



ZIONSVILLE PLAN COMMISSION

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Tuesday, January 21, 2025

6:30 PM (Local Time)

**THIS PUBLIC MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ONSITE AT THE
ZIONSVILLE TOWN HALL, 1100 WEST OAK STREET, ROOM 105 (COUNCIL CHAMBERS),
AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM.**

The following items were addressed:

- I. Pledge of Allegiance
- II. Attendance: David Franz, Kendrick Davis, Josh Fedor, Jim Hurst, Brad Johnson, Andrew Kossack, and Nick Plopper attended in person
- III. Recognition of New PC Members: Brad Johnson and Andrew Kossack
- IV. Election of Plan Commission Officers: David Franz was elected President for 2025. Josh Fedor was elected Vice President for 2025. Mike Dale was appointed as Secretary for 2025
- V. Planning & Building Department [December Monthly Report](#) (Informational Only – no action required)
- VI. Approval of the December 16, 2024 Plan Commission Minutes: Approved
- VII. Continuance or Withdrawal Requests

Docket Number & Link	Petitioner / Project Name	Address of Project	Petitions
2024-81-DP: Initial Filing	Cottages at Zionsville - Memory Care	6863 W. Stonegate Drive Zionsville, IN	<i>Prior to being heard by the Plan Commission, this project may require approvals of Development Standards Variances from the BZA on February 5, 2025.</i> Development Plan for a memory care facility on a 0.55+/- acre parcel being zoned Rural Professional Business (PB). Commissioners continued this request to the February 18, 2025 Regular Meeting. 7 in Favor 0 Opposed

VIII. Continued Business to be heard

Docket Number & Link	Petitioner / Project Name	Address of Project	Petitions
2024-50-Z: Staff Report with Exhibits Letters of Interest Supplemental Materials	Pittman Partners / The Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD Rezoning	11201 & 10801 E. 200 South and 2475 S. U.S. 421, Zionsville, IN	Petition was continued from the September 16, 2024, October 16, 2024, November 18, 2024, and December 16, 2024. Plan Commission Meetings. Rezoning of 147.4± acres from the Rural General Agriculture (AG) district to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) district for a mixed use development including single-family, townhomes, and commercial uses. Commissioners heard the petition and held a public hearing on the matter. After consideration, the request was continued to the March 17, 2025 Regular Meeting. 7 in Favor 0 Opposed
2024-74-Z: Staff Report with Exhibits	RFPDI LLC / Creekside Corporate Park Rezoning - Signage in Subarea E	10814 and 10850 Creek Way Zionsville, IN	Petition was continued from the November 18, 2024 Plan Commission Meeting. Rezoning to amend Section 1.20, M, of the Creekside Corporate Park PUD regarding wall signage regulations in Subarea E. A motion to send a Favorable recommendation to the Town Council was approved. 7 in Favor 0 Opposed

IX. New Business to be heard

Docket Number & Links	Petitioner/ Project Name	Address of Project	Petitions
2024-87-DPA: Staff Report with Exhibits	Zionsville High School - Update of Master Plan	1000 Mulberry Street	Plan Amendment to update 2008 master plan and expand high school locker facility on 79+/- acres within the SU-1 zoning district. Conditionally Approved as presented 7 in Favor 0 Opposed

X. Other Matters to be considered

Docket Number & Links	Petitioner/ Project Name	Address of Project	Item to be Considered
	HWC Engineering	Town-Wide	Status of the Comprehensive Plan Update
	Plan Commission	Town-Wide	Plan Commission's Appointment to BZA – Josh Fedor was appointed to the BZA for 2025
	Staff	Town-Wide	Attorney's Engagement Letter for 2025 - Approved

Respectfully Submitted: Mike Dale, AICP
Director - Planning and Building Department
Town of Zionsville

Zionsville Plan Commission
January 21, 2025

In Attendance: David Franz, Josh Fedor, Jim Hurst, Andrew Kossack, Kendrick Davis,
Brad Johnson, Nick Plopper

Staff attending: Mike Dale, Roger Kilmer, Owen Young, Jodi Dickey, Dan Taylor, Attorney

Franz Let's get started. Call to order the Plan Commission meeting of January 21, 2025.
Please rise, start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

All Pledge of Allegiance.

Franz Mike, would you please take roll?

Dale Yes, Dave Franz?

Franz Present.

Dale Andrew Kossack?

Kossack Present.

Dale Nick Plopper?

Plopper Present.

Dale Josh Fedor?

Fedor Present.

Dale Kendrick Davis?

Davis Present.

Dale Jim Hurst?

Hurst Present.

Dale Brad Johnson?

Johnson Here.

Franz All seven members are here. Mike, do you want to introduce the new Plan
members?

Dale Yeah, absolutely. The Town of Zionsville would like to thank and welcome
Andrew Kossack and Brad Johnson.

Franz All right.

Dale Thank you.

Franz Thank you for stepping up. It can be very enjoyable at times. We have to have election of the Plan Commission officers. I'll take nominations for President.

Fedor I nominate Dave Franz.

Franz Is there a second?

Plopper Second.

Franz Any further nominations? Is this a roll or an aye?

Taylor You can just say aye.

Franz Okay, all in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Opposed by nay.
[No response]

 All right, thank you. We need a Vice President nomination.

Plopper I nominate Josh Fedor.

Franz Is there a second?

Davis Second.

Franz Any further? All in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Josh, thank you. And we need election of a Secretary.

Davis I nominate Mike.

Franz Is there a second?

Hurst Second.

Franz Any further nominations? All in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Opposed by nay.
[No response]

 Mike, thank you again.

Dale You're welcome.

Franz In your packet there was a set of documents that contained the December minutes. Is there any comments, additions, deletions to those minutes? If there are none, is there a motion to approve?

Hurst So moved.

Franz Is there a second?

Fedor Second.

Franz Any discussion? All in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Opposed by nay.
[No response]

The minutes are approved.

Do we want to, okay, so we're going to – Mike, do you want to take this one?

Dale Right, our representatives, we'd like to invite HWC to tonight's, come, come on up. HWC Engineering is the consulting firm hired by the Town of Zionsville to facilitate the writing of our new Comprehensive Plan so we've asked HWC to give us a, a brief presentation with the status of the project thus far and they'll respond to questions.

Franz Yes. For the record, this is just them presenting, you're listening but it's presenting to us and the questions will only come from us so.

Peeper Yeah, well, thank you. Sorry, a, a bit unprepared. I thought I was lower on the agenda.

Franz We wanted to, we wanted to extend you the courtesy –

Peeper No, very much appreciated. So as Mike said, my name is Adam Peeper, I'm a Community Planner with HWC Engineering and the Project Manager for the ongoing update to the Town of Zionsville Comprehensive Plan. So we started this process last May actually with organization of the project steering committee and then moved into our kind of initial round of community engagement late last summer into the fall and then had an additional open house here last November and I will pull up a process diagram here in one second.

Kilmer Adam, I have your slides available if you'd want me to –

Peeper Yeah, I've got it right here. How do I, is there just a HDMI?

Dale Yes, there's right here –

Kilmer I've got mine.

Peeper Can I?

Dale There's a cable –

Peeper Sorry about that. So as I said, started the process back in May, have worked through an initial series of community engagement efforts as well as several meetings with our project steering committee. So right now we are at this critical point in the process where we are forming recommendations related to the Land Use and Character Plan, the Transportation Plan and the Economic Development Strategy. Admittedly, we're, we're a little bit behind in, in some of our analysis and refinement making sure that we get that dialed in before we go back to the project steering committee for these key discussions but that's going to be happening in the next few weeks and then into March and then we anticipate having the community strategy – excuse me – community strategies open house which there'll actually be a couple meetings towards the end of March and I'll touch on schedule a little bit before we wrap up but that's going to be our opportunity to present our initial recommendations and get feedback on those before we would then prepare a rough draft of the plan, work through additional refinement and then move into the adoption process later in the late spring/early summer.

So across our engagement meetings that were in person here, at the airport, as well as at the fire station in Perry Township, we also participated at the Lions Club Fall Festival, had a booth at the Farmers Market, an online survey as well as an interactive mapping exercise that was accessed via the, the website so I won't read all of these but just some of the key things that we heard resounding agreement or consistent mention throughout our efforts. Certainly a really strong value on open space and, and a want to protect Eagle Creek and the riparian corridor, additional woodlands and sensitive environmental features across town. That if growth is going to continue, it needs to happen in a fiscally responsible way that also enhances community character and that really the, the small town atmosphere, the safety, the school system that's been developed, all the quality neighborhoods, all of these things absolutely must be protected and whatever happens in Zionsville's future that these assets really must be protected and, and, and can't be sacrificed in any way. That's not to say we heard consistent input on all topics across our engagement opportunities so certainly some mixed opinions. One of those relates to kind of how to balance individual personal property rights or if someone owns a property and they want to sell that and realize a return on that investment as compared to long-term community goals of, again, preserving open space or not seeing every acre of Zionsville developed as something else in the future.

Heard mixed opinions about the desirability of additional commercial centers, additional employment generating uses, the appropriateness of varying types or densities of residential development and then how to, the challenge of accounting for some of the inherent differences between the, the Village center, the more urban part of Zionsville, the conventional subdivisions and then the rural areas. Obviously, there's the urban and rural service districts but also once you get to the Zoning Ordinance, as you all I'm sure know, there's a, a lot of different provisions, different standards, different districts so how to create some

consistency across the town but also recognize some of those challenges given the different context.

At the open house we had in November what we tried to do was present some guiding principles that we had developed and say okay, we know we've heard some different input, some consistent, some not. Here's some baseline statements. Can we, can we agree on those? For the most part, we saw more agreement than not. The, the top statements here being the ones that generally received positive feedback, some mixed and then some were, were more, more disagrees or more negative feedback than, than positive, again, relating to housing variety, commercial businesses and employments uses but, again, you can see, obviously, strong agreement on protecting the town's assets – the Village, quality neighborhoods, park system. Interestingly though even where we see at one meeting the, the positive of diversify the town's tax base but then negative responses to, like I said, that commercial or employment growth. So still trying to sort through this a little bit and, and thread the needle in the, the coming months here with our set of recommendations.

So where we're headed – again, I think as we started this process and talked to you all, one of the things the Comprehensive Plan is intended to do is answer or not answer – identify some of these big picture issues that maybe can't in and of themselves be answered or addressed with the Comprehensive Plan but put you all on a, a series of next steps to work towards those. So one of them is related to infrastructure challenges and obviously there's a number of different water and sewer providers within town limits and the ability of, of kind of realizing sewer and water service by different providers in different areas of town is going to be incumbent on being able to serve any type of development in some areas.

Other ones I didn't mention in terms of open house feedback but we've heard discussion of past plans for an additional interchange or an interchange on 865. I think we've heard pros and cons of that. That's kind of a, a, a bigger question than the Comprehensive Plan process can answer so our recommendation would be if the town's really interested in pursuing that, that's its own kind of separate study and, to better understand the cost and benefit what does it mean in terms of transportation system improvement or not so that's another kind of one of the big picture issues that's come up but we've drafted a future land use map and series of classifications that correspond to that and shared it initially with staff and are in the process of refining that and should have it for the steering committee here shortly. With that or, or following shortly thereafter is the thoroughfare plan and the transportation recommendations that would be needed to support that land use pattern as well as the economic development strategy and, and realizing the different role that different areas of town can play in providing varied employment growth opportunities.

With all of this is the development of a fiscal impact analysis to understand the relative costs and benefits of different development types to help you all make decisions. It's not to say every single development may be a tax positive but at a big picture certainly the town needs to be on a, a sustainable financial path, something we've heard and, and are developing information to guide that. And then after all of these individual components kind of come together identifying where the zoning and subdivision recommendations may need to be updated to

better implement the plan recommendations as the plan is, is only a guide and not developed as an ordinance. It will be incumbent upon the town to translate some of those more vision and goal principles in the Comprehensive Plan into specific ordinance language or other policies, programs and initiatives for the town.

So, real quick like I said, the, the project steering committee has been organized into some subcommittees related to the Land Use and Character element, Transportation and Economic Development so we're going to be meeting with those groups in February and early March so that we can come back with the community strategies open house in later March and have the initial draft of the plan together in April to then present hopefully in early May.

Franz Thank you.

Peeper Yeah, happy to answer any questions or, again, talk at any point through this process if, if you have anything you want to send our way we'd be happy to chat.

Franz You have any questions?

Kossack Just a quick one maybe – are, are you tracking kind of quantitatively the feedback you're getting on various issues or is it more just narratively?

Peeper It, it's a little of both. Certainly on the online survey responses and interactive map it's real easy because all that data's there. In terms of the first series of workshops, that's a little more qualitative because those were open-ended exercises, small group discussions. Like I said at the big ideas open house where we did have the ability for people to kind of say agree, disagree with dot stickers, we do have that quantified as well as additional comment, comment cards and, and notes that were provided.

Franz Okay. Do you feel this process has gone typical for how these go?

Peeper I will say I think we have heard a broader, a, a broader set of views on just about every topic than maybe we would normally see in a process to be honest. Again, everything from let's, let, let's really try to focus some development intensity into walkable districts versus don't – we'd be happy to not change anything or build another house in the community. Again, the idea of we want to attract jobs because we know, we've looked at the numbers, it's 80+% of Zionsville residents who work are working outside of town and, and the desire to have or the ability for some of them to stay in town to work versus you know what, we're a bedroom community, have been, always should be and that's why Indianapolis is to our southeast you know.

Franz I think that goes to say how interested our citizens are.

Peeper And I will say we've been very happy with the engagement that, the amount of engagement and the feedback that we have gotten. It's, it's not easy when it's that varied but I will take that over minimal or just a few people providing input and then you have to guess whether they're representative or not so.

Franz All right, thank you.

Peeper Yeah.

Franz Anybody else have any questions?

Dale Thank you Adam –

Peeper All right, thank you.

Dale Very much for coming. Appreciate it. Sorry for the short notice.

Franz All right, we do have a continuance request – 2024-81-DP, Cottages of Zionsville Memory Care, 6863 West Stonegate Drive, Zionsville. Development Plan for a memory care facility on a 0.55+/- acre parcel being zoned Rural Professional Business (PB). Roger, you handling it?

Kilmer Thank you. When this project was initially filed it was reviewed and a variance of development standards was identified that was required of the site plan so at that time it was made known to the petitioner you need to secure that variance before the Plan Commission would hear the Development Plan request. Since then and, and just recently, they resubmitted a revised site plan that may not require that same development standard. We're in the process of reviewing that with the petitioner but they were also informed because of the timing of when that material was received we were not going to be able to get it on tonight's agenda.

Franz Okay.

Kilmer So you should anticipate seeing that project at next month's meeting.

Franz All right and what is next month's meeting? February –

Kilmer It will be February 20, 21st or the 18th, February 18th. It's a Tuesday because the Monday is a holiday.

Franz Right. Any discussion on this one? Is there a motion to continue this matter to February 18th?

Hurst So moved.

Franz Is there a second?

Fedor Second.

Franz All in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Opposed by nay.
[No response]

Motion is approved, continued to next month.

Onto Continued Business – Docket Number 2024-50-Z, Pittman Partners/The Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD Rezoning, 11201 and 10801 East 200 South and 2475 South U.S. 421, Zionsville, Indiana. Rezoning of 147.4+/- acres from the Rural General Agriculture (AG) district to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) district for a mixed-use development including single-family, townhomes and commercial uses. Roger, staff report.

Kilmer

Thank you. As mentioned, the project name is The Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD Rezoning. As a point of orientation on the screen in front of you I have a location map. The property is located essentially southeast of the intersection of County Road 200 South and Michigan Road. The property boundaries that, that are a part of this PUD are outlined in white. To the east of the subject site we have the Union Woodlands residential subdivision which was approved in rezoning through the county a number of years ago. It has since come back before you for approval of primary plat and Development Plan and it has even received its secondary plat approval. They have started moving some dirt at least for utilities, things like that on the residential portion of the subdivision.

The northern portion of Union Woodlands is an area reserved for a future park that will be dedicated to the town. That is this area. To the northeast of the subject site is the Indy Executive Airport along with a few residential residences that have been developed along the north side of 200 South. To the west of the subject site right at the intersection of 200 South and Michigan Road is the Hopwood Winery along with the golfing facility The Range of Zionsville. On the opposite side or west side of Michigan Road are a number of residential use, large lot uses. To the south of the subject site we have two existing residential subdivisions, one is Countrywood subdivision and also Brookhaven subdivision.

From a zoning standpoint, the subject site is entirely zoned AG, agricultural, along with most of those properties around to its north and west, all of the area that you see in that light green designates the AG zoning classification. The Michigan Road Overlay zone does impact the very western portion of the subject site right in this area but I will say that within the, the text of the proposed PUD, the Michigan Road Overlay would not be impacting this site. They are, they're writing that out of the, the requested zoning. To the south of the subject site, again, we have one residential subdivision that is still zoned AG but then to the southeast where Brookhaven is, that is zoned R2 and this lighter area of blue is the Union Woodlands residential subdivision that is zoned R3, again, which is already under construction.

The petitioner seeks to rezone the subject property to a Planned Unit Development classification to support mixed-use development including single-family residential, townhouses and commercial office retail spaces and a preserve wooded greenspace. The proposed PUD would permit up to 284 single-family homes and up to 150 townhomes. The PUD would also permit up to 20,000 total square feet of retail and service uses along Michigan Road. The PUD, the PUD site would be divided into the following five use blocks: Item one is the estate residential block located in this portion of the PUD. Permitted within this use block would be, uses would consist entirely of residential uses located in single

and two-story and even three-story buildings. The traditional neighborhood use block which is this purplish area, permitted uses within this block shall be single-family dwellings and other authorized uses as set forth in the PUD's use table. This, I'm gonna call it tan or a tan color through here is the center common use block. Permitted uses within this block shall be single-family dwellings and other authorized uses as set forth in the PUD use table and then we have the Michigan Road use block which is this blue area and this pink area. This block is comprised of two sub-areas. The commercial use block and a townhome use block. Permitted uses within this block include a variety of housing options, assisted living, independent living and townhouses together with neighborhood commercial, professional office uses and retail uses and single-story and two-story buildings as authorized in the PUD's use table. This is the only block, only use block where townhomes would be permitted and townhomes would be permitted in both sub-areas. So even though this block plan currently is showing townhomes just in this blue area, they could, depending upon market demand, townhouses could occur up in this pink area, however, the retail and commercial uses that are permitted in this pink area would not be permitted back in this light blue area. The fifth use block is the tree preservation wildlife use block. This block reserves approximately 5.6 acres of wooded greenspace in the southwest portion of the development as a naturally preserved amenity. This block is not intended for any type of development activity but rather is intended to remain undisturbed greenspace.

The petitioner has submitted commitments for development of an offsite almost 49-acre public park to be located east of the subject site and north of the previously approved Union Woodlands residential subdivision. It is this area here. It should be noted that this public park is not a part of the real estate involved with this PUD rezoning but, again, is referenced as, in the commitments that the petitioner has provided.

Okay for items of interest, the Indiana Code states that in preparing and considering rezoning proposals under the 600 series, the Plan Commission and the legislative body, in this case the Zionsville Town Council, shall pay reasonable regard to the following five items: 1) is the Comprehensive Plan; 2) is current conditions and character of current structures and uses in each district; 3) the most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted; 4) the conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and 5) responsible development and growth. I'm going to focus the next few comments specifically on the first two items – the, the Comprehensive Plan and current conditions and character of current structures.

Regarding the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the subject site is within Union Township, however, this township's future land use map was amended with the adoption of the Airport Area Strategic Land Use Plan or Airport Plan in January of 2022. From this Airport Plan the eastern portion and I'll try to outline that here – approximately the eastern two-thirds of, of the, of the proposal is identified as an agritourism agricultural district. This district is intended to maintain existing agricultural uses around the airport and also allow for agritourism uses. With this recommendation in mind, the proposed use of single-family residential in the PUD would be a departure from the agritourism and agricultural district of the Airport Plan.

Staying with the recommendations from the Airport Plan, the western portion of the site, this, this area down here on the southwest is identified as a mixed-use campus housing district. The mixed-use campus housing district is to consist of low-rise campus style housing and supportive uses. The proposed townhomes within this mixed-use housing district, campus housing district are, in staff's opinion, consistent with the use, the Airport Plan's use recommendation. Also within the Airport Plan is a Residential Development Compatibility Map shown on the screen before you. From this map the subject site is within tier 2 and tier 3 and I know in looking at this map there are so many different colors involved it can be a little disorienting. What you need to focus upon are what areas are outlined. Those areas outlined in red are tier 1. Those areas outlined in orange are tier 2. Those areas outlined in yellow are tier 3 and then the remaining areas are tier 4 and, again, the subject site, it, it overlays a portion of it in tier 2 and tier 3. Tier 2 strongly discourages new residential development and tier 3 recommends to limit residential to multi-family housing types and minor subdivisions of existing residential lots. The proposed single-family residential uses within tier 2 are clearly in conflict with the recommendation but the proposed townhomes within tier 3 do, in staff's opinion, meet this recommendation.

I mentioned earlier that there were five different items that had to be considered. The second item was current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in, in the district. This next comment refers to that. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses, while the proposed residential use of the PUD would be an extension of many of the nearby residential developments, the density of the proposed development being 2.94 units per gross acre would be a departure from what has been approved and would not be in keeping with the current conditions and character of current structures in the site's vicinity. The proposed Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD accomplishes some of the conditions required for a PUD rezoning, however, 1) the proposal is inconsistent with recommendations of the adopted Airport Plan; and 2) the density of the proposal is significantly greater than that of nearby or recently approved residential subdivisions. For these reasons, staff cannot support this proposal. I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

Franz All right, thank you Roger. Just want to say one thing before we get started – the, the Plan Commission's responsibility tonight is to address and send a recommendation to the Town Council. The Town Council will make the final decision on the zoning request. So I just want to be clear on that. We're not approving or denying anything tonight so. With that, is the petitioner present?

Pittman Hello and good evening. For the record, my name is Steve Pittman. I'm here representing Pittman Partners. With me tonight is Wayne Falstad (sp?) with Pittman Partners. Also from the law firm of Dentons Bingham & Greenebaum, Matt Price and Suzanne Baker. Also our civil engineering firm, Kimley-Horn, Matt Luce is here our land planner and then our traffic engineering firm, A&F Engineering.

I think the way we're going to try to do this presentation tonight, we're going to, I'll make the presentation and then Matt and I will kinda tag team responses to

your questions and response to remonstrance. Is this, I think we're still on your computer.

Kilmer Yes.

Pittman Can we get on mine? All right, okay before I, I get started I just want to talk a little bit about kinda the, not only the site but kinda the journey that we've taken so far. So, we put three properties under contract for approximately 147 acres and we put this property under contract anywhere from, from May/June of 2023 to October of 2023 so there's been a tremendous amount of due diligence and planning that has, has gone into this to just get here. When you look at this aerial photograph I have before you, the 147 acres that we have under contract represents three property owners – the Diocese of Indiana, their land fronts 421, J&P Properties and then Quint Properties. So these are, these are not farmers, they're, they're land investors that obviously want to maximize the value of their property.

As we, as we put this property under contract I made, I made several stops before and met with people before we decided to move forward or not move forward, kind of a stop and go process and one of the first people I met with was John Stehr and his Deputy Mayor at the time, Kate Swanson, and I showed them some of our thoughts and they – I want to be careful not to put words in anybody's mouth – I don't want to say they supported this plan but they encouraged us to move forward and I think one of the things that was really, really important to John was the circumstances that are occurring in your community right now with your Zionsville softball/baseball and the Challengers Program where you're turning kids away and so he was aware of this parkland that had been created through the Union Woodlands property and encouraged me to talk to the Parks Department and Zionsville baseball and softball group to see if there was a possibility that a new sports facility could be built there. And we've built a couple sports facilities like this before that was a great addition to the community and we thought that was a good idea so, so I met with all of those folks – the Parks Department, the Parks Board, Zionsville baseball and I, in fact, I went to the developer that's adjacent to us, Union Woodlands Platinum Properties, and said hey, I think there's a neat opportunity here in this community to build a sports facility and we could kinda join venture on this and in addition to that as opposed to looking at your project in a vacuum, maybe we look at our projects together and you guys can modify your plan. We could create road interconnectivity and make this, a, a nice quadrant that's being developed.

If you look at the neighborhoods to the south of us, Brookhaven and Fieldstone and some of those neighborhoods, there was no interconnectivity and we thought that would be a good opportunity. I, also, I met with Zionsville Schools to see if they had objections and, and I, I think the way that Zionsville Schools looks at things was, is hey, thank you for meeting with us, thank you for showing us this. We'll, we'll make sure that we meet the responsibilities of educating whatever kids are in this, in this neighborhood. So that was not something that discouraged me.

And then last but not least and definitely not in this order, I met with Roger Kilmer and the Planning staff, whether in person or phone or multiple meetings,

and they were very helpful and, and I want to be very complimentary of them because they've been consistent with us and day one they said if, if, if you can't meet our Comprehensive Plan, we're not gonna, we will not be able to support this project and day one we said we know we won't be able to support the, we know that we will not be able to be consistent with the Comp Plan. We can't do campus housing next to 60-foot-wide lots and have a strip of ground in between us that's ag or ag tourism. So we hope we come up with a plan that you can reasonably support or write some nice things about even though at the end of the day you won't be able to support it.

We did meet with another group and I think this was an important thing, met with another organized group and I'm not, I'm not going to call this group out but one of the things that they told me when we were putting our plan together we, we showed them the plan they said this plan could make sense except there's one, one serious weakness to your project is Union Woodlands was approved four years ago and its never been built and we don't, we don't think that project is ever going to be built and so until that's built, you really can't make the argument you're making and I said to that group, I said it's interesting when I made this, came before you guys to make this presentation, I asked you guys one, one thing and I asked you to have an open mind and hear me out before you throw me out the door and so when they made that comment I said to them I said hey, it's only fair, turnabouts only fair that I have an open mind to what you have to say and I thought that that was a, was a good comment because if, if that was going to remain ag forever and not develop it's harder to make the argument that we're making.

In addition to that, the other, the other group that we met with we met with, we had a, on September 11th we had a neighborhood meeting at Zionsville Presbyterian Church and invited a group of the neighbors to come in and, and, and hear what we wanted to do.

As I, as I talk about – well, before I talk about this, and I'm going to tell you the last group and the last I guess entity that I talked to, I talked to the Hamilton County Executive Airport because they were very instrumental in putting this plan together and even though their job, their job literally if you look at their documents and you go through their minutes is to oppose every, every project that comes, comes their way. They opposed a project in West, a proposed project in Westfield, Westfield Middle School three or four miles away on 32 in Centennial, opposed Union Woodlands, opposed Fieldstone, opposed Brookhaven, Appaloosa Crossing – all that being said, they were very friendly and very helpful.

I finally got through to a really good guy, I don't know if he's here tonight or not, but Sam Sachs, yeah, there he is, and Sam was very good at taking all this nomenclature of, of the airport and the things that they put on their maps, these runway protection zones and, and helped me make sense of it and so as you'll see later in the presentation, we had put together this multi-million dollar sports facility that was outside of the runway protection zone. It was, we were going to move forward with that plan. We didn't think they would have any problems with it. He later explained to me hey, Steve, our Comprehensive Plan future plans that we may extend that an additional 700 feet and you will be in the future

runway protection zone and you're putting lots of kids and lots of people in this area, you know, we're, we're not comfortable with that and once I understood that I agreed with that, talked to Jarod Logsdon at the Parks, he agreed with that so we abandoned that plan and so once we abandoned that plan, it allowed us to come forth with the plan that we're bringing, bringing you tonight but he helped me understand runway protection zone and that's a very important thing. Noise, noise sensitive area of what you need to do with houses. These are areas that are not, noise sensitive area is not an area where housing is not allowed, it's, it's an area where sensitive to noise and you have certain requirements from the, the way that you build your home from the, the title work on a property, the covenants and restrictions in the purchase agreement that you notify people that you're in a noise sensitive area and then they also have what's called tall structure requirements. I'm sure he can go into more detail on this if he wants to but basically as you get further and further away from an airport, the higher and higher you can build. So you have to go through all sorts of analysis to make sure what you're proposing you can build that you can build and, and I found that very helpful.

When we look at this aerial photograph so I point out our, our neighborhood, Union Woodlands, the area to our east I'm also showing you Bradley Ridge that was recently approved. We have, like I say, a significant airport to our north, Zionsville Schools recently bought a property and we also have an EPA Superfund site and I point that Superfund site out because it's relevant to these properties because some of these properties have environmental encumbrances on them. In fact, one of our properties did and we had to have that removed but this quadrant from Michigan Road on the west of this area State Road 32 to the north, that's a quadrant that's very busy and a lot more stuff is going to be happening and it's not an area that we're in the middle of nowhere and nothing should happen here. It's, it's significantly different than the area west of 421. That was something that I really wanted to point out.

This was the, this was the original plan. I won't go into detail because I think you all have seen it but on this particular plan we have 683, 683 residential units when you include the apartments and everything else. We got a baseball facility, baseball/softball facility and, of course, you've got the 183 Union Woodlands homes. That's what we presented to the neighbors for the first time and they, they were very upset along with other people in the community that we had apartments. I mean I've, I've learned that apartments is a very bad, bad word in this community. We have removed all of the apartments. In addition on this site we had townhomes up on 200. People did not want townhomes up on 200. We took the townhomes off of 200 and moved them up into the Michigan Road area. So the, the plan has, has changed quite drastically from the original plan and part of that is we're able to do this now because we're not trying to fund a, fund a sports park. That's the, that's the type of facility we're looking to put out there. It's very significant.

The new, the new block plan that Roger pointed out, once again, we're – I'm gonna just maybe go in a little bit more detail. The area along 421 we're calling that a, planning on that being a commercial area and when I say commercial we're talking about doctor's offices, an eye doctor, a dermatologist, a dentist, those types of uses. There's not going to be retail with restaurants and drive-thrus

and those sorts of things and Roger, if that's not, if that's not clear and we need to make a, a commitment, we're glad to do that. Roger did mention that the way the PUD is written today the area in blue would be townhomes and that we would be allowed to extend the townhomes into the pink area but the pink area not into the blue area. If anybody objects to that and says hey, we just want one-story office buildings in the front, we're glad to do that but the way it's written now is the townhomes could extend all the way up to, all the way up to 421. You drop behind that area the, what color did you call that Roger? Peach? Tan?

Kilmer I'm colorblind so –

Pittman Okay, whatever we want to call that color, the goal there was to just match up what we're adjacent to. That's all we're doing. We're just matching up to the Lennar property that's adjacent to us and I was fortunate to get the Platinum Properties folks and I think we have one of you guys back there oh two of them, great, Platinum Property folks to work with us to create that interconnectivity and they were willing to modify their plans to make that work. And then as we go up to the area to the north that we're calling the TND area, those are lots that we're looking at doing houses with front porches and the garage tucked behind in an alley. It's a really attractive thing, we've done it in other places. Some people seem to really like, some people don't like it. If it's the wish of this body or others after this meeting that we look at making that all that area with the garages the same as the tan area or doing some different things, we're certainly open to that. We did get, we did get a letter just last week which was disappointing from the Boone County Highway Department because I would've expected to get it like two months ago that says those two entryways in the front they, they want us to consolidate that to one entryway so that's going to require us to go back to the drawing board and look of, of how that entryway is going to affect the project and we, from what we might hear tonight, if you, depending on what you do, we'll, we can make adjustments to that.

And then as we go to the area to the, to the east of that, that's an estate residential area, bigger houses, side entry houses, you guys have seen the elevations, that will go up from \$750,000 up to, up to a million. Essentially we have heard some criticism that people think we're trying to get too high of prices and we can't get those and if that's the case it, it will be open space but we, we think we can get those prices. This is just, this is just the site plan of the same thing. It's a prettier version. I'd, I'd add to this we're putting common areas adjacent to all the adjacent property owners. The neighborhood to our south we got a much more significant common area there and, and one of the people in that neighborhood has chosen to talk to me and engage with me and meet with me. I've been out there a couple times and has asked if we'll put a, a mound with trees behind his property and we said we absolutely will do that and if your neighbors wanted us to do that and run it around the full length of that property, we're glad to do that as well. We, we haven't heard that so if more communication happens, that's something that can happen.

In our trail plan we have a very significant trail plan, I think. Our trails are, I can't remember if it's 2.6 or 3.6 miles, it's on your, on your plan but a lot of really nice connectivity. Now when you develop a community like this and create

the, the common areas, you make the lots smaller in order to have more common areas versus larger lots, less common area.

Also to be clear, to be clear about the parks, we had some criticism before. The way we were always proposing the parks, it wasn't, we weren't standing up in front of everybody and saying hey, we're such good guys look what we're willing to do for the Parks Department. It was more of hey, if we can take, if you want, if you want to do this, we'll take our park, the park impact fees that we would pay to you and we'll, and we'll use those to build the park for you and there was advantages to the town to do that because we're not subject to fair wage laws number one. Two, we can get out there and do it while we're doing other things. There's economies to scale in doing that but – so we came back and I don't know if Sam Sachs and the airport has seen this plan yet or not but we, in this area a portion of that area, a portion of that area is in their runway protection zone. I don't know if they are going to allow a trail there or not, if, if they do or not. Maybe he can address that but we put a, more of a passive trail and this was working with Jarod Logsdon, putting three pickleball courts, no lighting. Sam, no lighting on the pickleball courts and a playground area and a restroom facility. We'll run sanitary sewer and water out there for a restroom facility which would be a tremendous amenity. I, I have had a conversation with adjacent property owner that said hey, what about if they did some sort of farmers market out there or you did some other activities out there and I said hey, the Parks Board can have whatever they want to do but I don't want to get criticism that we're doing a farmers market here and taking it from your downtown area. That's something they would have to decide.

Okay, just, I'll just show a few of the elevations that you guys have seen. This is the estate area, side entry, 3-car garages, \$750,000 to over a million. This is an area that we told you a lot of people like, some people may not like. If, if you don't want alleys and garages in the back, we can, we can modify this but that's the area in the traditional neighborhood development area. This is an area where we're adjacent to the Lennar Homes. So no deviation from that, just matching up with them. These are some examples of, of the professional office space in the front – a doctor's office, chiropractor, dentist, orthodontist, optometrist. And then here we're showing just different elevations of three-story townhomes. So we would anticipate that the townhomes and the townhome area would be three story.

Okay, so I wanted to put together our little exhibit of, of the zoning that's occurring in this area. If you here areas at 146th and Michigan, there's a, a neighborhood commercial node that Bob Harris is developing and, and it's a, it's come along quite well. I think it's really nice. He needs more density. It needs more rooftops, it needs more people for that area to thrive. The area south of it is zoned R2. The area north, Fieldstone and Brookhaven, are zoned R2 as well. As you go north of Brookhaven, the area that's adjacent to us is zoned R3. So if we were to, if we were to pick a zoning classification and not try to do this really innovative, interesting plan and said let's go 3 or 3 to 3 52:02 audio units per acre. The, the plan that Lennar put together they have 183 units, 183 units on about, I think, 100 acres and one of the reasons why they're density 52:17 audio is because they've got about 15 acres of wetlands and pipeline easement. And so, so we're looking at what we're proposing which is 2.9 units

per acre adjacent to that to the, to the north, we're, we're actually transitioning to something that's more, more intense. We're transitioning to U.S. Highway 421 and up to 200 where we're in closer proximity to the airport. So, in our minds of being in this business, that, that transition is an appropriate transition. Once again, we're, we're willing to talk about that if there's some, some way to, to – some people think we can make that more appropriate, let's have that conversation.

Okay, so we just looked at the actual zoning so the next thing we're going to talk about is we're going to talk about the Comp Plan and the Comp Plan is what your Planning Department is hanging their hat on and is focused on and, and I get it. That's, that's their job and Roger's always said to me, Steve, we don't vote. We don't vote. We just present and we understand the Comp Plan is just a guideline. It's a guideline that and I would tell you in most communities is not followed. If you looked at Carmel, or as John Stehr tells me to refer to it as the city to the east, probably 90%, 95% of the development that's occurred there in the last 20 years has not followed a Comprehensive Plan. People come in, people come in with good plans and you band-aid about and you work on stuff.

You know this Adam who talked about, about your Comp Plan to, to me the tough decisions are not being made in the Comp Plan process it's when somebody comes in who's spending a bunch of money to do this and who's trying to meet market conditions. We say that's what we do, we meet market conditions. We don't create markets. So, so we know what the, what the marketplace wants. Now, I say there's three concentric rings. There's what does the marketplace want? What can the town reasonably support? And what's reasonably respectful to the neighbors that you can have some sort of overlap and that you can have a plan. So we know that apartments would've been very supported here. You know as I've talked to people here, we have a housing crisis in our country. The average age of a first-time homebuyer is 38 years old and, and that's a problem and that's why so many apartments are being built because people can't afford houses but the community said no, we don't want that. We don't want that. So then they want all for-sale product and that's how we've come to this. Now, when you look at this Comp Plan, this is the map I created and I'll, I'll show some that Roger created – once, again, you can see on your Comp Plan where Union Woodlands is. Your Comprehensive Plan called for open space there. Okay, it's not open space it's 183 units and people will say oh, well that was a mistake. That was a mistake. That shouldn't have happened. Bottom line is boots on the ground 183 homes are being built there and I, I think it's going to be a great asset.

If you go, if you go where we're on 421, you're calling for campus housing. Roger says that we meet the requirements of your Comp Plan for campus housing and you've got the area in between that's agriculture, ag tourism. We don't know what that means or certainly we know it, we know it, we don't know how to make that work. Then you, then you go up and you look at a project that Bradley Ridge, that's, that area is, is estate conservation district that you approved and that's an area where that flight path comes through the north end of his and my understanding is the airport did not want that project to happen and his compromise was he stood, he stayed out of that flight path. We don't get in the flight path. Then you go up north to Promontory and the only reason I call

that out that's another recent development that's approved and that's, that's in an ag district. So you, so you all your Plan Commission and Council made decisions on good common sense of, of, appropriate or not, for this area.

This is what Roger put together and I, I added the R2 and the R3 to show what we're adjacent to and we're showing the transition from R2 to R3 and then, and then as we go up to 200 and over to 421. This is the runway protection zone exhibit from your packet. This, once again, this shows that we're out of the runway protection zone. It shows that we're, if the runway protection zone is expanded or if they go an additional 700 feet we're still out of the runway protection zone and as I told you, we gotta meet the noise sensitive area requirements and the tall structures and we've agreed to do that.

Another thing I forgot to mention, we were in, in those noise sensitive areas, we're required, in the noise sensitive area we're required to do five additional commitments of our values and the ceiling, our values and the walls, exterior surfaces of the buildings, roofing materials, all of these things and, and we have a very, very small, very small area that's in the noise sensitive area. I think that's hey, we want you guys to do that on your entire project. We've agreed to do that. So that's another, another commitment that we've made.

Another thing that your Planning staff before and I'm a little bit out of order here but I want to bring up now – your Planning staff, we put together architectural guidelines for our community and 57:54 audio pride of authorship. We looked at Wild Air Farm because we were told that people really liked the architectural guidelines and we were very similar to that. The Planning staff has asked us to go back to the drawing board and they want architectural guidelines for each individual zone that we're in and I've asked them to share is there something that's been done in Zionsville like that and there hasn't been. We've agreed to go back to the drawing board and look at how we can do that for each zone. That's not done yet. This, once again, is another showing the runway protection zones, where we are in relationship to that.

This is the map, once again, showing these different tier 1, tier 3 that the, that Hamilton County placed over here on these maps and we can see R3 is in a, in a tier 1, R2 is in a tier 2. So while their preference is that they don't put housing there or anything for that matter, there's certainly precedent. People have built in that area and it's been fine and the marketplace, the marketplace loves it. Now, we've sent people up there for two full days to sit up there, once in the summer and once in December and watch the planes – what's coming in, what's going out, is it, we don't want, we do not want a property where the planes are flying right over us. We did not have any planes that went over our property.

Let's see – I guess, I guess the last thing I'm gonna, I'm gonna close on and then Matt and I will tag team any responses. When I looked at the staff report and a very, very thorough report, well done, there are a lot of very positive things as well as about this plan and the one negative was that we don't meet the Comp Plan. That's the one negative. But if you look at on page 6, I'm just gonna pull out one thing – there's many things like this – the proposal is expected to have a positive impact on the area property values throughout the jurisdiction. Like that's what we, is our goal to always do wherever we do business and I can tell

ya we've always done it. When we put in, when we do a development, we put in a property not only does that development do well, the property values go up and we believe the property values will go up here. Quality of life is going to be great and the peoples' homes around it will, will go up in value. At the appropriate time we look forward to answering any questions you may have or respond to any comments from the public. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you. All right, at this time we'll take public comment. What I would ask is if you want, you can line up, come on up – if, if understanding you all have something, might have something to say. If what has been said already covers what you are going to say, I would request that you don't expand on it. Just say I, I agree with prior comment something because I think there's going to be quite a few people who are going to want to talk on this one. All right, go ahead.

Frye My name is Bill Frye. I'm the President of the Hamilton County Airport Authority and I'm representing Indianapolis Executive Airport at 11329 State Road 32. The first thing I'd like to do is correct a few of the things that Mr. Pittman said. Regarding Union Woodlands, of course, that was zoned R, what R2, R3 by the county, Boone County back in like 2003 something like that. So when that development came up, originally it was Arbor Homes, Silver, Silverthorne Homes came in to, to build there, there really wasn't any, it was already zoned R2. There was no way, I mean it wasn't coming up for rezoning like this property is. So it was already zoned R3. The second comment he made was the airport opposes everything. Well that's not entirely true. We oppose developments that potentially could be a threat to the population or to aircraft operation. For example, at Union Woodlands, we, we objected to the, the retention ponds there that were going to be wet ponds. Wet ponds attract geese. Geese and jet engines don't play well together. If anybody's seen the movie Sully you can attest to that. And secondly and then the last thing he said is the flight path. We have a number of tracings of aircraft that fly over that routinely. It's, it's in the traffic pattern for the airport and there will be air, there will be aircraft flying over there and it will be noisy.

So, like I said, the, the same, the same builder, Lennar, but with a different developer tried to have this same parcel rezoned in late 2021. The petition received an unfavorable recommendation by this committee to the Town Council 1:03:26 audio one vote with one member recusing themselves. And the Commission staff in 2021 made the following statement: "However, for the purposes tonight, density remains an issue and concerns staff with this project. Citing the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan of density residential development as well as considerable, consideration of responsible growth, the development in this area staff recommends an unfavorable recommendation to the Town Council" which, which this Council did give.

So what's changed? The Comprehensive Plan which incorporates the air, Airport Land Use Plan, which, by the way, was developed with HW by HWC which is the same organization that's doing your, your Comprehensive Plan now. That's still in effect. If a portion, portions of property still lie within the, the traffic pattern and the aircraft and there's still an issue with noise. That same, that same and density. The staff recommendation for the current zoning petition states that

staff is reliant upon recommendations of the Airport Plan, again, which was developed by HWC to determine desirable and appropriate uses. The proposed Airport Plan use recommendations which indicate use of this site is not residential. The staff recommended that this go to the Town Council with an unfavorable recommendation. The past attempt to rezone this property was unsuccessful by reasons of the density which has now increased than what it was in the previous one and incompatibility with the Comp, Comprehensive Plan and the Airport Plan. The current proposal has the same 1:05:11 audio as the last one that was audio and I urge you all to accept the staff's unfavorable recommendation. Thanks very much.

Franz All right, thank you.

Sachs Hi, good evening. I'm Sam Sachs, the Airport Director at the Indianapolis Executive Airport. Do you guys still require an address to be spoken when up here or just – want full address? All right – 11329 East State Road 32, Zionsville, Indiana. All right, so I just want to address, before I forget, the, the thing about the park. I do want to say first of all, I want to say thank you Mr. Pittman for actually corresponding with us. There's a lot of developments that occur in the area and, and we never hear from those developers until they pop up here. Mr. Pittman was, was kind enough to reach out to us and have multiple conversations and I think they were productive. We do appreciate the consideration of the baseball park situation and on the surface the new park does look better. We're gonna take a, a look a little bit closer at that trail to try and understand that a little bit better but it's definitely, in our opinion, much better than having a high-density baseball field situation like there was before and the lack of lights is, is a positive for us as well.

To address the, the aircraft operations thing – I'm not going to hit too much on the zoning. I know we, we kinda talked about that a little bit but I want to talk about the aircraft operations. So, at the moment, the airport averages about 115 operations a day on the runway. About 90 of those are piston engine or propeller engine aircraft with the rest about 25 to 30 a day or so are, are jet aircraft. What we're really concerned about in this situation are those propeller aircraft, specifically, ones that are landing from the south going north. So our, our runway with 36 as we call it.

There's something called an aircraft traffic pattern. If you're not familiar with that, it's basically a rectangular pattern that propeller air, airplanes specifically fly around the airport and it's really popular for flight training. If you want to become a student pilot that's what you do, you fly around the airport. This proposed neighborhood would be directly underneath what's known as the base turn in that traffic pattern which is essentially where the airplanes are turning back towards the runway. So they're flying parallel to the runway and they start to slow down and they descend and they come back towards the runway and so that's essentially where this neighborhood would be directly underneath that turn. So there would be a significant amount of aircraft noise and operations in the area, specifically, in a, a vulnerable part of flight that includes oftentimes student pilots slowing down and flying very low, probably less than 1,000 feet over the proposed houses.

So our concern is really on a safety point. As, as Mr. Frye alluded to, we just want to make sure that, that people on the ground have a, a safe place to be and putting a bunch of people and homes and families directly under a vulnerable part of aircraft flight, in our opinion, is not a safe option. So that's our main concern and thank you guys for your consideration.

Franz Before you leave –

Sachs Yeah?

Franz The base turn pattern is that over the, the proposed, proposed greenspace or is it over the estate housing?

Sachs It'd be, do we have the – I don't want to touch the computer. I don't have the exact map in front of me. Looking at it earlier, it looked like it'd be closer to the estate housing. That would probably be the most vulnerable area to, to aircraft noise. Thank you.

Fedor And are you flying that pattern currently because there are no homes in that area? As in, if there were homes there you wouldn't be practicing with people who don't know how to fly a plane too well?

Sachs They'll fly regardless. So –

Fedor That's just a standard where they go around the airport –

Sachs Correct, yeah. So an aircraft traffic pattern is, is standard across every airport, really across the world so aviators know how to fly and approach an airport regardless of where they are. So whether they're flying into Indianapolis Executive Airport or Scottsdale Airport in Arizona, they approach the airport in the exact same manner as FAA prescribed in how they do that and it doesn't matter what's underneath them, they, they approach it the same way.

Fedor Thank you.

Sachs Thank you.

White Good evening. My name is Sean White. I'm here on behalf of Jet Access. We are the primary business operator at the Indianapolis Executive Airport. Our address is 11329 East State Road 32, Zionsville, Indiana 46077. I'm kinda here speaking not only on behalf of the airport but on behalf of the businesses at the airport. We employ ourselves and alongside of Beck's about 75 employees directly but through our 100 or so tenants at the airport, support thousands of employees across the region, both in Hamilton County, Boone County and, and even other adjoining counties. It's important to kinda note, I think it's been alluded to, but the airport is one of the busiest business or general aviation airports in the state of Indiana. The only airport that gets more business aviation traffic is actually Indianapolis International. So we are busier than Gary, Evansville, South Bend, Fort Wayne, all of those airports. It's a very busy airport, a lot of activity, a lot of flight training activity and from a, from that perspective it's also a strong economic engine for every, everything – I know it's owned by Hamilton County

and folks are like well why don't, why doesn't Boone County own it? Actually, the advantage is that the tax base of Hamilton County pays for an asset that is an economic tool for everybody. Everybody has access to it just the same. It doesn't really matter where, where, where that comes from but at the end of the day, we want to be an economic partner with, with everybody that's around us and this development as has been alluded to has some concerns. It has some great elements to it that do meet the Land Use Plan but, but a Land Use Plan was put in place and, and I think those arguments have already been made.

To be clear though, kinda just to clarify on the flight path – I'm a pilot as well, what Sam said was correct. And, and even though the folks went out there for a couple of days, those could've been days where actually the opposite side of the, the airport was being used because depending on winds, is which side of the runway you use. So if you're, if the winds are coming primarily out of the north, you're going to use runway 36 and would fly over this, this area as Sam described. If winds were, were more southerly, they would've been using runway 18. I think the, the Airport Land Use Plan actually has a full map in there that shows the traffic over a much longer period of time rather than a few days. There's ADS-B data, there's plenty of data to show that this is actually in that area and that's why it was designated as such because it is in an area that we would be concerned about from that side. So we certainly want to, as a business and as, as users of the airport, want to make sure that, that we partner with the community to, to, to work with compatible land uses. This has been identified certainly high-density residential, it's not a compatible land use. The, the wet, the wet detention and other things that are, that are also proposed in, in some of the plans would be of strong concern from a safety perspective in addition to the just general incompatibility of the high-density residential. So on behalf of, of the users and the businesses that we represent, we would strongly urge a, an unfavorable recommendation going forward.

Franz Thank you.

White Thank you.

Traylor Good evening. My name is Bryan Traylor, address is 10319 East 100 North in Zionsville. I come to you with a little bit different perspective than you might hear from a lot of people, having been on the Town Council, having heard petitions similar to this. I want to talk a little bit about why this doesn't fit and I want to first say Pittmans and I we, we get along. I've supported some of their projects in the past. I can't stand beside them in this one.

So in looking at, at this development, I think it's important to know that I also sat on the, the steering committee for the Airport Land Use Study so if you have any questions about that, I'm happy to lend my knowledge on that but I also am the son of a pilot who ran our local airport in the hometown that I grew up in so I have a pretty good knowledge of airports and how they run and, and I do understand that in the title work for these properties if they were to be developed there would be information disclosing that hey, you're at the end of a runway, you should know this. I would say while that is true, I know of a lot of people that don't read their closing documents at their, at their closing and even the ones that do, I would, I would encourage you to do a FOIA request on when I was a

Counciler the number of complaints that I received from Fieldstone and Brookhaven as it stood and those same disclosures are in their title work. Quite simply, they don't care. It's, they're not looking at the document, when they move in they may know that airport's there but they don't know how much traffic is there.

I'd like to thank the staff for their unfavorable recommendation. I think that was very well thought out. I won't restate what they said but I agree wholeheartedly. It does not fit with the Comprehensive Plan and it does not fit with the Airport Land Use Study that is part of that Comprehensive Plan that we adopted as Town Council.

Some, some points on this – the fact that Union Woodlands is under development should not be an influencing factor in this. The town itself did everything in our power to stop that project from moving forward. It was an unfortunate case where that zoning was inherited by Zionsville from the county and we, unfortunately, did not catch that before the petition was filed. So we did what we could to, to stop that which was to tell them no to a PUD. If you want to develop it, you develop it as it's zoned and that's what they're doing. So, the fact that Union Woodlands is going in is not a favorable thing for the community putting houses at the end of the runway just doesn't make sense. That goes the same for that park property that is being donated. The idea, there were a lot of park ideas for that property – I'm sorry Steve wasted the time to, to look at building the, the baseball fields because I knew and I think a lot of people that watch the Council meetings knew that there was not going to be anything going on that property for the park because it's a bad idea to put people at the end of a runway. I mean it's, it's kinda, to Steve's point, talking about you all making common sense decisions, putting people at the end of a runway is kinda common sense. You don't do it. If a, if an accident is gonna happen it's gonna be on takeoff or landing, 99% of the time.

The, this decision is pretty vital to this area. You look at the natural, I shouldn't call it natural because it's not, but the obvious distinction of where rural starts and urban ends and I would say right now it looks pretty obvious that that's 300 and 421, 300 South and 421 seems to be where that cutoff exists today and I would say that if this were to be approved and moved forward, that obvious distinction is no longer there. Where does it go to? It goes to 32. So we're not opening up just this little part, we're opening up hey, it's fair game and that's the message that will be sent if this is approved is hey, rural Zionsville is now fair game and I think a lot of people out there, whether they live in the rural area or not, love the rural lifestyle and love that we have that option and it's part of what makes Zionsville unique. It's also a part of what makes all the different opinions for the, the Comprehensive Plan that's going in place now, there's a lot of different opinions and that's because there's a lot of different places and a lot of different areas, a little something for everybody in Zionsville.

Property rights are absolutely important but rezoning is not a right. That is an, that's something you can request. It's not a right, it's not my problem or your problem to make somebody else's property more valuable by rezoning it. It, it just doesn't make sense. If you look at the letters of interest, the ones that came through in favor, they either don't live in the rural area or they have property that

they want to develop themselves. So that's something to point out to you that the people that live in this area are not the ones that wrote the letters of, of support.

In closing, I'd like to ask that you affirm the staff's recommendation of an unfavorable recommendation to the Council. Do not continue this petition, please do not continue this petition. It, this is a common sense, it doesn't fit the, the Comprehensive Plan, it doesn't fit the Airport Use Study, it doesn't fit with the neighbors. This is an easy no and I will say that I'm part of the leadership team for Save Rural Zionsville. I was not part of the leadership team for Save Rural Zionsville when Bradley Ridge was negotiated but what I, what I will say is there's a reason this project isn't being negotiated and that's because it is so far from acceptable. It's not close enough to even have the negotiations on. Please, just affirm the staff's recommendation of an unfavorable recommendation to the Council. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Wright Good evening. My name is Christy Wright. My family and I live at 9301 East 180 South and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of Save Rural Zionsville and appreciate the opportunity to address you. I'm also going to refer to Save Rural Zionsville as SRZ in these remarks.

SRZ is a volunteer organization and we represent like-minded residents who seek to advocate for and protect our rural areas. We have 320 members. We live in the rural places in Zionsville, the Village and all the places in between. Our leadership team is comprised of a retired civil and aviation engineer, a farm family and large property owner, an architect with historic restoration expertise, a former Town Council member, two physicians and one of them is a Zionsville business owner. You've heard from others tonight about the many ways this petition does not conform to Zionsville's Comprehensive Plan or its current zoning and we would like to share six additional considerations.

1. We want to highlight recent community input about Zionsville's rural areas. In the town's Comprehensive Plan process, attendees across multiple input sessions identified preserving the town's Village and its rural assets as top priorities. This was such a consistent point of input that it became the first guiding principle for the Comprehensive Plan update. SRZ heard similar themes after conducting a member survey and the results should be of interest as they relate to this PUD. Eighty-four percent (84%) of respondents agreed with the current Comprehensive Plan land use goal, the principle that the intensity and density of development decreases as it is located further from the core of the town proving the relevance and importance of this cornerstone principle. Ninety percent (90%) do not think PUDs are appropriate in rural Zionsville and 96% identified high-density subdivisions as a top threat to rural lifestyle.
2. The Plan Commission has heard tonight that Pittman has worked with neighbors and groups coming up with their latest plan. As it relates to SRZ, Mr. Pittman engaged us in conversation initially but after dialogue and our own analysis including an in-depth review by our engineer, Bruce Nicholson, SRZ informed him that the petition departed so significantly from existing

zoning and the Comprehensive Plan that negotiations would not be fruitful. SRZ also asked Mr. Pittman to consider pulling his petition and resubmitting it when the town's new Comprehensive Plan is finalized. He declined. SRZ was not contacted regarding this latest version of the petition.

3. The Union Woodlands decision was based on existing zoning and not the Comprehensive Plan as Mr. Pittman said.
4. Existing residents and people considering moving to rural Zionsville need to be able to depend on unbiased sources of information such as zoning regulations and the Comprehensive Plan. They have or are considering making what is probably the biggest investment of their lives. Residents deserve a level of certainty that these ordinances and policies will be upheld and that the guiding documents will be honored.
5. At a Park Board meeting on November 13th, Steve Pittman told the Board the following regarding the recommended tier 2 land uses of agritourism and agriculture district and aspects of, of his proposed development: "The area you have in between your Comp Plan was calling for what they call agribusiness or agritourism which in the development community we say that's code for we don't want any development because nobody knows what do you do with that." He appeared to suggest that this district is not a real zoning district. Was he also suggesting the town and its consultants in this case, HWZ, HWC Engineering have not done diligent and intentional town planning?
6. The Plan Commission has heard from residents who are concerned about how low the planes fly. When the runway was extended to the south by 1,500 feet, the typical altitude for a plane landing on it from the south was lowered by about 78%. When it is extended another 700 feet in the future, the altitude will be reduced by about another 36 feet. This petition would dramatically reshape and densify this area of Zionsville, eliminating its rural character and leading to safety issues, infrastructure concerns and a myriad of other issues.

For all these reasons, we ask respectfully that the Plan Commission send an unfavorable recommendation to the Town Council. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Franz All right, thank you.

Schultz Good evening, my name is Julia Schultz. I live at 8440 Hunt Club Road. Thank you for your time and careful consideration. I know it's not always easy to balance the needs and wants of everybody when it comes to development. I'm going to go over what I'm concerned with on this.

I'm concerned with the fact that we have yet another higher density development being proposed. This one, as, as already mentioned, requires a zoning change. There seems to be no cap or attempt to control the growth rate in Zionsville right now. It appears that over the past four years, which is how long we've been here so that's my reference point, the population has increased by roughly 5,000. In a town that had roughly 28,000 residents just four years ago, that's huge. We

moved from a southern California, from southern California where high-density housing is required. That's part of the general plan every time they review it and our growth rate in our town that was very similar in a lot of ways to Zionsville was less than 1% per year. Zionsville's growth rate over the last four years has averaged 4.5%, again, a huge difference. That's alarming, especially for a town that is supposed to be rural. It's also not a sustainable rate if you expect to retain the character of our town.

Let's talk about property rights as was mentioned earlier – currently this property is zoned General Ag so you're not violating their property rights by denying this rezoning as has been mentioned before. Creating exception sets up a pattern of precedence which thereby makes it increasingly difficult to protect Zionsville from urban sprawl and overpopulation.

Let's talk about the financial aspects – while additional housing brings additional tax revenue, especially if you have multi-family units, you have to weigh that against the associated costs of higher densities and also consider more viable options that don't result in outcomes that are detrimental to the Zionsville way of life. This isn't your only option for increasing your tax revenue. We are constantly hearing about the need for commercial development to increase our tax base so let's compare some of these options. For commercial development, you add retail commercial development you get a higher tax base by you're not impacting the infrastructure the way you are with housing. Additional housing, however, increases, yes, the tax base but it also requires additional costs for additional safety personnel like Fire and Police. Also additional school resources, you need more classroom space, you need more teachers, etc. We are currently spending \$8,649 per student. We've been averaging adding population at a rate of roughly 1,200 new residents per year. So assuming that a quarter of those are kids, that could conceivably add the need for roughly \$200 per year in property taxes just for the schools so that means over a 10-year period now our property taxes would conceivably need to be \$2,000 higher. Add that to our already exorbitantly high rates. No thanks. Additional, the negative impacts on our community include added pollution, reduction in air quality, higher traffic, increased noise pollution, the loss of our town's rural and quaint characteristics.

Let's look further into the negative aspects of higher densities and increased populations. Every study I've found regarding the effects of higher densities and increased populations show a direct correlation between the following and give the following results: Increase in crime, depressing property values, not increasing them, creating the potential for triggering increased violence and political unrest as you crowd more people together, increases in the elimination of forested lands which decreases biodiversity and increases your air pollution. Places an increase on demand of resources like water, food, energy, healthcare and transportation. Our healthcare system is already overburdened often requiring long waits for appointments and surgeries. This also overwhelms the education system, overwhelms the sanitation system leading to public health decline, it leads to unreasonable traffic congestion, it decreases neighborhood involvement because when you add lower cost housing it attracts more transient residents. It's a step-up house right. The safest areas all seem to have one thing in common – very high, a very high rate of permanent residents as these people are, have a vested interest. It also affects, affects unemployment rates. I'm not trying

to be an alarmist. We've actually, my husband and I have actually witnessed this and lived through this which is why we moved here. This, the city that we loved no longer existed after all of this. No, it doesn't happen overnight and, but if you continue approving projects like this, it will eventually happen and the Zionsville we know today will no longer exist. Time and time again these PUDs provide benefits to the, to the developers to the detriment of existing residents. PUDs are supposed to provide at least every bit as much benefit to the public but I don't see that happening. PUDs by their nature are larger than other developments in the community and generate substantial demands on our public facilities, roads, schools, libraries, sewers, etc. as been mentioned.

Let's talk about the effects of placing housing in the airport path. There's been a lot of talk about the safety by the runways, noise, etc. Okay, noise is one issue but let's look at the air quality. More importantly, pollution is a major problem associated with airports. The toxic emissions including ozone are released by aircrafts containing or the toxic, excuse me – the toxic emissions including ozone that are released by aircraft include volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides which pose a serious threat to human health. These pollutants, these pollutants cause odors and health risks. Aviation emissions are transmitted in the form of sprays that our lungs cannot filter out. Constant exposure to them can cause everything from severe headaches to deadly respiratory problems and a whole host of other things like throat irritation, tightness of the chest, coughing, asthma, difficulty breathing, emphysema, bronchitis, COPD. In addition, the soot that's released as a result of incomplete combustion of these hydrocarbon mixes or it mixes with the air and can also lead to chronic lung disease, influenza and lung cancer. So do you really think it's a good idea to put this by an airport? I know people want, want to find housing but putting them at risk is not a good idea. The ultrafine particles around an airport, not just where the runway area is or the flight pattern is but around an airport contain are extremely small and they affect the lung surface area because they're so fine a larger area of your lungs. The problems that are caused by that are circulatory system damage, cellular damage, cancer, asphyxiation, etc., etc., etc. The list goes on. These are not good things.

We are not good stewards of the town development if we put people in harm's way and/or destroy the nature and character of the town that we, that, that were the very reasons that most of us moved here. Previous attempts to develop this properly, property similarly have, with even lower densities have been denied. The Comprehensive Plan updates have not been completed and we've already had numerous developments that have added or will add or will be added that will ultimately result in thousands of additional residents. Let's put the brakes on until we can absorb the recent additions and evaluate their impact.

A large number of letters were included with the staff report. Of these letters, roughly 80% of those were opposed. I'm gonna quote the Mayor because it was in our last magazine that came around, The Current magazine, "Zionsville has its own character, one that is often copied but rarely duplicated." Okay, he's absolutely right. So why would you or anyone who loves this town want to do anything that destroys our uniqueness? We don't have to change our town to please anyone. Do you know why people want to be here? It's because of our unique character. The very reason they are attracted to this town are the reasons

that will be destroyed if you continue approving these rezoning petitions, PUDs, TIFs, high-density multi-family housing projects. Residents have consistently expressed concerns over the infrastructure as well as all of the same items that are covered above. It appears that the majority of people, as mentioned before, wanting to change this town are primarily people who don't live here and who or want to sell their land and make a higher profit. Barring legal requirements and statutes, the residents that are here should always be given priority in these decisions.

With respect to higher density, lower income housing, I'm not sure what has caused the shift into a more of an entitlement mentality where we're expected to modify our town just because there are people who want to live here but can't afford to. I know or I knew I would not or I would have to work my way up to a bigger house and a nicer house, a better neighborhood. I didn't expect it right, right out of the gate. Unless your parents are rich and very generous, your first car was not a Rolls Royce. You have to earn it. Zionsville is the Rolls Royce of small towns in my opinion. If you wanna live here, you're welcome to earn it. In the meantime, there are plenty of affordable options nearby and no one is stopping anyone from earning their way. People don't have a right to live here just because they want to anymore than they have the right to expect us to provide for affordable housing. I'm not trying to be mean or unsympathetic, I'm just trying to preserve one of the few remaining jewels when it comes to small towns. I'm not opposed to neighborhoods with smaller homes, especially for seniors who, who want to downsize as long as the densities are kept low and the rural nature is retained. I think it's safe to say that the vast majority of residents are not opposed to development as long as it is properly controlled, limited and retains the town's character. While I do not live in this proposed development, I do care very deeply about the entire town and all of our residents. Most of us moved here for the same or similar reasons and I don't want to see that destroyed anywhere in Zionsville regardless of whether it's in my backyard or not. Staff has recommended a, a no again on this and I would respectfully ask that you also, I respectfully ask that you say no. Thank you.

Franz Thank you.

M. Stark Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Michelle Stark. I live at 11920 East 200 South. We are directly east of the runway. I currently reside there and have for nearly 20 years. We live on a 15-acre parcel that we do work as an ag property. Directly to my right my neighbor lives on 5 acres. Directly to my east on the north side my neighbor has 13 acres and directly to my east on the south side the neighbor has 13 acres. So this is definitely not relatable to what is currently existing in the area.

Today you'll hear from many of our members of our community. Although you will only hear from a few members, please rest assured and be aware that we do stand together as a strongly organized group referenced by representation not only here today but also by the petition relating to this request that has over 500, 500 signatures at this time that are verified signatures. We are here in numbers to express our deep concern and dissatisfaction with the ongoing overdevelopment of rural Zionsville, specifically around the 421/200/300 area. We must put a stop in place to prevent high density continued leapfrog developments such as this

proposal by Pittman Partners, especially stopping any development at the end of a runway for the second busiest airport in the state. Our ask is that you affirm the unfavorable recommendation by staff for this development. Precedence is in place due to prior petition from Lennar Homes that was zoning from ag to R3. It was affirmed unfavorable by this Plan, by the Planning Commission as well as Town Council on November 1st of 2021.

One final point I'd like to leave you with today as you consider your options: There will always be people that argue zoning is an infringement upon their freedom to build a home where they choose to build. Well, speed limits and traffic lights are also an infringement on our freedom to drive any speed we want and society has that in place because they recognize that without that we would have life safety issues as well as chaos without such limits. The same principles apply to land use and zoning. We recognize that zoning has value. We participated in those airport studies and the current Comprehensive Plan and are actively providing feedback. Who doesn't believe keeping structures out of a flood plain or keeping a pig farm out of the center of the town isn't reasonable? Or, in this case, keeping high-density housing away from the second busiest airport in Indiana or within our beautifully rural farmland? Again, we urge you to affirm the unfavorable recommendation provided by staff and help us protect the uniquely rural beauty of Zionsville. Thank you.

Franz Thank you. Can I, let me say something – I'm hearing some common themes. In an effort to kinda get this going, I mean, I know you all want to speak but if we've, if somebody's said it, we, we've heard it, we've heard it several times about end of runway, overdevelopment, all those things so let's, if you could, if you have new topics we'd appreciate it but this is just in the process of trying to get this thing moving forward. Thank you.

K. Stark Lucky for you I have a new topic.

Franz Thank you.

K. Stark My name is Ken Stark. You just heard from my better half. I also live at 11920 East 200 South, also have lived there for the better part of 20 years. And the topic I'd like to bring up that you have not heard a lot about and always seem to be an afterthought is road infrastructure. Let me just take a moment and remind this audience of the existing road infrastructure at 421 and at the intersecting County Road 200 South. This intersection is only controlled by stop signs on County Road 200 South. Turning south onto U.S. 421 from County Road 200 can be very dangerous, especially during morning and evening rush hours. You even heard the petitioner say this is a very busy area. County Road 200 South is also a major thoroughfare for area group bike rides and cyclists, cycling enthusiasts of which I am one. This, this has been documented by the uniquely Zionsville and the Comprehensive Plan work and these ongoing Planning Commission meetings. Through spring, summer and fall there is a large volume of cyclists that enjoy County Road 200 South. It also sees its share of heavy and very wide agricultural equipment during the farming season. These tractors, fertilizers and combines take up every inch of the road.

So with that in mind, now let's consider the traffic impact of the development proposed by the petitioner. In its current form, they'll have 434 units with a single unsignaled traffic outlet onto U.S. 421 and two outlets onto County Road 200 South. Per datausa.io, the average number of cars per household in Zionsville is two with most people driving to work alone. This means this development would be adding, at, at a minimum, 868 additional vehicles onto U.S. 421 and/or County Road 200 South.

Let's also consider the potential volume associated with the proposed commercial, retail and office space. These vehicles are likely to be larger in order to support those businesses. All of this volume would be emptying onto an unsignaled intersection or onto a County Road that's not designed to handle that type of volume. Additionally, per the petitioner's layouts and the reports in the, in the staff report, based on how this development is laid out, proposed units in the purple colored traditional neighborhood use block will essentially abut the south side of County Road 200 South. There is no berm and limited protection from the road. Any vehicle that would leave that road in an accident could literally end up in those units.

Furthermore, all existing residents along County Road 200 South face the road and lend to a more rural appeal. All residents in the proposed development would have the back of the buildings facing the road. That doesn't fit with the current aesthetic and would be more unsightly in this rural environment. The proposed plan also does not provide any dedicated lane, turn lanes into the development and park from County Road 200 South, again, raising more safety concerns. The petitioner says it's not their problem to plan for road infrastructure and we heard from this committee that road infrastructure improvements are "something to be solved for after the development." If and when those improvements were to happen, you're now going to infringe upon the land of existing residents on the north side of County Road 200 South because that will be the only land left to use for road expansion because the proposed development is so close on the south side. You're penalizing the residents and the landowners that are already here. The lack of planning on required road infrastructures to support the increased vehicular volume of this development alone should give everyone on this Commission concern to pause and consider a more appropriate location for this type of high-density development. I would ask that you affirm the staff's recommendation of an, of a no. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Holbrook Hello, my name is Greg Holbrook. I live at 1945 South 1100 East with my wife and my two kids. I will try and skim some of the parts that duplicate because I have unique points as well in what I wanted to say. Recently Zionsville started to update the Comprehensive Plan. The name that has been given to this process is uniquely Zionsville. And, yes, this process is still in play, in progress. What does uniquely Zionsville mean? From the Uniquely Zionsville website we see a list of topics of agreement.

There are three of these topics that I would like to discuss in the context of this development. One is that our open spaces and rural character are key assets. The second is traffic congestion is becoming a larger challenge as the town continues

to grow and the third is the small-town atmosphere and that's the part I want to hit so I will skip the rest of that point and I'm sure you've seen it. I would submit to you that this proposed PUD violates these topics of agreement. It represents a high-density development that would appear to me to be more in line with something you would see in Indianapolis. We hear that people want to move to Zionsville and I agree that that is true. However, we need to understand that they want to move to Zionsville, not to Indianapolis, not an Indianapolis mini me. We must keep the flavor of Zionsville to attract people to Zionsville. This proposed development lies in the face of proclaiming uniquely Zionsville. This is due to the high density of the development and the repetitive nature of the lots in the proposal. This development looks nothing like what we envision when we say uniquely Zionsville.

When we consider traffic, we can tell the developers know that exiting onto U.S. 421 will, will be a problem which is why they have the entrances onto 200 South. It's still going to be a problem turning left onto Michigan Road from 200 South. Many of them will turn right, go over to 1200 East, down to 300 South where they can actually get a traffic light. Is this what we want for traffic in Zionsville? Also remember that as these developments and others like it are developed, the urban portion of Zionsville is going to expand. What are currently county roads will become Zionsville streets with all the, with all the requirements entailed in that.

Small town atmosphere is a part of what makes Zionsville desirable. This PUD, P-U-D, sorry, looks nothing like a small town and the petitioner in the Exhibits 6, 7 and 8 we see wonderful pictures of houses. Most do not show another house beside it and show wooded and open areas behind the houses. We only have to look at the plan description to know that this development will look nothing like this. These houses are packed in almost barracks style. Further, in Exhibit 13, we see conceptual images of the types of common areas. It shows wooded trails where you couldn't even tell that you're in a town. That's not real for this development.

The other thing I wanted to discuss is property rights. We've talked about people being able to develop their land. These people make speculative developments and they make bad investment or speculative investments and when you make a bad investment, you lose money. You don't come to the Town of Zionsville asking to be bailed out with a development that will allow you to make money. So like all the others, I ask you to affirm staff's decision to reject or to give a negative recommendation to this petition as it is nothing unique, uniquely Zionsville. There's nothing about it. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Borman How does this work? My name is Terri Borman. I live at 2714 South 1200 East and I've been there for over 30 years. While others have talked about several other concerns with the proposed Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD, which I agree with, I'm going to discuss my concerns with the sewer infrastructure for the development. While I've talked about my past concerns with sewer construction with several new Board members, I really wanted to take the

opportunity to show you more clearly what the sewer situation – getting close?
Okay, thank you. Sewers have not –

Franz You gotta – mic please.

Borman Thank you. Sewers have not been mentioned yet tonight but there is currently no sewer infrastructure for this proposed development. While TriCo may have some plans for a sewer, the proposed sewer route from TriCo Utilities would require eminent domain against several properties. Severe hardship would be imposed if this route goes forward. I'm trying to show you a map of where the TriCo lines are. TriCo Utilities is in charge of the area and TriCo services the area east of U.S. 421 and south of County Road 200 South. So this development is within the TriCo. Above that, 200 South to the north is Hamilton Southeastern, okay? You getting close? Try the one up top.

McCullough 1:50:13 off microphone

Borman Yeah, I mean that's fine. Thank you.

McCullough Hello, I'm Melissa McCullough and I live at 11688 East 200 South. I have three points to make, about two minutes. In 2000, we chose Zionsville to live because of the schools and eventually bought a parcel of land, a cornfield, along East 200 South. My husband and I wanted to live in the country with our growing family away from the city but still close enough to be involved in as much as we wanted to with school, sports and church. We built our home and have developed our property ourselves. There has been and continues to be a lot of sweat equity put into it. I am requesting that the Commission consider the current residents along East 200 South and our rights. I am requesting that you help us to maintain our rural environment where we have invested thoughtful planning for our properties, maintaining the natural environment and considering ourselves a neighborhood already. I come home from work and see all my neighbors' homes and outbuildings, their use of their land for outdoor living, hobby farming, yards that are large enough for kids to ride 4-wheelers, go-carts, play pick-up football games and our wildlife – small deer herds that run across 200 and the field across the road from where we live. There's a sense of peace, of comfort in this area. My neighborhood is rural living and we love it. I'm asking as a current resident of rural Zionsville, please do not approve of unharnessed housing and business development on land that has been historically agriculture in Union Township. Without your protection and appropriate zoning, our rural area will quickly become overdeveloped and we will lose our rural areas, culture and what makes our area of Zionsville unique. Will you please look out for me and my neighbors when you make your decisions on Union Woodlands? Thank you.

Franz Thank you.

Elgin Hi, my name is Chad Elgin. I live on 11930 East 200 South, so just east of this proposed project.

Franz Closer to the mic please.

Elgin Okay, sorry. I need a little taller mic.

Franz Sorry.

Elgin So, I guess really what I wanted to refer to is similar points have been made but for us we, we've been in Zionsville, our kids went to school K through 12 here. We originally lived down in Austin Oaks which is a neighborhood south of this area. We grew up in a rural environment. The opportunity for us to move up into this area was great for us. We loved it. Our kids thrived in it and I couldn't imagine a better opportunity for future families to have the same thing to offer to their kids.

This neighbor, this proposed neighborhood would essentially sit right in the middle of these large acre properties that are on the side of 421 which was shown. It doesn't show it as well but on the county, county road side it's very similar. We all have larger properties and this would literally tuck right into the middle of them and you might say well, you've got the neighborhoods down around Union – yeah, but that was on 146th Street. I mean drive down 146th Street or 300, if you will, and then go up to 200 and drive on it. It's just a very different environment and it's not set up to be high density.

I just have a couple more points I want to make and I, I think a, a lot of things have been already said but the one thing I guess – sorry Roger, I didn't understand with, with in the staff report was in the, as it's described the, the mixed-use housing which has the two- and three-story townhouses in it, in that area in the airport –

Franz You're addressing us. You can't, not staff so.

Elgin Oh sorry. I just –

Franz We'll, we'll –

Elgin I want to be, I want to be respectful that I'm disagreeing with him.

Franz Okay, all right.

Elgin That's all I'm trying to do.

Franz All right, okay.

Elgin Yeah. Is, is described or to be mixed-use housing and it's described as low-rise campus style housing allowing limited residential development. So that area is currently not envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Plan to be multi-story townhouses.

And the last point I just wanted to say is, as has been pointed out, the Bradley Ridge project over on, on the Bradley property, the, the utilities do run from Hamilton Southeastern over. Those utilities run across our, our property so that sewer line will be about 900 feet across my property. We're working with HSE to come up with a plan to make this work for everybody so we're not anti-growth, we're just trying to keep the character in the area the same as it is today.

So we ask you to go with the staff report and give an unfavorable recommendation to this proposal. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Olson Hi everyone. My name is Courtney Olson. I am speaking really as a proxy for my parents, Kelly and Deena Bailey, but also as a Zionsville resident. My folks have lived on 1100 East for 35 years now. They moved in in 1985 and continue to live in the only home that they have ever purchased and owned. My sister and I were raised in Zionsville our entire lives, attended K through 12 at Zionsville Schools so I feel like I've got skin in the game too because I've got a couple kids that I can't get out of their house when I take them there. So I'm very familiar with this exact – the roads, the space, everything having grown up there and now getting to frequent it on a weekly basis.

So wanted to just touch on a few different things and my goal in this, there's been a lot of facts and a lot of very specific details. My goal in this is to really pinpoint some things that I think should draw on the conscience, not that it's not there, not that it's not front of mind but just to make sure that we're really focusing on some things that I think really matter and to not take our eye off the ball on those.

So wanting to understand, as I read through some of these documents, it appears on the surface to suggest that the, the tier 2 “strongly discouraged” for residential use, critical zone of flight runway safety protection zone. While it's supported by the airport with respect to this proposed development, it's seemingly being reevaluated by the Town of Zionsville. This is evidenced by the town providing Mr. Pittman with an opportunity to propose his development for consideration on a site that has been “strongly discouraged” for residential use. And I understand tonight there were some changes proposed and now there's going to be a field for people to be on rather than homes to live on a few feet away. With that being said, this allowance stands in contrast to documented statements found on the Airport Area Strategic Land Use Plan in the executive summary specifically, I found this online on the town website, specifically on page 8 under the new development and overflight areas, the area that I'm specifically referencing just to quote it says: “Since the rough draft of this document was published, the Zionsville Plan Commission has approved a proposed development in the flight path south of the airport. Although development was not desired at this site, the Plan Commission had no legal grounds to reject the development proposal since it had the required zoning.” I understand this was the other neighborhood that is like water under the bridge. But with that being said, approval of this development is a unique situation and is not intended to set a precedent. The goal remains that development in an overflight area should be prohibited. I'd like to repeat that last statement though. The goal remains that development in overflight areas should be prohibited.

Based on that specific statement, I'm sure that you can understand why my family and I are confused and concerned that Mr. Pittman has been afforded the opportunity to have this development considered multiple times and iterations given that prohibited can be defined as forbidden a/k/a no, a/k/a not gonna happen because it feels like it's still being considered to happen. With that being

said, I'd like to touch on quality of life. I'm skipping ahead – as you can see, so many good things were said. I've crossed them off trying to not be too redundant over here.

Quality of life – I know that that was brought up earlier. I know some specific things were mentioned. I know you had said different health concerns that could be brought up. We also have quite a few links to articles and published medical research if anyone is interested we're happy to share those. Wanting to share that there is certainly some worrisome research that we found just even by Googling around that there are certainly negative health impacts that can cause, that can be caused by chronic exposure to aircraft noise, aircraft emissions to the residents living beneath flight paths and within close proximity. Children specifically, there are studies that have revealed elevated blood lead levels, impaired learning abilities, delayed cognitive function and respiratory issues, especially in children with diagnosed asthma. With adults there's been a variety of other issues, all of which can potentiate reduced heart health. One of these articles was published in Forbes, numerous medical journals, again, happy to share and not get into it. I am not an attorney, a doctor, a pilot, none of those things. I do just happen to be able to pull on heartstrings occasionally with smart details.

Okay, one other thing I wanted to touch on and piggyback on what Mr. Stark had shared – having driven 421, 200, 1100 over the years, I think it's important to note there are countless school-aged children that are also traveling on those roads. We have at least 15 school-aged children that we know of that are currently residing on 1100. Keep in mind that number does not include anyone on 200, we just aren't familiar with all the folks living on there but are certainly happy, certainly happy to tab those numbers. We also don't know how many kids are going to come to live within Union Woodlands and with that the anticipation of additional buses that are going to be required to navigate that already dangerous intersection and the lack of infrastructure that we know whether it's going to be addressed after, never, however is currently not in place to support.

On the topic of buses, there is a parcel of land that the school owns on 1100. It's rumored to be for transportation, a transportation barn. If, in fact, that is true, that is going to catapult bus traffic to the fact that that intersection is already going to go from a hot mess to just completely over the top concerning and dangerous with the stop signs.

Another third point that I have is Hopper Trucking Company, it's one of my folks' neighbors, great people, they have been lifelong Zionsville residents. They reside on 1100 East. They own multiple semis and they are traveling on a daily basis down 1100 onto 200 onto 421. So I know we've talked about the combines, we've talked about the cyclists, we also have semis traveling on a very consistent basis on those roads. So no matter if you are a kid riding in a car, a student riding on a bus, a cyclist on the road, however it is, 200 is not set up for success in any capacity in current state let alone if we add a whole bunch more people trying to get anywhere, whether it's through or to a new home.

So with those things being taken into account, in our opinion, we are very thankful to hear that the staff's recommendation is unfavorable tonight and we certainly hope that that can be affirmed. In our opinion, to recommend anything

otherwise we feel as though it'd certainly be a disregard for safety and certainly hope that this recommendation can come and be shown as a strong message to send that rural neighbors, both current, historic as well as prospective developers that Zionsville will not now or ever compromise on the safety of its people. So thank you so much for your time. I appreciate it.

Franz Thank you.

Borman Okay, just to reiterate, my name is Terri Borman. I live at 2714 South 1200 East and I've been there for well over 30 years. So these are the sewer concerns I've already mentioned. There's currently no sewer infrastructure for the proposed development. The proposed sewer route from TriCo Utilities would require eminent domain against several properties and there will be, severe hardship would be imposed if this route goes forward. So this is the current TriCo sewers where it shows where there's a forced main going down 421. There's main gravity sewers throughout the different subdivisions north of 300 South and south of 300 South as well as the interceptor which is a gravity feed interceptor that's 10 to 15 inches. And this is where the proposed development would be with Union Woodlands already approved and they're currently using a lift station that will hook up to the main gravity line in either the Brookhaven or the other subdivision to the south of there.

Okay, so I wanted to show the Plan Commission how this project would impact me and others around me if TriCo Utilities proceeds with their current plans to service this PUD. This slide show shows the previous route that TriCo was planning on utilizing with Union Woodlands and it is the current plan for this development also per the TriCo Utilities information on their, on their website and agendas. If you look at it, the red line I've highlighted is the proposed sewer route okay? And to the, all the way on the I'll say the, I don't know how it look – the left side of the, of the, of the thing is 300 South, to the bottom of the slide is 1200 East and then 200 South is off the page to the right. The blue line is a creek that meanders through all of our properties. So while I'm gonna focus on my property, it should be noted that the sewer placement is also negatively impacting my neighbors to the south with regards to their ability to build their dream home on their building site. They have put this off for a year again because of this development and then to the north, my neighbors to the north with their property being so close to the sewer route, which includes their home and their pool, etc.

Okay, so going on then to my property the next slide – okay, this is my property and if we look at this, keep on going, one more time – it does require private property to be condemned. They, they are requesting a 30 to 40-foot-wide, 600 feet long easement against my property and it should be noted that the amount of land they want for the sewer easement is equivalent to five building lots in the proposed PUD. It requires the destruction of mature trees and if you look at this slide, this, this photo, I abut up to Fieldstone to the west of me and you can see all of their homes through all the tree line so I don't have a lot of woods coverage there. They basically want to destroy half of my trees to put the sewer line. Those trees block both noise and light from that subdivision. So it results in, results in the loss of the noise and light buffer. It also, they told us it was going to take six months to install this sewer line. So it's going to require six months of noise, disruption and invasion of our properties and our homes during the construction.

I have a horse property. It's completely fenced to the tree line. I constantly walk my dogs through that property all of the time and it's just not going to be possible to enjoy that. I mean I moved out there for the rural area. And it does require a permanent easement for future service of the sewer okay?

And while I'm concerned with the overall use of my property for sewer placement, I'm even more concerned about how the sewer will be constructed, installed on my property due to the creek placement. As you can see by the picture, my property is landlocked by the creek, okay? The plan is to bore underneath the creek to get into my property, bore back underneath the creek to get off of my property okay? There's been no definitive communication from TriCo on how they will conduct the installation of the line, i.e. equipment, material, personnel, etc. One individual mentioned that they may need a temporary easement from County Road 200, 1200 East down the entire 1,500 foot plus length of my property to access the sewer, the sewer line construction site. If that would happen, if that were to happen, which I sure hope it doesn't, it would cause extreme hardship for me and my property. It would be within 50 feet of my house, it would be within 5 feet of my backyard fence. There is no driveway for the last 700 feet of the path. My driveway is not wide enough, made for construction semi-trucks with material and equipment to traverse the entire length of my property. It's not intended for this. In addition, I have an access gate okay? It's going to require it to be left open for months and I will tell you this – my neighbor and I both have access gates, we have it as a security buffer, not just for people but for our livestock. We have had occasions where, accidents happen, I mean I think his horse one time, he had a new horse and it got spooked and it jumped over the fence. Without that gate on my property, they would've been on the road and with the traffic we have anymore, that is a severe safety concern. That's why we have the gates. It requires access to my property by multiple construction workers losing all my privacy and security that I really respect and enjoy on my place.

In addition, it requires even more trees to be destroyed and access for future service of the service line is an issue. Are they always going to have to traverse the whole length of my property to work on this sewer line? Definitely concerned.

There are sewer route alternatives. Unfortunately, they cost money. One of the routes is to utilize the road frontages. You got U.S. 421, you can see there. We talked about County Road 1200 East and those should be considered even if the costs are higher. Per TriCo, they looked at 1200 East and it was going to cost \$400,000 more, they declined it. Said we'll just, we'll just do, do eminent domain. They are having a Union Woodlands lift station, use it. Utilize easements from the subdivisions to the south and lastly, Bradley Ridge is using a sewer line from Hamilton Southeastern, why don't we try to tap into that? I use these sewer route alternatives as just talking points. My belief is that's down the road if this development goes forward. Personally, I am requesting that The Reserve at Union Woodlands PUD project receive an unfavorable recommendation from the Zionsville Plan Commission. Thank you for your time.

Franz

All right, thank you.

Leffler Good evening. My name is Sherri Leffler. I live at 1850 South 1200 East with my family including my husband and children. I grew up in Zionsville and have lived in Boone County the majority of my life. In 1950, my grandparents purchased their 40-acre farm which is now the site of Pleasant View Elementary, so I have a long history with the Town of Zionsville. In fifth grade, my family moved slightly north and I had to attend Union Elementary. I remember vividly when it came time to go to junior high, even though I had gone to school with the Eagle Elementary kids for several years, my classmates and I from Union were labeled the farm kids by the Eagle kids and it was kind of, we were the hicks because we came from the rural part of Zionsville.

In 2008, we had the opportunity to move back to Zionsville from the Thorntown area. We bought a home on 3 acres on the west side of 146th Street that adjoined my parents' property. The homes in that area at that time were on large parcels and the three nearby subdivisions were small as in the amount of houses with large lots and custom estate-style homes. Over the next couple of years, larger subdivisions were added and others were expanded in the areas south and west of our previous home. Traffic increased dramatically and we decided we wanted to pursue our dream of owning a hobby farm. Our search took a few years, as in Zionsville everybody knows it's hard to find acreage, before we found our current property in 2015. It was a perfect home or perfect area with homes on large acreage surrounded by working farms and equestrian facilities. To build our home, and I will say, we stretched ourselves to even get to that property but to build our home we had to subdivide the original property into two parcels of 13 acres each which we had one and our neighbors had the other. We encountered a substantial expense during this process. It involved requesting an exception to build in an ag area and due to the existing buildings on the property and in the general area, we had a height and square footage requirement. So, I'm no stranger to coming before the Planning Commission and the Zoning Commission. There were specific guidelines. Requirements included renderings of a home that was comparable to the existing homes in the area in both size and appearance. Acknowledgement of building in the area, immediate area of the airport was required. The process to build one home on large acreage in this area involved several meetings for approval and there was a big focus on fitting in with this area.

We choose to live in a rural area where our neighbors don't just live next door. These friends, neighbor, friends and neighbors live on 1100 South, 1200 South, 200 South, Little Eagle Creek, Joliet Road, etc. When we have a neighborhood party, it's in a local barn. Like many of our neighbors, we operate equestrian and hobby farms. We have hayfields, keep bees, along with chickens, ducks, horses and maintain a large garden. We share our eggs, honey, produce and hay with family, neighbors and our suburban friends. Three of our four children were 4-H, 10-year 4-H members. My grandfather's original tractor is part of our farm. He would've been proud to see a farm operation like ours. Our methods support organic and maintain natural habitats. We have eagles regularly on our property, deer, racoons, turtles, cranes, woodpeckers, etc. to name just a few. Family, friends and visitors comment often on the beauty of our area and on our property. A truck driver to our property recently stated that his dream is to work towards having a property like ours to raise his three sons. We attended an event at the Hopwood Vineyard recently and spoke with numerous people there. None of

them were Zionsville residents but they loved the opportunity to attend an event in the rural area and remarked on the beauty. I think all of us understand that growth is inevitable but we are simply asking that the rural character of Union Township be taken into consideration when growth occurs. I appreciate your time to allow me to speak and I'm asking for an unfavorable recommendation. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Roebken Good evening, my name is Tim Roebken. I reside at 240 South 1100 East, Zionsville, Indiana. I support many of the comments that were made tonight. I want to thank Mr. Traylor for his comments tonight. He echoes my feelings as well. The only thing I would add, we had people talk tonight about where is this ag economic development area that's grown that's currently there we have to only look at Hopwood Winery. It's there. It's ag development, it's ag econ and I think that's what this was intended for. If you approve this development, that will never have an opportunity to be developed like that. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you.

Metzler My name is Jim Metzler. I'm at 11280 East 200 South. Mr. Pittman, I, from your words earlier, I'm a businessman so I appreciate wanting to maximize the value of your properties but at whose expense? And I think what we're all saying is we wish you the best but not in my house. Everyone else has been pretty much talking about, we've been talking about the what if. I want to talk about the what is and I'm saying that because I realize that the Union Woodland addition we can't stop now but I, my address is 11280 East 200 South. Union Woodland is 11281 East 200 South. Their driveway is across the street from my driveway. So I'm living that right now, literally across the street Union Woodlands station. You may recall that my wife and I built our home 35 years ago. I'm starting to see I'm the, I'm the real old guy because 35 years ago we built our house out there and even the airport was a, a putzer plane place that didn't have the commercial jets and things and so I long for those days but that's not going to happen either.

You may be tired of hearing from me but I thought I'd give you the update on Union Woodlands. It's not the same addition that we're talking about but, in fact, it's smaller with the numbers, it's like half of the size, less than half of the size. I think they said it, it's 193 units, 183 units and we're talking 434 units if we add all those and you add x2 cars a piece, we're talking hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of cars on that little bitty road. My point here is it's, it's not the same. In fact, it's smaller but it should be, it should give some indication of how these folks, I say these folks, not you in particular, but these construction companies treat their neighbors. Since they've begun which is probably a month or two ago across the street from me, our home is nearly unlivable. At 6 a.m. almost every morning they have to fire up all the huge commercial diesel engines waking up the entire neighborhood. I don't know why they have to fire them up so early because they don't start working for another hour or two but I, I think it's just to annoy me maybe. Semis are constantly blocking the entire street while they unload their equipment. My wife has often not been able to get out of our own driveway because of the semis and you try to wave at them and ask for – they

don't care. You, you wait until they're done and then I can leave my own property. The mud and the mess all over the road is like sitting in the middle of a pig pen. Large clumps of that dirt wash into my driveway every day. I have to wash my car nearly daily because of the filth on the road and, and, and in and around our house. For 35 years we didn't have that problem but we sure do now. Once they, if they were to get your blessing to move forward with this, with this project, they don't care about anyone else after that. I tried to walk across the street to express my concerns and was nearly run over, literally. He wasn't going to talk to me and he wanted me to get out of his way. Looking out my front porch where we used to be able to watch the birds, watch the squirrels, watch the deer, watch the beautiful nature, now looks like a warzone. I tried to take some pictures – I have pictures on my phone but I, I was going to share them with you but it, it's unbelievable. Add all of this to the insufficient infrastructure, the stress this will create on the schools and all the other public services and I don't see how you can with a clear conscience vote in favor of this project. I'd invite you to come out and visit me someday and see what we're having to live through right now. If you had to put up, if you had to put up what my wife and I have to put up with every day, you'd never even give this request a second thought. Please confirm the unfavorable recommendation. Thank you.

Franz Thank you.

Wietholter Hello. I'm Garret Wietholter. I live at 2400 South U.S. 421. I'm old school, so I like to print things out instead of using a computer but my house is right here where this little sticker is and I'm just going to talk about the Michigan Road block. So if I'm reading this correctly, the proposal is way too loose currently. It talks about townhouses in the 421 overlay and we know businesses are going to go there but in the block it also references this could be a variety of housing options, assisted living, independent living, townhouses, commercial, professional offices, retail, single and multi-story and this proposal does not outline the intended use. So we have the 421 overlay which allows the businesses but the Michigan Road block it's proposed to do townhouses but it could be much more. So I'm asking you to make sure you verify what's going to be in that area. And I don't know if everybody saw the article in the Indianapolis Star last week concerning Carmel, we'll go with the city the other way – City Councilor Jeff Worrell, at large, City Council Member "he now regrets his previous votes in favor of townhouses developments in certain areas of Carmel." Second quote – "I don't think I understand the aesthetics, the feel of the neighborhood and how it's different when you have townhouses versus detached single-family homes." So I'm asking you to vote unfavorable for the development.

Franz All right, thank you.

Shappaugh Good evening. My name is Anna Shappaugh. I live at 11779 East 200 South. My home is the first home directly east of what would be Union Woodland Reserve and then Union Woodlands and so as somebody who is that first property after it, I've paid extensive attention to both the site development plan and then the staff's report and I want to commend the staff for doing a thorough job. I think there were a lot of factors analyzed and things taken into consideration that make sense, one of which was the density of the surrounding homes, neighborhoods and businesses. You looked at it and this proposal calls for 2.94 units per acre

where the first adjoining neighborhood has 0.78 and so while I agree that that is grossly over the density that's surrounded in those neighborhoods, I'd like to call into point two other considerations that I don't think have gotten enough attention.

Agritourism is a real thing over there. If you look at this property, within 0.25 miles and/or directly attached or across from it you will find five agritourism businesses. You'll find Circle City Trees which is a tree farm. You'll find a driving range, a winery, and two regenerative farms in Wonder Tree and Watch Us Grow. If you look at the map of the things that were considered as they were factored into density, it just so happened to stop at Union Woodlands but if you go just a quarter of a mile over to the east and go to 1200, you're going to see homesteads on 3 to 20-acre lots. Most of us have livestock, crops or horses.

Tonight it was talked about market demand and meeting the market needs. So yesterday I went on Zillow and said what's available? Forty-six (46) houses in Zionsville, 47% of them were in the price range of \$400,000 to \$800,000 which is my understanding where most of these houses will be built. You can read the letters of interest and it will tell you we need more affordable housing in Zionsville, I want to move back to Zionsville yet I would ask is \$400,000 to \$700,000 affordable for the people that want to move back here that are living in apartments or will they continue to go to Westfield and Indianapolis and Whitestown where it truly is more affordable?

So I said okay, 47% of the houses between \$400,000 and \$800,000 – how long have they been on the market? Some of them up to 112 days. Some of them had taken \$10,000, \$20,000 and \$40,000 price drops. So my point is that if you want to afford an \$800,000 house, they're out there. So then I tried to say, okay, how many houses on 1 to 5 acres under \$2 million? Do you know how many there were? Zero. So what is the real market demand and what is the real supply issue? Is it \$400,000 to \$800,000 houses which currently represent 47% of the houses available or is it the people in this room and the 124 pages of letters of interest that were proposed or the people at the Comprehensive Plan meetings that are telling you the only thing that makes Zionsville unique is greenspace. The only thing that makes Zionsville unique is that we have a place for people like myself, though my 4-year-old he had to go home and go to bed tonight but he told me he was going to come up here with me tonight because he wanted to be a leader and he wanted to talk to you about how our lifestyle allows him to raise chickens and vegetables and work and gain real skills and so I would just ask you is there a place left for us in Zionsville because if this is voted yes it doesn't feel like there is. Why? Not because I'm against development, not because I don't think Zionsville should grow. Zionsville is the best community in the state but I think that we owe it to our community to build something that enhances the lifestyle of the people that live here.

So I'm a visual person and I heard Mr. Pittman say that no planes fly over this piece of land and I thought well, if that's true then maybe it makes sense for this development to go here but if a visual doesn't represent that, maybe he could agree that that's not the best place for this to go. So I would like to present this visual that shows the airport traffic. So right here in the middle you'll see there's the Indianapolis Executive Airport.

Franz You want to be showing us.

Shappaugh Sorry. Here's 421 and here's 200 South. This arrow here points to the approximate range that these flights and these airplanes go over. This is the proposed development. Now I'm not a civil engineer so my drawing is certainly not 100% to spec but common sense shows you that not only is this area black because there's so much air traffic here, you can see, as the airport said, it's also where these planes turn and I had no idea that we were actually allowing people who were training to get their pilot's license there to make those turns but now that I know that it seems like even more of an egregious stretch.

My fear is if this development gets approved and this PUD is allowed in this area, where does the line go for what's sensible development and what is realistic for this community? Ultimately, it's your guys' decision to, to decide what goes here tonight and I heard Mr. Franz say that it's a vote, either way they're not approving it and I would respectfully disagree with that because my understanding is that if you give it a favorable recommendation, it goes to the Town Council and they have to vote on it as is and so as you've heard from the community tonight and multiple experts who are way smarter than I am, that is an irresponsible decision.

Franz Let me just make a comment on that. We've sent stuff to the Plan, to the Town Council with approve, with favorable recommendations that have been turned down and we've sent stuff that's had unfavorable. Generally they follow the unfavorable but they, they don't always follow the recommendation that comes from us.

Shappaugh So if –

Franz Ours is a, ours is a recommendation only based upon the input of this panel. They do not have to follow it.

Shappaugh But if you recommend it, can modifications be made after you recommend it?

Franz Yeah.

Shappaugh Substantial modifications? Was that a no Mr. Taylor?

Taylor That's a no.

Shappaugh Okay.

Franz I'm just saying it's like it, it's, it's we will, I mean, we're, this, there's conversation tonight – there's going to be another discussion with the petitioners, we're going to ask questions, they're to answer questions that came up –

Shappaugh Sure.

Franz So there's, I mean he's already stated, I mean and I'm not saying anything – he's already stated that they're willing to modify this thing so this thing's not done as to what would be going towards the Town Council at this point in time.

Shappaugh Great and I'm, I'm glad that we got clarity on that because my impression on your original statement was that this decision tonight didn't really hold a weight one way or another and I just wanted to make sure we all understood that it does hold weight.

Franz No, all I said was we're not the one, the Board that's approving the zoning.

Taylor You're not the final.

Franz Right. We're not the one who is making the final approval that's what my intention was.

Shappaugh Thank you. So, I'm going to conclude by saying that we're not, not in my backyarders even though it appears that way but many of us did buy homes predicated on the Airport Study and I think those taxpayer dollars and that time means something and if you look back to the Plan Commission meetings from 2021, you will find multiple Plan Commission members stating that it was an irresponsible decision for Union Woodland to be approved and if they could do it all over again, it would never be approved. And so what I would ask is that you take that into consideration tonight and you give this an unfavorable recommendation. I will say, Mr. Pittman called me last week and we had a great conversation, we actually had multiple. He was very amenable to taking feedback and meeting with people who had a vested interest in this project moving forward and so I also saw the staff report mention that maybe we should hold some sort of community meeting and take community input or at least there was something that indicated that community suggestions should be taken in one part of the staff report, so I thought. And so if that's the case, that's what I would ask is because everybody in this room wants what's best for Zionsville. Everybody in this room wants something that's going to enhance the lifestyle of the people who live here and the people that wanna come here and so with that, I will ask you to affirm the staff report and give this an unfavorable recommendation. Thank you.

Franz Thank you.

Fraser Just when you guys thought you were done. My name is Donald Fraser, I'm at 702 South 1200 East and really this is my property. It's just that. We chose, we, as many people have said, we chose the area that we live in for a reason. We didn't choose it to be built up. We knew there was an Airport Study, we knew that what that meant that there wasn't going to be development and this proposal is contrary to that so, again, I ask that you support that. I have, there are needs that are medical, there are needs that are beyond mention here that, that just support why we live where we're at and to take that and to change the culture and the environment of where we live is what this proposal is, is supposing and so I ask, again, support the plan. Thank you guys.

Franz All right, thank you. All right, at this point I'm going to close public comment. So, would the petitioner like to respond to the comments that have been made and then we'll open it up to the Plan Commission for questions.

Price Yes, thank you Mr. President. For the record, my name is Matt Price. I'm the attorney for the petitioner, Pittman Partners. Steve and I and, and my colleague, Suzanne Baker, took extensive notes with regard to each one of the comments but I'll do my best to respond to some of the highlights and some of the items that were, I think, mentioned repetitively because they're top of mind and I think of most importance to the individuals that had the opportunity to speak tonight.

Because we have a very different take perhaps on the process and, and the genesis really of the Airport Study and I think it's really important for this petitioner and the due process that he seeks as well as for the broader community to kinda understand the context of the, the Airport Study and, and, and it couldn't have been perhaps a better segway than maybe the last speaker who referenced and I, I take him at his word, referenced the Airport Study as being an indicator that there would not be future development and I want to say that I went to most of the meetings regarding the Airport Study and it's actually quite the contrary. The reason why there was an Airport Study is because there was going to be future development, profound future development. And what the Airport Study did was outline and give suggestions for how the conflict that would inevitably arise between new development and existing property owners and, in particular, the airport which has its own vested interest and it allocates responsibility to everyone, really everyone in this room, to how we resolve that conflict between a development proposal and the needs of the community and the needs of the airport.

And I note first off that with all due respect to the, to the airport as an entity, they had three or two and then one affiliated party speak in opposition to the proposal and I do want to say that under the terms of their grants and financing, they have legal obligations to essentially use good, good faith efforts to oppose development in their vicinity and they've done so on every opportunity here in Zionsville, most recently submitting a letter against Bradley Ridge, a project with \$2 million dollar plus homes and less than one unit per acre gross density and they wrote an extensive letter suggesting the parade of horrors that would happen from this development would happen as a result of Bradley Ridge as well and with all due respect to their views, they simply don't have a great deal of credibility when they paint with such a very broad brush attacking every single development proposal that comes before the Town of Zionsville that's within eyeshot or earshot of the airport.

With regard to the specifics of the, the Airport Study, I wanted to highlight just a few key things because we've gone to great efforts to try to prepare a, a cohesive and cogent development proposal and, in particular, what I want to note is that the, the western portion of our project, so in the southwest portion of our project, that area is located within the campus housing recommended use in the Airport Study and that same campus housing area extend, it actually widens as you go further north up 421 and takes in dozens and dozens of acres that contemplate some form of multi-family housing. The campus housing term is explained a little bit in the study but it's not defined anywhere, anywhere else. It's not

defined in Zionsville's Zoning Ordinance, for example. And so what Mr. Pittman has done through this proposal is prepare a, a proposal where, where we incorporate the elements of that campus housing component and then try to weave in single-family housing options that transition as you, as you go further east against the existing development that is around the property today including the previously approved Union Woodlands project. And we understand that that rezoning occurred when it occurred and a plat was subsequently approved for the property under, under the town upholding the law by doing so but it is a real factor in terms of influencing this particular project and the development pattern that surrounds this particular project. I should also add that unlike the Union Woodlands project, this project is actually to the west of the runway. It's outside of the runway protection zone and unlike Union Woodlands which had an area that was directly in line with the runway and, in fact, that park area, the undeveloped park area is immediately adjoining that runway area and so our project was laid out specifically in contemplation of the physical improvements and potential future planned improvements to the airport.

With regard to kind of some of the ideas about process and I think individual property rights that were mentioned, I do want to note that the Airport Study when it identified the particular areas of recommended land use, for example, the agritourism section, the campus housing section and then talks and then, and then later establishes the tiers where the campus housing section is in the tier 3 and the single-family section, our single-family section is in the tier 2, what the, what the Airport Study goes on to identify though is that there, there are additional steps that need to be taken to put in development requirements to reconcile the inevitable conflict that will occur between development proposals that are naturally going to go, come to the town because of where these properties are located, what has already been developed around them and where the market is going to seek to locate additional housing opportunities and so what it contemplated were, was that there would be additional enactments to Zionsville's Zoning Ordinance that did things like established appropriate densities, established building material requirements for noise abatement, established standards for lighting and in each one of those cases, we've attempted through our development proposal to identify those development require, requirements to make it compatible with an adjacent airport and so we have limitations, for example, on lighting. We have requirements for specified building materials with regard to noise. There are other requirements in the or statements in the, in the Airport Study about whether additional safeguards can be provided to homeowners about putting them on notice and those were all things that were contemplated to be additional steps provided so that we could go forward with development proposals but do so in a way where conflict could be resolved between and among the property owners, the neighbors and certainly the airport and its concerns.

I did want to note just a couple of other what I think are key items that were mentioned with regard to the proposal. With regard to road conditions on, on County Road 200, I think it's important to understand that this development proposal because it is a rezoning is required to do a traffic impact study and so part of that traffic impact study is recommended improvements to County Road 200. That would include accel and decel lanes, turning lanes, passing blisters. Our study also indicates that there will likely be a future signalization of the

intersection of County Road 200 and Michigan Road largely driven by other projects and activity along Michigan Road. This certainly would be a contributing factor to that but that's already something that's on the radar of the officials that are responsible for regulating traffic along, along U.S. 421 and, and you can see as development has continued to occur along U.S. 421, there have been those additions made with regard to travel lanes. There have been additional signalization and one of the, one of the comment letters even noted that, that the signal at County Road 300 and U.S. 421 was helpful to her because it gave her a, a clearer opportunity to make a lefthand turn from her, from the intersection I think at County Road 200 and, and U.S. 421. And so those type of improvements continue as additional investment is made along the Michigan Road corridor and our belief is is that there will continue to be additional investment along U.S. 421. There are large areas of land that are held by individuals with reasonable investment backed expectations and the Airport Study does not foreclose or prohibit future development. What it does is it lays the foundation so that future development can be evaluated against the criteria that it articulates as well as it contemplates additional development standards that can be published to help all of us navigate the land development issues that are, that that will, that will be addressed as proposals come forward.

Look through my notes here real quick – we did, I know Steve mentioned this during his case in chief but I think it is very important to, to realize kind of along those lines with infrastructure that the staff notes that raising property values throughout the jurisdiction would be the outcome of this project that's in part, I think, directly tied to the understanding that the project will bring infrastructure in terms of sanitary sewer improvements and transportation improvements to the area and I do agree, I will say this – I do agree that Zionsville is the best community in the state and I think that's due in no small measure to the work of this town and this Plan Commission in particular. I welcome the two new members. In my opinion, you're joining an august Board that has done an excellent job of governing our town and, and regulating land use here over the last several decades and, and the result of it, the proof in the pudding, if you will, is the fact that so many people do want to live here and there is the development pressure that's being brought to bear here and Mr. Pittman has been a part of that story, a part of that legacy in our community.

He brings a very different project and I'll close with this – he brings a very different project than what was denied with regard to the Lennar proposal a few years ago. First of all, it doesn't involve the exact same properties. That project involved the driving range. This project includes the Arch Diocese but not the driving range. That project had no significant architectural commitments whatsoever. Mr. Pittman's proposal, in my, in my knowledge, is only the second Planned Unit Development that has specific architectural standards with regard to single-family housing that's been presented in Zionsville. It goes further and specifies noise abatement for the, the use of building materials on the roof and the exterior. The, the, the Lennar project I've looked at those plans before and I was at those hearings when that was being considered, provided no significant connectivity either internally or externally. This project has a very robust internal pathway and sidewalk connections as well as connections to the park. So it's a, it's a far superior project to that of Lennar and that's, that is evident by a review of the proposal.

Having said all that, we've received comments from Boone County Highway Department as late as Friday afternoon, I think it was. We would welcome the opportunity to receive additional comments and, and Mr. Pittman has an open mind and I'm sure would be willing to consider making additional amendments and adjustments and also he is willing to talk to any member of the public that would like to speak with him about the proposal or, or modifications to it. He wants it to be a successful project and I think, I told Steve this when we were preparing last Friday, Steve did an excellent job of working with the neighbors around his project at 116th Street and Michigan Road and that's a really, a testament to his approach and his willingness to listen and he would bring that same, those same qualities to this project as well and so we're anxious to receive your feedback and to keep working on this project. Thank you.

Franz All right, thank you. At this point I'll open it up to members of the Plan Commission.

Fedor Why is everyone looking at me?

Franz I'm just looking around.

Fedor What are you guys looking over here for?

Franz Let me, let me do one thing first – so the, the people mentioned the school, Mr. Pittman mentioned that he talked to the school and basically said they'll factor it in and I know Roger you basically confirmed what Mr. Pittman said. The school does not provide impact reports like they did maybe 5, 10 years ago.

Kilmer That is correct. We, we've spoken specifically with the school not about this project but just projects in general as to when new residential is being proposed, how do they want to be informed of that? How do they want to respond? And, and currently for those in the public that are not familiar, one aspect that every project goes through is a review by what is called the Technical Advisory Committee for the town. That includes all the town's departments, that includes utility providers, that includes the school, that includes many, many different aspects. Everyone is going to be looking at a project from their perspective and the school, as I mentioned, is a member of the TAC committee and as they have responded to us, they said every project that comes in we receive your email along with the attached items for each individual project. We're going to review it but we are not going to make a, a special study about it because we are going to be prepared for whatever comes our way. We're, we're going to plan for that so they historically, up until just a few years ago, may have provided comments specifically on projects. They no longer do that. They just say that we are going to be prepared. We will handle whatever comes into our school system.

Franz And I just thought that's important that members of the public know that because this was something that we do go back, have tried to get that information, because we hear this quite a bit that the schools, the schools are impacted but they have an opportunity to weigh in and until most recently they just, they don't give us any feedback. So I just wanted people to understand that. Josh, were you gonna go?

- Fedor Oh, I, I guess I can start. A few things I – is there any restrictions on rentals in this PUD? As far as rental homes and if, if there isn't can we look at doing something along those lines?
- Price There, there is not any proposal on occupancy, I mean there's no occupancy restrictions in the current proposal. I don't know what Steve's experience has been with that but we've dealt with that in some other, other proposals certainly.
- Pittman Yeah, for the record, Steve Pittman with Pittman Partners. Josh, I, I was anticipating a question like that and recently a proposal has gone through Carmel where the exact same thing occurred and a proposal was brought forth by the petitioner. It was a big builder about how to handle that and so I have that propose, I, I have what they wrote up and so we will be prepared to address that.
- Fedor Great, great, great. And we're looking at around 2-1/2 or 2.9 homes per acre. Can you give me another example of an R3 subdivision in the Zionsville area that, where Union Woodlands is technically zoned R3 it looks like it's coming in more like a 1, 2 – what was it? Is there another subdivision in the community that's like an R3 that I can kinda get my head around?
- Price I think it's an R4 but the Epcon community that's immediately north of the St. Alphonsus Church.
- Fedor Okay and then on –
- Price Can I comment on that a little bit maybe just a little more?
- Fedor Sure.
- Price Part of the reason why there's a, a probably a paucity of, of comparable subdivisions although if given a few more minutes or maybe a day or so I could come up with some more is that historically prior to consolidation, what Zionsville did is an adjoining property development would petition to be annexed into Zionsville and you would receive the default zoning classification which was an R-SF-2 so that's why you don't see a lot of R2s or R3s around. There's a few but not, not very many.
- Fedor And then finally on the, the townhomes I know when we looked at the townhomes at Appaloosa Crossing we kinda, initially it was going to be three-story townhomes all the way around the entire project. I think we went back, looked at it and started with two that gradually went into a three-story building. Can something similar be addressed if townhomes are decided to go into this area?
- Pittman Yeah, we could, we could take a look at 2s and 3s. I've driven down to Appaloosa Crossing and looked at that I think, I don't wanna say, I don't say, wanna say lack of appeal because Pulte's in here somewhere but the, the backs of those are facing the road, right?
- Fedor Uh huh –

- Pittman So you're going and you're seeing the backs. They didn't do the brick or stone wrap all the way, they don't – yeah, I, I noticed that the other day. They didn't go all the way around. So we would make the commitment of whatever stone or brick put on it would be four-sided and then we, we wouldn't have the backs of units facing 421, so you'd see the fronts. We, we could also look at two-story but the plan was three-story facing the road.
- Fedor And that's all I got for now. Who's next?
- Franz Anybody down here?
- Plopper When I look at the Exhibit 2 concept plan I see what appears to be seven wet ponds. Is that an accurate depiction of the current plan?
- Pittman Nick, with the, like right now that's a concept plan and so until you do more of your development plans, site construction plans and more heavier engineering, you're not going to necessarily know the exact location and the sizes of those so, so I couldn't answer that for sure.
- Kossack Could you share more about the conversation with the Boone County Highway Department and kinda what may come next?
- Pittman Yeah, it wasn't so much a conversation as much as a letter that we just received last, late last week and they talked about wanting us to eliminate one of our entries, taking those two and consolidate it to one. They want passing blisters, accel/decel lanes, some of the road improvements they pointed out. So we're going to go back and look at making that change and see what that does to our plan. I also thought it would be kind of a good opportunity as we're doing that, I mean if we hear some constructive feedback as well about lot sizes and some things like that we could incorporate that.
- Franz Looking at the traditional neighborhood use zone, that looks to be the most dense and I, I follow what you're saying that this transitions from Union Woodlands which is roughly what is it – 1.14, something like that? And as you go west your development gets denser so there is kind of a natural progression, if you will, but I, I do find this thing to be rather dense relative to neighboring divisions, subdivisions. On the traditional neighbor use, those are the densest – could those be modified? I mean I'm just kinda curious – what is the justification for how dense this is? That's my, that's –
- Pittman Yeah –
- Franz And I, I mean –
- Pittman Yeah, so, so –
- Franz What can be done to –
- Pittman Yeah –

- Franz Assuming this is gonna go forward, what could be done to minimize the –
- Pittman Yeah so, so we're not married, we're not married that we have to do that. We, we, we looked at before those lots were a little bit narrower I think we looked maybe at the Bradley Ridge development and Roger, correct me if I'm wrong, maybe I think they're, they have maybe some 50-foot-wide lot sizes there so we thought maybe that that was okay so it was more of like this, let's really make this thing unique and have a variety of housing types and have front porches with a garage tucked in the back. We've done that other places and there's municipalities that like it. If this municipality doesn't like it, then we're glad to eliminate that and try something else. We're not opposed to making some of, we thought having 80s on one side of 60s and 60s adjacent to 60s we were being consistent but if, if we need to look at making those 65 or 70 whatever, we'd be, we'd be willing to do that but we, if you look at this exhibit I have up here right now, I said let, let's really kinda look at where our density is and so we're going up in that front area and they're, they're showing 126 units, it's really our, our PUD says up to 150. We don't know if we'd do 150 or, somewhere between 125 to 150. Part of that was do we take townhomes all the way to Michigan Road or not but you had 4.2 unit per acre in the area that we're meeting the Comp Plan requirement and then the area where it's ag, we're at 2.4 and the adjacent neighborhood to us is 1.83 and if you look at it, they had, I don't know, 13 to 15 acres of wetlands and pipelines and things like that and so, so we thought that this was appropriate but we can certainly look at that and say if there's some ways to reduce that that, that, you know, but we thought as you transition towards 200 and towards 421 that transition and by the, closer to the airport that transition made sense the way we did it but, I mean, that's our opinion. We're, we're open to messing around with that.
- Hurst Help me out with, I understand that you've addressed some building standards in the homes you're putting in and near tier 2 for the Airport Study but that's noise mitigation. Help square for me the safety of putting homes in tier 2. I realize there are existent homes in tier 2 that are there but what, why would we continue to build where other people have, other experts have determined is an unsafe place to build?
- Price It's a, it's a good question. The, I think what the Airport Study actually identifies is say, is to say we're not going to encourage or even going to discourage single-family development or dwellings in the tier 2 but then it goes on to say but we know there are going to be proposals come forward for single-family housing and so it outlines factors that could be built into a proposal to mitigate those risks, one of which, for example, is don't build within the runway protection zone, another of which is to deal with the noise concerns and another of which, as you heard a lot tonight, is to deal with density. But, but I think there is the notion that there is going to be some reconciliation, otherwise, otherwise what we're essentially saying is that there's, there's no development within those areas or there's develop, development that's only something called agritourism but when you, when you read more into some of the FAA circulars, for example, there are concerns over bringing concentrations of people drawn by agritourism into those same areas so there's always a certain amount of balancing of, of interest with, with these type of proposals regardless of, of the land use and I, and I think that, that the way of discouraging the development, if you will, or at least not

encouraging it is to put those kind of conditions onto the development so if it's going to occur, it's going to occur in a way where people are on notice about noise, where they have noise mitigation, where the density is appropriate for the development. Those are all fair game, I think, under the Airport Study as opposed to reading that in kind of a, in kind of a completely inflexible way to say that it's just a prohibition because I think at that point if it's a prohibition then the airport ought to be buying that property.

Franz I, I, I'm looking at the airport plan with the tier 1, 2, 3, 4 even in the, even in the map there's tier 2 that is identified for residential use. So there's, I mean, there's inconsistency in the plan itself so to say I don't, that doesn't mean tier 2 is an absolute abolition against it but – so there's, it's in the same plan that they allow residential in that zone.

Hurst And, and I believe Mr. Price addressed that one of the ways to mitigate that is, is density and if I'm reading this without my glasses on correctly, in the area that I would identify as tier 2, we're looking at 2.4 units an acre which is somewhere between R2 and R3 zoning if we were just using regular zoning, right?

Price We're, and, and what, what, what Steve's tried to do and, and we're not saying that, that this iteration is the only way to do it and it's certainly something that we can go back to the drawing board on but we're looking at the same guidance you are in trying to determine okay, how do we fit within this campus housing designation which we're at the kinda the, the bud of, if you will. As that goes further up Michigan Road if that's really carried out the way that plan is saying, there could be a lot of additional development up that corridor so how do we put something in that's between the park and the campus housing that kinda fits between those two types of land uses itself and is, and is mindful of the, of the kinda the mitigating criteria that the, that the study contemplates. So we're trying to fit that in in a, in a way that is graduated.

Franz It was brought up the usage in the Michigan Road use block, specifically the townhomes, home occupation, residential is included in there. There was some discussion of some of the commercial permitted uses that were, the individuals felt were inconsistent with what was initially said. I'm assuming you would be open to modifying – I, I guess that's the question on the, the, the Michigan Road use block. Would you eliminate townhomes, home occupation and just limit that to commercial?

Price Yeah.

Franz Okay.

Davis I think when I, when I look at this, first, I, I appreciate everybody that's come out and has taken the time to, to tell us how you feel so. I know it's, I know it's kinda longer but we, I, I do appreciate the input. I appreciate the letters that are sent in. It's nice to hear from everybody. Ms. Leffler brought up a great point – if you go to build a home out there, if you buy land on your own and go to build a home it does have to fit what's around it. If somebody was to come and ask to build 2-1/2 units on, you know, 2-1/2 homes on one acre of land that they just bought, I think it would be a resounding no for what that is out there but now we're faced with

multiple different variables, right? We kinda have this, this one-off R3 surrounded by R2, surrounded by ag with another designation that we're not quite sure what it is, right? So we're kind of stuck in between that and Bradley so we've, we almost have like this sandwich here so I appreciate what you're trying to do and to figure out what, what is going to be the meat in between the sandwich of stuff that's been approved. Some of it doesn't have utilities yet, right? And so we find ourselves in a very unique situation and that's kind of what makes this hard.

So in my mind I see really two projects here rather than a full PUD. I see a, a pretty easy per se project along Michigan Road. That, that seems to make sense as far as your commercial as far as what's being allowed there. We start to get into a little bit of an awkward area with something that, obviously, in '21 the Plan Commission said no about but we are, we were kinda forced in that. You're aware, obviously, of, of all of the, the Airport Study having been involved in and around like you have and I appreciate that and listening to the citizens of Zionsville, all of the meetings I've been to for our Comprehensive Plan, the airport has been a very big topic no matter where we've been about developing around that and so that's one thing that I, I do want to make sure that folks know is at those meetings we're talking, people are talking about hotels, convention centers, I mean doubling the size of State Road 32, so this type of thing is going to happen so now we have to figure out how does, how do we make that work but also make all of those things work for Zionsville and it being uniquely Zionsville. So to me we have a unique opportunity here to look at what is agritourism. Well nobody knows. You said nobody in Carmel knows, nobody, you know, Hamilton County doesn't know. So what can we do here to blend these things, to blend equestrian, to blend the, the wineries that we have and so I think that when we just look at a development that's pretty dense with this kind of airport/runway issue, the flight pattern issue and that sort of thing I think we have some pretty unique people and unique opportunities right around that area to –

Franz I don't think there's a question there for the petitioner.

Davis Well my, my, well no, but I'm saying that to say is is you see how many people are here. I think it would be a very good opportunity to see what does that look like from a development standpoint. And so when, when you say you're open to talking to them, how open are you?

Pittman Well, first of all, I say very open. I think to, to be blunt and try not to, I don't want to come off as disrespectful but I think that the staff report of recommending denial made people feel like why would we meet with Steve. He's gonna get a denial. If he's reasonable with us all the sudden, so from day one we've said we, we're open. We want to meet with people and as Anna just mentioned, we started talking to each other and she's been super helpful. She's been great. I hope we can do more of that. We kinda, the way we left it was let's have this meeting tonight and then kinda reconnoiter after that.

Johnson One question for either one of you, there's been mention about sewer availability. Can you guys speak to what your perspective is on sewer availability?

Pittman Yeah, thanks for asking that question. So full disclosure I'm on the TriCo Board. So I actually know this, this topic pretty well and I would also recommend that you lean heavily on your attorney for the Plan Commission. So TriCo is a sanitary sewer utility. They have a certificate of territorial authority that basically their territory goes all the way up to 200 South, goes all the way over to 421. Not only is that their territory, they're required to serve it. They, by law, have to serve it. And I can, they've never, I'm, I'm gonna say this maybe someone correct me but I don't believe they've ever condemned or gone through the eminent domain process because they're so thoughtful. They have put together a plan and its, you know, people were saying taking a red-tip marker and drawing it through the woods and I think they want to go through here and I, I appreciate the gal that had the sanitary sewer stuff.

Borman They have given us that route.

Pittman Pardon me?

Borman They have given us that route.

Pittman Okay, and, and it's a, so it's a, it's a, they actually have a draft set of plans. I mean they're ready to put it out to bid, it's ready to go. They were hoping to have some more dialogue with the property owners to say are there trees you want us to, to go around or they're, they are gonna bore underneath the creek. They have told me it's, it's minimal impact but they could go 30 feet deep and, and, and disrupt a lot more people at a lot more expense going other directions that would, would never be the way to go and so to me that's, when I've gone before a Planning body do you have sanitary sewer service? Yes. Well, how do we know that? Well, here's a letter from, from the sanitary sewer provider that says that we do. So to me like that's a transaction between the utility company and the property owner. They either work it out or if they can't work it out then a judge decides. It's no different as a town if you guys want to widen a road and the adjacent property owner doesn't want you to buy additional right-of-way. It's that same sort of arrangement and I've been and, by the way, I've been on the receiving end of this with, with TriCo with sanitary sewer, with other utilities and, and I, I have a lot of empathy. I understand how they feel about it but I can tell them they're going to get incredible treatment with TriCo in terms of being palatable and the, the least impact. Now while they don't care about this, I understand that, their property value is going to soar in value with sanitary sewer. So maybe that's for the next generation or the next one but that's the reality.

Fedor Steve, on your sanitary sewers and this are on the sewer lines. They're going to bore these lines in whenever possible, is that correct? They're not coming in and –

Pittman Umm, umm so my understanding is they're going to bore and, and, and we should have TriCo tell us specifically –

Fedor Uh huh –

Pittman My understanding is they're going to bore the crossings of the creek –

Fedor Okay.

Pittman And the other places they've told me they're, they're really scrub trees that on they're and if they had to modify and move something and put an additional manhole to miss really nice trees that these folks like, they would do it. They'd also I'm sure be willing to come back in where possible and plant additional trees. So they're, I, I would tell you they're very accommodating.

Franz I'm going back to one, one thing that's kind of weighing heavily in my mind and this is a comment not a question at this point in time. I don't think I've ever had the town staff come back with an unfavorable recommendation on the PUD. I, I mean I can't recall any. I've been, I think this is my 14th year on this. I, I don't, so I'm going back and looking at the reasons you, you've got that on there. Take a look at the Comprehensive Plan and you say the tier 3 conforms, tier 2 doesn't conform. So you're saying the, the use is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or does not conform. I mean, correct me if I'm wrong Roger. So, current conditions and character, the biggest thing there is looks like the density is the major departure that you see there from the adjacencies and then you've got conflicts with the Airport Plan usage again on the, on the next one, on the most desirable use. Conservation of property that one's fine because, so it would, you know, consistent wouldn't increase so I'm not and the responsible development and growth could be may, maybe appropriate. Again, you talk about the density if I'm not mistaken.

So I think I can, myself personally, I can get past the tier 2 component given the fact that in the airplane, in the, in the Airport Plan there's tier 2 property that they recommend residential in so I can, I can get past that. I'm, I'm struggling with really it comes back to the density and it's like just I know you're saying that it transitions from Union Woodlands over to the much denser on Michigan Road but, I mean, it just, I mean that, I, I'm struggling with the density to be quite honest. That's where I'm, I mean that's my biggest, biggest question and I realize there's going to be significant road impact fees generated from this when it gets built. I mean there's a lot of stuff to come that's going to pay for a lot of things but that's not happening right now. I mean so I mean that's where I struggle. And I mean I know you, you, this is a question back to you – I know you said that you could modify some of the, the, the neighborhood use block and reduce the density there but I don't even know how much, if you did modify that to be consistent with the other non-estate lots you're probably maybe getting rid of 10, 15 home, homesites if you would modify that area. I'm just trying to get kind of a ballpark.

Pittman Well I think if you modified this thing, I mean, we'd, we'd have to study. I think you could lose more than that. I guess I'd, I'd want to throw back the question to you or to Roger because I've never heard the answer. We're going from 1.83 units per acre to 2.94 so we're like 1 unit more per acre. I, I'm just curious what one might think is a more appropriate density.

Franz I mean, anybody have thoughts on that?

Fedor You're at, you're at R2 in the Brookhaven, you've got R3 in Union Woodlands –

Franz I guess –

Fedor R2 would be the number close to that 2 number.

Franz Let's put it this way. I, I think if we're going to go – I, I understand where you're going with this but I, I, it's hard for us to say something. We've gotta see the whole plan.

Pittman Right.

Franz I guess I would ask if, if, if, if this thing gets continued or something I would have you propose what you think makes the best sense when it comes to density.

Pittman Okay.

Franz Versus us saying something without, I mean, again, he could say something, he could be sitting there and we could have different opinions on every member. So that, that doesn't, so I'd rather have you propose –

Pittman Okay.

Franz Something that we could look at.

Pittman Okay. Yeah.

Davis And I know you have a lot of folks here that will be willing to speak with you in, in, in maybe coming up with, with a plan. Obviously you'll have to rework some stuff too with the roads and that so if that's the case this, if the solution is a redesigning and maybe talking to, they may be getting some support. If we have one petition that has 500 people and another one that has 200 folks, maybe getting some support from them and maybe some guidance that direction will probably help as well to figure out, you know, with our Comp Plan is uniquely Zionsville so what, what can we do to make this unique so it is not just another kind of lot plug and play I think is, has a really good, a really good opportunity to maybe set some unique precedence for, for development.

Franz And, and I'll say this, one of the reasons that I'm, I mean, willing to potentially continue this if it's up to the rest of the Plan Commission, is I mean 1) you've done a lot for Zionsville, you do develop Zionsville so I mean I think people should understand that you, you do feel like you have the best interest of Zionsville at heart. You've invested a lot in this project. I, I want to have best efforts so we can get what you think is the best thing you can do relative to this PUD before we make a recommendation one way or the other.

Davis Between having those conversations, kinda looking hopefully with, with folks looking at easements and that sort of thing if, if we were to continue what would be a, a reasonable amount of time do you think you would need?

Pittman I, I think we could, we could be ready by next month. We could put something back in front of you.

- Kilmer If I may just to give some hard and fast dates so the, before you commit to that the, the meeting in February is scheduled for February 18th but to have materials back into staff's hands to distribute to all the different members for review, our, our deadline would be one week from today.
- Pittman Oh.
- Kilmer So that and from the discussion I'm hearing, I'm hearing some significant study and possible communication with, with members of the public to do all that in one week would be challenging.
- Pittman Yeah so, so you're right. We'd, we'd need two months.
- Franz What's the March date.
- Fedor March 17th.
- Kilmer The March date would be Monday, March 17th.
- Franz Okay.
- Pittman With the information being submitted when?
- Kilmer That, that would need to be submitted then by Tuesday, February 25th.
- Franz Any other comments, suggestions before?
- Plopper I, I want to add that first, thank you Mr. Traylor for pointing out the history of the Union Woodlands being approved. I know that was before most of us on this Commission were participating and so I, I had lots of questions about how that came to be so echoing what Dave said, I, I share the same concerns about density so even with Union Woodlands coming online this particular petition before us this evening is far more dense, twice as dense, as, as Union Woodlands which in hindsight nobody seems to want. I think that Kendrick's suggestion if there was a possibility to phase a development and maybe do the denser units along Michigan Road first that might entice TriCo to re-route their sewer. I know that's a lot more expensive and that's probably a longshot but I'm very sensitive to the people that will ultimately have to make a deal or have their land subject to taking for the sewer. I would encourage you to explore every option to follow the public roadways rather than bore through peoples' backyards for the sewer if at all possible but I, I am, I'm not anti-development. I think, I appreciate all the efforts that you've spent to reach out to the public and listen to everyone's concerns and ultimately something's gonna be developed there but we have to be responsible about it and not create some inconsistent patchwork. I think everybody wants to see consistency and not deferential treatment paid to anyone developer over another and, and hopefully that leads us down the right road.
- Franz And, and while the Union Woodlands if it hadn't been zoned as it was, there wouldn't be probably any development on it right now but I, it can't be ignored as a, an area that you can compare to, to develop adjacent to. It, it does make up

that area for your transition from that to wherever. It, it has to, it becomes a factor in the future development. There's no, that's in my mind.

Pittman On the, on the sanitary sewer I think what I might suggest so I can help facilitate that and I'm curious what Mr. Taylor might think, it'd be good for maybe the TriCo attorney to talk to the Plan Commission attorney on that issue because, because I don't have any say. We're talking about a third-party utility, I don't have any say. In fact any, any item with regard to this, I recuse myself because I'm involved in this particular piece of property but do you think that'd be appropriate to have the attorney for TriCo communicate directly with your attorney?

Plopper 3:23:34 didn't hear what he had to say.

Taylor That'd be okay and then I'll share the information with staff because it's, that's really where it needs to go is to staff.

Pittman Okay.

Taylor And then it will come to you all.

Franz Yeah. Does anyone have a motion to continue this to the March 17th meeting?

Fedor I move that Docket 2024-50-Z to rezone approximately 147.4+/- acres from the Rural General Agricultural zoning district to The Reserve at Union Woodlands Planned Unit Development (PUD) district be continued to the, to the March 17, 2025 meeting.

Kossack Second.

Franz Any further discussion? All in favor signify by aye –

Hurst Dave, I do have something.

Franz Okay, all right.

Hurst Is there public comment at the March meeting or is that closed?

Franz So what we'll do is –

Hurst Just setting expectations.

Franz They'll present their revised information, Dan, correct me if I'm wrong, and public comment will be limited to those revisions.

Taylor To the changes.

Franz To the changes. So that's you're all welcome to attend again but, again, the comments will be limited to the changes that they've made.

Hurst Thank you.

?? 3:25:02 inaudible from the crowd.

Franz I, I can't answer anything. It's, there's no public comment at this point.

Taylor See Roger.

Franz It's, it's see Roger but it's going to be posted just like it was this time. There's a, there's a timely requirement to get it posted so. All right, thanks everybody. Appreciate it.

Kilmer You need to vote. You need to vote.

Franz We're not done.

Taylor You need to vote Dave.

Franz Oh yeah, okay, sorry, sorry. All right, we have the second. Okay, roll call on this one.

Dale Josh Fedor?

Fedor Aye.

Dale Kendrick Davis?

Davis Aye.

Dale Jim Hurst?

Hurst Aye.

Dale Brad Johnson?

Johnson Aye.

Dale Dave Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Andrew Kossack?

Kossack Aye.

Dale Nick Plopper?

Plopper Aye.

Franz All right, it's approved. We'll see you in March. Thanks everybody for contributing, paying attention. Appreciate it. We still have a few things to go so I'd appreciate it if you guys could exit quietly, orderly.

All right, next on the docket is – well, I'll give them a minute.

Fedor We've got five minutes for you guys to suspend rules.

Franz I'm still gonna beat, I'm still gonna beat your 11:30.

Fedor I know. We're gonna drag this thing out. I'm gonna get him.

Franz So while, while this is going on, do we have a motion to suspend rules so we can continue beyond 10:00?

Fedor So moved.

Franz Is there a second?

Davis Second.

Franz Can we aye this one? All in favor signify aye.

All Aye.

Franz Rules have been suspended. All right, onto the next one – Docket Number 2024-74-Z, RFPDI, LLC/Creekside Corporate Park Rezoning Signage in Subarea E, 10814 and 10850 Creek Way, Zionsville, Indiana. Rezoning to amend Section 1.20 M of the Creekside Corporate Park PUD regarding wall signage regulations in Subarea E.

Young That was pretty good. So the location –

Franz Owen, is that you?

Young Yes sir, I am up. I was going to move for a seventh inning stretch but apparently we're not going to do that so. So the location, as stated, it, is Building 1 and Building 2 of Creekside Corporate Park. It's 10850 which is Building 1 and 10814 which is Building 2. All of this is within the Subarea E of the PUD. The location north of our rezoning is the Creekside parklet and portions of Lot 12 and 13, west is vacant Lot 9, south is open field, part of the Dow PUD and Group 1001 and east is RLL Racing Headquarters.

Some of the signage depictions just for visual reference, these, the line share of the signage is currently already installed. This is Building 1. This is the view north and west. And the existing Building 2 the only existing signage currently, I believe, is just Piaggio. The other signage that they are proposing is both on the east side and the, rounding out the additional on the south side as well as proposed signage on the north.

So our redline language through the Creekside Corporate Park, we are moving the hyperspecific language of Section 1.20 M about the Subarea E. It's more forward thinking and more specific or general for future tenants and not specific for current Piaggio, etc. This allows for additional signage for Building 2 and

also we are amending Section 1.21 K to allow for lighted accent bars as an architectural lighting option for tenants. This is the text to be removed as well as the specific imagery. This is the more general proposed signage.

Franz Okay.

Young And then again the accent bar language. Still here Joe?

Calderon I'm still here and I'm still awake.

Young Hey, winner, winner chicken dinner. Let me cue up your PowerPoint presentation.

Calderon Is there a remote to advance or do I just tell you?

Young Advance.

Calderon Thank you and good evening. Mr. President and members of the Commission, Joe Calderon, 11 South Meridian, Indianapolis representing RFPDI, LLC, the owner of, as Owen mentioned, 10814 and 10850 Creek Way. This is essentially the Graham Rahal development. 10850 has GRP Performance, Ducati, the coffee shop, etc. and 10814 is gonna have Bowdie's restaurant, there's car storage and Piaggio. So, what happened in this case was truly, I think, too many cooks in the kitchen and that is the PUD which was last amended in 2023, got, as Owen mentioned, hyperspecific as to signage but only as to 10850. It didn't have any language for 10814. So there was kind of a, there were permits issued for 10814. There were permits applied for for 10850 that couldn't be issued because guess what? There were too, there was an architect and there was a sign company. Each had designed signs for 10850, they didn't match the PUD and we came to the Board of Zoning Appeals once and we figured out that we were gonna have to come again. They weren't very happy with us for that and we figured the best solution is just to kinda start over and so we went down the path of a text amendment and your staff was very gracious. They kinda nursed us through and, and worked with us as, as we tried to reach the language not only to get the signs that were already kind of in the queue for permits but to kinda think forward because you don't know if the same coffee shop's gonna be there, Ducati may change five years from now so we ended up, I think, coming up with a solution that works best for everybody so.

How do I advance this Owen? You?

Young Advance.

Calderon Thank you. So as mentioned, this is a two-part amendment, text amendment, 1.20 M and 1.21 K which was the most recent thing that we talked about with your staff. Next – the existing sign language, as mentioned, had specific mentions in 1 A, B and C for the 106th Street frontage of the 10850 building and then they had two auxiliary signs on the east-facing wall both very specific as to what it could be and the maximum square footages. Next – the current conditions just describing the signs. You've probably seen them out there. Some of the signs are actually temporary, they're just plastic that's on there and not actual channel

letters. There are some permanent signs as well. Next – the, there are no signs on the north façade of the 10814 building. We have written in language because there is a car storage facility that we may put in a sign on that north façade and what you basically see is what you’re getting today as mentioned in the PUD but for the car storage which will be limited to a percentage of its façade as compared to the whole building which matches your code, by the way. Next – so the amendment now strips out the specific tenant mention and we just label tenants 1, 2, 3 and 4. We have the square footages which ultimately are right at code or slightly below. I think there’s one series where we’re 4 square feet above and that includes some rounding so we are being consistent with your code and this addresses both façades south and east on 10850 and you can see these images. Next – this is what’s out there today. GRP is already permitted. You can see the logo for Rahal Paint Protection, RIVET Coffee that’s temporary. Next – Rahal Paint Protection this is all on that south façade of the 10850 building and then next – that’s we’re all familiar with the Ducati images on both sides so. One more kinda getting on the east façade. They are service bays so we felt like it was important to have some level of identification for those as well.

Next slide – the 10814 building, the east building allows for three signs facing 106th, tenants 1, 2 and 3. You can see these are not significant square footages. We will also allow for four, up to four signs facing east which matches what’s there today. The only addition to that, as mentioned, is the Rahal car storage would be allowed to have one sign on the east façade and on the north façade and there is one projecting sign that is also gonna be at the southeast corner that we’re proposing. It’s about 25 square feet. Next slide please – and then, finally, there is some accent lighting that’s in place for the Piaggio tenants. We felt like since it wasn’t mentioned in the sign portion of the, of the existing PUD Ordinance that we would just add it to kind of the miscellaneous section and allow it not only for Piaggio but if there was an accent lighting feature for some of the other tenants moving forward.

So you can see what things look like in the next images. That’s existing today on the south façade. That’s east. All we’re doing is permitting that and then you can kinda see the square footages and we can just kinda fly through these. Next – the text that’s, and ultimately, what we come down to, if we get down to the end, Owen, just kinda the size summary of what we’re looking at is up to 580 square feet on the south façade, 218 feet on the east façade for the west building, 10850. 10814 would be 231 square feet on the south façade, 160 feet on the east façade plus tenant 4 which is Rahal car storage today up to 3% which is consistent with your code and then one projecting sign of up to 25 square feet. And the last slide I’ll share with you just is kind of your code requirement just so you’re comfortable that we’re not trying to do an overreach is that we would, under code, under your sign code on 10850 we’d be allowed to have 576 on the south, 270 on the east, 387 on the south. For 10814, 214 on the east and 202 square feet on the north. So, we’re just trying to be a little more forward looking, trying to avoid going to the BZA every time we need to get a sign and trying to be also respectful of the sign code regulations themselves. Obviously, it’s a lot to take in for signage so I’m happy to answer any questions and, again, we’re very grateful for your staff and the recommendation.

Franz At this point, is there anybody who'd like, from the public who'd like to comment on this matter? Get in line.

Calderon I hope not.

Franz Actually, you had us at text amendment.

Calderon I wasn't sure if these gentlemen were here to say anything or not. We got an earful from the BZA so. It's been a little skittish.

Hurst There might be a little history on that.

Calderon Yeah.

Franz Okay, so anybody have any questions, comments?

Hurst Are the signs on the building now appropriately permitted? Even if they were permitted –

Calderon Everything is either appropriately permitted permanent or under temporary sign permits, so yes. Yes, we're all, I believe, squared away.

Young I believe so.

Franz Any other questions/comments? Is, now we're making a favorable motion, correct? We're making a recommendation?

Dale Yes.

Franz Okay, all right. So would somebody like to make a motion on this matter?

Davis I move that Docket Number 2024-74-Z, a Petition to Amend Section 1.20 M of the Creekside Corporate Park PUD regarding wall signage regulations in Subarea E receive a favorable recommendation based upon the findings in the staff report as presented with the recommendation being certified to the Town Council for adoption or rejection.

Franz Is there a second?

Johnson Second.

Calderon May I, can we add 1.21 K to that motion because that was part of the amendment as well.

Franz Oh yeah, you're right.

Calderon I'm sorry.

Franz Okay, so, so –

Davis That adds 1.21 K right?

Franz So you would say Section 1.20 M and 1.21 K?

Calderon Please.

Franz So, do you accept that amendment?

Davis I do, yes.

Franz Does the second accept that amendment?

Johnson I'll second it, yes.

Franz Okay.

Dale Who seconded it? I'm sorry.

Johnson [raising his hand]

Franz Any further discussion? All right, roll call Roger or –

Dale Kendrick Davis?

Davis Aye.

Franz Mike.

Dale Brad Johnson?

Johnson Aye.

Dale Jim Hurst?

Hurst Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Andrew Kossack?

Kossack Aye.

Dale Nick Plopper?

Plopper Aye.

Dale Josh Fedor?

Fedor Aye.

Zionsville Plan Commission
January 21, 2025

Dale Unanimous.

Franz All right, it's approved.

Calderon Thank you so much.

Franz Thank you. It's, it's going to go to the Town Council, not approved let's –

Calderon Yes.

Franz Okay, next on the docket 2024-87-DPA, 1000 Mulberry Street, Zionsville. Zionsville High School locker room building addition. Petitioner, Zionsville Community Schools, Matt Doublestein. A Development Plan Amendment to update the 2008 Master Plan including 102,670 foot, square feet of building additions, drainage, signage, parking improvements. Current zoning Special Use (SU-1) zoning district.

Dickey This one's mine.

Franz Jodi –

Dickey Yep, thanks. You can see on the first slide the location of the existing Zionsville High School, pretty much built to spec how it is today and the subject site zoning and the surrounding property zoning. Nothing of that is changing. What we're just doing here is updating the Master Plan for ultimate buildout of the high school. Here are the existing conditions. This high school campus has been building going along tickety boo according to initial approvals and then in 2008 there was a Master Plan prepared, adopted and they've been constructing according to that Master Plan. There was last year an, an amendment to that Master Plan to increase the size of this locker room facility down here. Now the school is like now we need a whole new Master Plan because we have other building projects coming up.

So what we're doing this evening is adopting, hopefully, approving a Development Plan Amendment to update the 2008 Master Plan and that should help carry this campus through to like the 2035 construction season. So there are a number of tentative projects listed here. You can see that on the timeline and specifically, the schools want to do this particular addition project here in this building season and that will necessitate demolishing an existing building here, doing a little bit of site work, road work reconfiguration and then in future phases some drainage improvements, additional additions to the building and one of the elements of this site plan is the, the building addition. This is a Special Use zoning district which follows the BO zoning district standards. The BO zoning district requires the Zionsville theme so we know that buildings there we want them to be Georgian or Federal or Victorian in architecture. Sometimes the Plan Commission can grant a waiver to this. In this particular instance, the schools have submitted a letter from their architect showing how they feel that the current building meets some of the styles of that colonial architecture and how the brick is laid out and the cornice features and mullioned windows and then how the new building addition will meet those same standards, therefore, meeting the, the

terms of the Zionsville theme. The building materials are compliant with the building materials that are required in the Zoning Ordinance.

I will mention that this new building addition and you can't see it from here so I apologize for that but is taller than what is allowed in the Zoning Ordinance but it's going to be constructed to match existing building heights so the school is seeking a variance but that's going until the February 5th BZA meeting. Normally we like to do the BZA first but to help the schools keep with their construction schedule, you get the plans done and bid out and get the construction season going on, we are asking for conditional approval that they either get the variance from the BZA for the building height or that they would then, if they do not get that then they need to submit to staff compliant plans and then staff can approve those plans and not have to come back to the Planning Commission for another Development Plan Amendment. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. I know I went through that a little quickly but we are recommending approval with the, the conditional approval.

Franz Okay. Petitioner –

Doublestein Good evening Planning Commission and staff. Thank you very much. We are grateful to be here tonight and I'd like to acknowledge folks in the room as well, Mr. Dennis Bane, Ms. Jennette Moline and Dan Schnur from Fanning Howey and TLF and then also Mr. Becker from CCHA on our behalf.

Yes, staff has summarized it well. We were very grateful for their work with us. We really have two goals here – long-term goal to provide our town and community with this, with a Master Plan with, with what neighbors in the community can expect is our, our desire as staff. It's true that, that from time to time those needs change and so that's why we bring this forward to you as far as the Master Plan component and indeed also in the short term to update and consolidate locker room space to serve increased number of students in our district and the existing locker room facilities that this group would replace go back to 1997 and as best memory serves were likely a little more than half, we were a little more than under half the size that we are now so that, that improvement is necessary to serve the students we have. Additionally, we wish to further improve that southern orientation of the high school for the safety of students and patrons, in particular, separating pedestrian and vehicle traffic much better than currently exists.

The one, if I may, one point I'd love to – if, if we could go back to that elevation. The, the component that is higher than, than that ordinance is – would you mind putting the little hand on that? Is, is only the top, nah, it's, it's the top, the far right, that far right component of the building, right there. Only that portion right there and it is the same as the existing elevation of the building behind it. The remainder is under that ordinance. That is an HVAC area. Again, it connects to an existing HVAC service area that would allow us to serve this portion of the building. That also sits back, as you can see in the upper picture, it sits back from the, the frontage elevation by quite an amount. There is in the packet, I believe, a 3-D view of that and you can see how far that sits back.

Dale Is that a parapet just to cover the HVAC?

Doublestein It is, it is an interior mechanical room so –

Dale Oh.

Doublestein It's, it is, it is a physical part of the building.

Dale Okay.

Doublestein I think that's what I'd have at the moment to offer.

Franz Okay.

Doublestein We are grateful for your consideration and I'm happy to answer any questions that I can.

Franz All right. Is there anybody from the public who'd like to comment on this matter? We wore them out earlier I guess. Any questions from members of the Plan Commission?

Dale So this, this being a 10-year Master Plan buildout, so we would, we would assume that this Master Plan is valid for the next 10 years at least or buildout over the next 10 years.

Doublestein I think it would be valuable for me to say on the record that our Board has not approved all of those projects, in a similar vein to what we did in 2008 in seeking approval for, for a Master Plan that allows our Board the ability to direct staff to continue working toward those goals and then can bring them for – well, as it relates to the locker room expansion, we hope that that would be a project in the consideration tonight.

Franz And then none of this has to come back to us, it's all handled by staff at that point?

Dickey Correct. That's the hope with the Master Plan update –

Franz Yep.

Dickey That, yeah. As long as they build according to the –

Franz Yeah.

Dickey Approved site plan then we'll just approve the building permits and –

Franz Yep.

Dickey And sign permits.

Franz Any other questions/comments? If not, is there a motion on this matter?

Dickey There is a public hearing requirement. Sorry.

Franz I did ask.

Dickey Oh did ya? I'm sorry.

Franz I did ask for comment.

Dickey I was busy not listening.

Taylor It'll all be up to staff from here Dave.

Franz Yes, that's right.

Fedor Let's see here, I got it. I move that Docket 2024-29-DPA, [he said 29, should be 87] Development Plan Amendment for an update to the Zionsville High School Master Plan including building additions in the Special Use (SU-1) district be conditionally approved based on received, receiving the requested building height variance from the Board of Zoning Appeal. Should a variance be denied, the petitioner shall submit a compliant plan to staff for review and approval. 3) Staff recommendations and Findings in, Findings of Facts and subject to the resolution of future staff review, technical items as may be identified as the Master Plan continues through the proposed development schedule 2025-2035.

Plopper Second.

Franz All right, any further discussion? Mike, would you please take roll?

Dale Josh Fedor?

Fedor Aye.

Dale Nick Plopper?

Plopper Aye.

Dale Andrew Kossack?

Kossack Aye.

Dale David Franz?

Franz Aye.

Dale Brad Johnson?

Johnson Aye.

Dale Jim Hurst?

Hurst Aye.

Zionsville Plan Commission
January 21, 2025

Dale Kendrick Davis?

Davis Aye.

Franz The motion is passed.

Doublestein Thank you.

Franz Thank you.

Dale Thank you.

Franz Other Matters to be Considered –

Dale Yes.

Franz We already did the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Dale Right.

Franz The Plan Commission appointment to the BZA.

Dale Right.

Franz So do we have any volunteers? Everybody's looking away.

Fedor I'll, I'll take the big money. I'll take the big money.

Hurst Doubles your pay.

Franz So Josh, Josh has accepted the, the, the appointment so thank you very much.

Plopper Here, here. What a guy.

Franz It's rotating, just remember next year. And then we've got the attorney's engagement letter which Mike, you forwarded that to me –

Dale Right and it looks like the terms are the same but is there a rate increase?

Taylor There is.

Dale Okay.

Taylor Mr. Becker would be disappointed if I didn't ask for more money so.

Dale Okay.

Taylor No, it's just adjustment for inflation. It's 4.2% more than last year, \$10 on the hourly rate. Otherwise, it's exactly the same letter.

Plopper Thank you for the volume discount.

Franz And I'm, I'm very, I'm very comfortable with the representation that we get from the firm. So I concur with that.

Fedor Concurred, thank, thank you very much.

Dale Should there be a motion on this?

Taylor Yes.

Franz All right, so do we have a motion to accept the new engagement letter?

Kossack So moved.

Hurst Second.

Franz All in favor signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Opposed by nay.
[No response]

 You're hired for another year.

Taylor Thank you.

Franz Anything else? Is there a motion to adjourn?

Hurst So moved.

Fedor Second.

Franz All in favor?

All Aye.