall be painted, textured (rough, striated, imprinted with a pattern or form), or designed to simulate brick or stone (limestone, marble, or granite).
 - e. If EIFS is used it shall not be permitted within 8 feet of the ground level.
 - f. A maximum of 60% of any one exterior building material may be used.
10. Dedicate right-of-way for minor collector for CR 450 E, 32.5' half ROW & additional ROW for corner cut at CR 450 /CR 750 S for future roundabout.
11. Dedicate wastewater treatment plant access easement area to Town of Whitestown in fee simple. Full access is not permitted to the proposed development site. The applicant may have perpendicular utility and storm water crossings to be approved by Whitestown. Emergency access location(s) may be approved by Whitestown.
- iii. **Lindsey Phipps** – Added that they are working with Boone County and understand that they need to get approval from the drainage board.
- iv. **Josh Dickey** – 7955 S 450 E Brownsburg – Stated that the neighborhood meeting went well, but they are still not in favor of the development. Thinks this should go in a more industrial area. Concerns with their water source, drainage, size of buildings and safety.
- v. **Amanda Dickey** – 7955 S 450 E Brownsburg – Built home two years ago and family lives on road. Concerns with property values, traffic, roads, Howard School and lack of transparency.
- vi. **Time Sharpe** – 7447 S CR 475 E Lebanon – This development would be down the road from his house. Has well water concerns and stated that they need to be hooked up to the Town water and sewer. Stated that this was not a big enough area for this development. Asked how will it benefit our children.
- vii. **Becky Robinson** – Howard School – Stated that the Howard School is the only registered National Historic Landmark in Whitestown. Concerns with large truck traffic.
- viii. **Jeff Coan** – Howard School – Grew up in Fayette and volunteers at the Howard School. Went over the history of the community helping restore the school. Has concerns with traffic and safety.

- ix. **Andrew McGee** – Read email submitted for public Comment: NOTE: When retrieving the email address to send this statement, I noticed it was due not later than noon today - I missed the deadline. Therefore, I included family members which will be in attendance tonight to speak on my behalf: Good evening Whitestown Planning Commission, I'm writing to voice my sincere objection to the proposed rezoning from agricultural to light industrial at the corner of County Roads 450 East and 750 South in Perry Township. As I read through the Whitestown website [Home - Town of Whitestown \(in.gov\)](#), I believe Whitestown is stating inaccurate messages. Here are just a couple excerpts from the website. **Home Page.**
IT FEELS LIKE HOME.
For nearly a decade, Whitestown has been the fastest growing community in Indiana, while retaining its small-town charm and agricultural roots.
Please explain to me and the residents along County Road 450 East and County Road 750 South how Whitestown is going to keep its small-town charm and **agricultural roots** with numerous warehouses being constructed on farmland.
Parks & Recreation. The Whitestown Parks and Recreation Department is dedicated to connecting parks and people, by providing environmentally friendly outdoor recreation opportunities for citizens of Whitestown and surrounding communities. **We strive to build a greener, healthier community for the children of tomorrow.**
Again, how can Whitestown advertise a greener, healthier community when they are building warehouses replacing farm ground?
Along with others, I have stated my personal opinion and feelings in previous meetings. I plea to keep the southernmost East/West County Road in Perry Township (i.e., 750 South) zoning AS IS - NO rezone.
Sincerely, Lynn Rounder Dickey
- x. **Mark Dollase** – Indiana Landmarks – Helped with the National Historic Registry and rebuild for the Howard School. Worked with INDOT about planning of the Ronald Reagan Parkway. Commented on the staff report in relation to comprehensive plan and not mentioning the Howard School. Would you ban billboards on this property?
- xi. **Lindsey Phipps** – Stated that drainage and lighting had not been determined yet. Car repair not intended on this property and there will be no billboards.
- xii. **Jon Hughes** – Billboards are not permitted per our UDO.
- xiii. **Jill Conniff** – Anything going in must be connected to Town water and sewer.
- xiv. **Andrew McGee** – Question about WPD comment that an officer said it would be a place to service their vehicles.
- xv. **Dave Taylor** – Clarified that the Town owns adjacent parcel and that is what the officer was referring to, not this development.
- xvi. **Andrew McGee** – Ronald Reagan is coming and development in this area is coming, just not sure about this.
- xvii. **Phillip Snoeberger** – Whitestown is growing, but we don't know when the RR is coming in and all of the area surrounding is AG. Appreciate the neighborhood meeting and personal opinion is that this is too soon.
- xviii. **Nathan Harris** – Agree, need more thought for Howard School, RR no idea when coming and not funded.

- xix. **Lindsey Phipps** – Would staff have anything to add regarding the comprehensive plan?
- xx. **Jill Conniff** – It was designated as industrial, it makes sense with the water treatment plant and RR coming through.
- xxi. **Lindsey Phipps** – Yes, it looks like an island, but it is not, we would have no empty buildings.
- xxii. **Andrew McGee** – Where would the traffic go if the RR isn't coming anytime soon?
- xxiii. **Nathan Harris** – Too early.
- xxiv. **Phillip Snoeberger** – Reminder that nothing gets approved tonight, will still go to the Town Council.

Motion for an unfavorable recommendation by McGee. Second by Harris. Motion passes 4-0.

c. PC23-012-PP Prairie Chase Waiver

- i. **Rick Ellis** – With Weihe Engineers for Adam Braun, Braun Property Development. Back from last month working with staff to address concerns and request waiver.
- ii. **Desire Irakoze** – Staff report - Staff is providing a favorable recommendation for the Prairie Chase Section 2 Primary Plat Docket PC23-012-PP Sidewalk Waiver. The applicant is requesting the removal of the sidewalk on the west side of Good Drive. If Plan Commission approves the Waiver request, staff recommends the following conditions:
The gang box be moved to the corner of Alder Lane and Good Drive.
Sidewalks will still be provided on the southern end of Good Drive to include the on-street parking spaces.
- iii. **Pat Howenstine** – 2587 S 650 E – Asked about the Town code for work hours and has concerns about dirt, trash and noise from construction. Asked about issues with waiver and missing a fence on the report.
- iv. **Paul Dimiceli** – 2415 S 650 E – Asked about the distance from Goode Dr to his property line and what would be the buffer. Could Goode Drive be one lane to not use so much property.
- v. **Rick Ellis** – Explained that they will provide a fence on the South property line even if it is not being shown currently. Sidewalks have been revised. This sidewalk waiver is being requested to give more room from the corner of the property to the roadway. It has to be this wide form emergency access.
- vi. **Desire Irakoze** – Went over verification of the fence location.
- vii. **Andrew McGee** – The fence is a mistake it was omitted?
- viii. **Rick Ellis** – Yes, we agree, there was a note on the primary plat and we will make it more clear.
- ix. **Jon Hughes** – Went over fence location on slide of power point.
- x. **Nathan Harris** – Makes sense.

Motion to approve waiver request with fence added to the South on revised drawing and adopting staff findings by Snoeberger. Second by Harris. Motion passes 4-0.

d. PC23-014-CP and PC23-015-DP Blue Beacon Truck Wash – This item was continued.

e. PC23-016-DP Greenview Apartments Phase 2

- i. **Liam Sawyer** – Kimley Horn – Went over slides and spoke about the trees to the East staying. Stated specs of the development and that nothing has changed since the concept plan. Showed landscape plan and elevations. Meet all requirements and went over staff recommendations.

- ii. **Desire Irakoze** – Staff report - Staff is providing a favorable recommendation for the Greenview Phase 2 Development Plan Docket PC23-016-DP Greenview Apartments Phase 2. The petitioner is proposing to construct three apartment buildings totaling 85,636 sq. ft and 188 units, amenities, and associated parking and amenity on approximately 12.53 acres.

Staff’s recommendation to Plan Commission finds the development plan complies with the following requirements in accordance with UDO Section 11.8 E. and approval be granted upon:

The proposed Development Plan is in compliance with all applicable development and design standards of the zoning district where the real estate is located.

The proposed Development Plan manages traffic in a manner that promotes health, safety, convenience, and the harmonious development of the community.

The applicable utilities have enough capacity to provide potable water, sanitary sewer facilities, electricity, telephone, natural gas, and cable service to meet the needs of the proposed development.

If Plan Commission provides a favorable recommendation, staff recommends the following conditions: Sanitary sewer routing and any other outstanding Public Work TAC Comments must be addressed prior to building permits.

- iii. **Andrew McGee** – Question about the trees.
- iv. **Liam Sawyer** – They will remain.

Motion to approve by Snoeberger. Second by Harris. Motion passes 4-0.

f. PC23-017-ZA 3745 S Main St

- i. **Matt Price** – Representing Kite Harris property group – Presenting an amendment to Bridle Oaks PUD. Bringing in this property to complete the Main St frontage of the PUD.
- ii. **Jill Conniff** – Staff Report - Staff is providing a favorable recommendation for the 3745 South Main Street Rezone Docket PC23-017-ZA. The applicant is proposing to rezone the described area from the Low-density Single-family and Two-family Residential (R-2) Zone to the Bridle Oaks Planned Unit Development (PUD) district.
The Whitestown Plan Commission and Town Council shall pay reasonable regard to the five decision criteria when taking action on all rezoning acts. Because this is a legislative act, the Plan Commission can require that certain commitments be made as part of the Rezone action. Staff’s recommendation to the Plan Commission finds the Rezone complies with the following requirements in accordance with UDO Section 11.16 I.
The proposed rezone is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; The proposed rezone is appropriate given the current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;
The proposed rezone proposes the most desirable use(s) for which the land in each district is adapted;
The proposed rezone conserves property values throughout the Jurisdictional Area; and,
The proposed rezone demonstrates responsible development and growth.
The proposed rezone is in compliance with the Land Use Map and Special Development Area 3 in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezone meets other goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan including encouraging larger Planned Unit Developments and mixed-use developments. The site is surrounded on three sides by the Bridle Oaks Planned Unit

Development district. By taking on the same zoning district it will accomplish a more integrated community design.

Motion for favorable recommendation by Snoeberger. Second by Taylor. Motion passes 4-0.

New Business (Public Hearing)

Other Business

Announcements

Adjourn

Unanimous vote to adjourn.

7:42 pm

Andrew McGee, President

Jill Conniff, Staff