



**TOWN OF ZIONSVILLE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING RESULTS**  
**Tuesday February 16, 2021**  
**7:00 PM (Local Time)**

**THIS PUBLIC MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY PURSUANT TO GOVERNOR ERIC J. HOLCOMB'S EXECUTIVE ORDER 21-03 AND GOVERNOR HOLCOMB'S EXERCISE OF HIS POWERS UNDER INDIANA'S EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND DISASTER LAW, IND. CODE 10-14-3, *et seq.* ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE MEETING IS PROVIDED IN THE ANNEX PUBLISHED WITH THIS NOTICE.**

Members of the public shall have the right to attend Plan Commission Public Meetings via the following forms of electronic communication:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82920328298>

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: +13126266799,,82920328298# or +16465588656,,82920328298#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 829 2032 8298

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82920328298>

Or an H.323/SIP room system:

H.323:

162.255.37.11 (US West)

162.255.36.11 (US East)

115.114.131.7 (India Mumbai)

115.114.115.7 (India Hyderabad)

213.19.144.110 (Amsterdam Netherlands)

213.244.140.110 (Germany)

103.122.166.55 (Australia Sydney)

103.122.167.55 (Australia Melbourne)

149.137.40.110 (Singapore)

64.211.144.160 (Brazil)

69.174.57.160 (Canada Toronto)

65.39.152.160 (Canada Vancouver)

207.226.132.110 (Japan Tokyo)

149.137.24.110 (Japan Osaka)

Meeting ID: 829 2032 8298

SIP: [82920328298@zoomcrc.com](mailto:82920328298@zoomcrc.com)

**The following items are scheduled for consideration:**

- I. Pledge of Allegiance
- II. Attendance
- III. Approval of the January 19, 2021 Regular Plan Commission Meeting Minutes and February 2, 2021 Special Meeting minutes
- IV. Continuance Requests
- V. Continued Business

<b>Docket Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address of Project</b>	<b>Item to be Considered</b>
2020-44-DP	Appaloosa Crossing - Master Signage Program	3295 S. U.S. 421	<b>Approved as presented</b> <b>6 in Favor</b> <b>0 Opposed</b> Petition for Development Plan Approval of a Master Signage Program for the Appaloosa Crossing Commercial Development; zoned Rural Professional Business (PB) and Rural General Business (GB) and within the Michigan Road Overlay (MRO)
2020-48-DP	21 <sup>st</sup> Amendment – Outlot I of Appaloosa Crossing	3295 S. U.S. 421	<b>Approved as presented</b> <b>6 in Favor</b> <b>0 Opposed</b> Petition for Development Plan Approval for a 12,500 sq. ft. commercial building on Outlot “I” of Appaloosa Crossing which is zoned Rural General Business (GB) and within the Michigan Road Overlay (MRO).

VII. New Business

<b>Docket Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address of Project</b>	<b>Item to be Considered</b>
			None at this time

VIII. Other Matters to be considered

<b>Docket Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address of Project</b>	<b>Item to be Considered</b>
			None at this time

Please note that a quorum of the Zionsville Town Council may be in attendance at the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted:

Wayne DeLong, AICP, CPM  
Director of Planning and Economic Development

## ANNEX TO PUBLIC NOTICE FOR THE FEBRUARY 16, 2021 REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZIONSVILLE PLAN COMMISSION

In his Executive Orders 21-03 Governor Eric J. Holcomb has ordered all political subdivisions of the State of Indiana to limit public gatherings and to implement the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's and the Indiana State Department of Health's recommended virus mitigation strategies. The Executive Orders suspend certain requirements for Essential Governmental Functions that facilitate Essential Infrastructure with respect to public meetings and open door laws, including suspending physical participation requirements by members of public agency governing bodies and permitting public attendance through electronic means of communications. As a political subdivision of the State of Indiana, the Zionsville Town Council must comply with the Executive Orders throughout the duration of the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82920328298>

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: +13126266799,,82920328298# or +16465588656,,82920328298#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 829 2032 8298

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbMt6X59cn>

Or an H.323/SIP room system:

H.323:

162.255.37.11 (US West)

162.255.36.11 (US East)

115.114.131.7 (India Mumbai)

115.114.115.7 (India Hyderabad)

213.19.144.110 (Amsterdam Netherlands)

213.244.140.110 (Germany)

103.122.166.55 (Australia Sydney)

103.122.167.55 (Australia Melbourne)

149.137.40.110 (Singapore)

64.211.144.160 (Brazil)

69.174.57.160 (Canada Toronto)

65.39.152.160 (Canada Vancouver)

207.226.132.110 (Japan Tokyo)

149.137.24.110 (Japan Osaka)

Meeting ID: 829 2032 8298

SIP: [82920328298@zoomcrc.com](mailto:82920328298@zoomcrc.com)

Members of the public shall have the option of recording their attendance at Plan Commission Public Meetings via electronic roll call at the start of the meeting or via e-mail at [wdelong@zionsville-in.gov](mailto:wdelong@zionsville-in.gov).

1. If a member of the public would like to attend a Plan Commission Public Meeting, but cannot utilize any of the access methods described above, please contact Wayne DeLong at 317-873-5108 or [wdelong@zionsville-in.gov](mailto:wdelong@zionsville-in.gov).
2. The Plan Commission will continually revisit and refine the procedures in this Annex to address public accessibility to Plan Commission Public Meetings during the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency.
3. If you need technical assistance in logging into Zoom for this webinar, please contact: Roger Kilmer, [rkilmer@zionsville-in.gov](mailto:rkilmer@zionsville-in.gov), or 317-690-6539.

Zionsville Plan Commission  
February 16, 2021

In Attendance: Mary Grabianowski, George Lewis, Larry Jones, Sharon Walker, Chris Lake

Staff attending: Wayne DeLong, Roger Kilmer, Dan Taylor, attorney, Janice Stevanovic.

A quorum is present.

Franz Tuesday, February 16, 2021. Start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

All Pledge of Allegiance.

Franz All right. Wayne, would you please take roll?

DeLong Certainly. Mr. Lewis?

Lewis Present.

DeLong Mrs. Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Present.

DeLong Mr. Fedor?

Franz He's absent. He notified us of his situation so he's excused.

DeLong Mr. Jones?

Jones Present.

DeLong Mr. Franz?

Franz Present.

DeLong Mrs. Walker?

Walker Present.

DeLong Mr. Lake?

Lake Present.

Franz So, we have six people. Any matter needs to have four votes to pass. In your packet, you had—there was two sets of minutes, one from the January 19 regular meeting of the Plan Commission. Are there any comments, additions, deletions to those minutes? If there are none, is there a motion to approve?

Grabianowski So moved.

Franz Is there a second?

Zionsville Plan Commission  
February 16, 2021

- Jones Second.
- Franz All in favor, signify by aye.
- All Aye.
- Franz Opposed nay. Those minutes pass. There's in—also in minutes are the February 2, 2021 special meeting. Is there any comments, additions, deletions to those minutes?
- Jones Nope.
- Franz None? Is there a motion to approve those minutes?
- Lake So moved.
- Franz Is there a second?
- Jones Second.
- Franz All right. I will abstain since I was not present. All in favor, signify by aye.
- All Aye.
- Franz All oppose by nay. Motion carries, 5-0. Those are approved. On the docket are two continuance requests. Both actually from December meeting. The first number on the docket is 2020-44-DP Appaloosa Crossing Master Signage Program 3295 South US 421 petition for development plan approval of a master signage program for the Appaloosa Crossing commercial development zoned Rural Professional Business PB and Rural General Business GB within the Michigan Road Overlay MRO. Is the petitioner present?
- DeLong Mr. Franz, before we jump in, I do want to create your opportunity to have the public acknowledged.
- Franz Yeah. Is there anybody in the audience who'd like to be acknowledged? I actually have that written down today. I just missed it, so. If you do, please raise your hand.
- Kilmer Mr. Franz, Sally Zelonis has raised her hand and that is all.
- Franz All right. Okay. Now, to the petitioner, please.
- Price Yes, Mr. President and Members of the Commission, it's Matt Price here today on behalf of Harris FLP and Appaloosa Crossing for approval of our master signage program. You may recall that this was initially heard back in November. We received feedback on the proposal then and we've had it continued a couple times since then, and are coming to you tonight with a different proposal for how to initiate this program than what was originally proposed. You may recall that originally we had provided a diagram that showed the anticipated locations of each single-tenant sign as well as the multi-tenant signage. I think a good

comment that was raised during that discussion was, you know, how can you be that specific about that location of signs when you don't have individual users for each lot at this stage? So, we took that comment into account as well as other comments, and are coming to you this evening with a modified proposal which is to seek approval of our site, excuse me, of our sign designs both with respect to our multi-tenant design and our single-tenant design but leaving the location approval to the individual development plans that will come before you as petitions are submitted and heard in the ordinary course of the project. Now, the individual sign applications, as individual development plans come in, will still be subject to the commitments that are of record with respect to the proposal. So, it would still be reviewed against those individual commitments. What we're not seeking tonight is approval of the individual sign locations but rather just the sign designs themselves. I'll tell you what our intention is going forward as you frame your comments and questions. What our intention is that we are developing a packet of information that we give potential purchasers. Part of that packet that we would like to include is an approved sign package that here is what your individual signs need to look like. Right now, we're doing that through a little bit of a method of just individual conversations with each purchaser. In fact, Roger Kilmer and I have corresponded within the last week or so about a specific sign that's going to be coming before you at next month's meeting. We just think it would be more efficient if we had an approved sign design with regard to size, building materials, landscaping treatments so that we could tell our suitors that this is the approved sign and that they need to conform their signs to that approved design. I should mention that I have Rick Green with me this evening from Axis Architects who's the individual who developed the exhibit that shows what our preferred sign design is. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you have and appreciate your patience in working with us over this last couple of months. Thanks.

Franz All right. Thank you. At this time I'll ask, is there anybody from the public who'd like to make a comment on this matter? If so, please raise your hand. All right. Being none, staff commentors? Have any staff comment on this one, Wayne?

DeLong Thank you. Certainly, Roger Kilmer provided a very detailed report for your consideration this evening. Certainly, it covers a lot of information. Certainly, staff is supportive of the petition as it's been submitted and is happy to answer questions you may have.

Franz All right. At this point in time, I'll open it up to any members of the Plan Commission if they have any questions for Mr. Price.

Walker I was happy to see something like this because I was trying to figure out in my mind and I'm not an engineer nor am I an architect, how you were going to establish that without the business person having any input at all. So, I thought this was better than what you presented at first.

Price Appreciate that.

Lewis So, I guess my question is the multi-tenant signs, will those be like individual development plans for the multi-tenant signs and then the single-tenant signs

- would come in as part of the site development plan for a individual tenant type of thing probably?
- Price Right. Yes, so what we envision happening is, for example with the shops that were approved back in late spring last year up in the northwest corner, that what will happen is that the sign plan will need to be submitted for that individual development. For example, if that was going to include a multi-tenant sign, then that multi-tenant sign would be presented as part of the sign package for that project. The same with the single-tenant properties either as part of the development plan, comprehensive development plan where the entire package is being presented or as part of the sign plan for that development plan. They would come in with their individual sign for that lot.
- Franz So, the buildings that are approved that are multi-tenant, I mean, where are those—I mean, is that going to be a separate process to approve those locations then?
- Price It will be. The way we're envisioning it and Mr. DeLong can certainly weigh in if I'm misstating this, but what we understand the process will be is that we would need to come in with a sign plan that would include the location of any multi-tenant sign, for example for the shops. That step has not been completed yet in connection with, for example, with the development of the shops in the northwest section of the project. That's a step that still needs to be completed which would include the location of that sign.
- Franz All right.
- Price Then, we would be subject to the commitments with regard to the overall number. We're actually permitted more outlots than we are signs. There are greater sign limitations than there are numbers of lots. So, we have to be, you know, economical about our use of signs. So, we've not come in with individual sign plans yet for the development plans for either our medical office building or the shops. That is a step that we would be required to do before a sign could be built.
- Franz Okay. What you're asking for today is basically approval of the design of the signs?
- Price That's correct.
- Franz All right.
- Jones So what you're asking for this evening is for us to approve the two types of signs you have here, the multi-tenant and the single-tenant?
- Price Yes.
- Jones Now, what you haven't confirmed yet is that whether you'll need to use a multi-tenant or a single-tenant sign on each lot because right now, you've got the multi-tenant building up there at the northern end. Then, you've got a smaller multi-tenant building down at the south end. Correct?

- Price            That's right. That's right.
- Jones            Will the multi-tenant building at the south end need a multi-tenant monument sign?
- Price            It could. Now—I think really this was part of the dialogue that I think we found very helpful last when we talked about this back in November, I believe it was November. It might subject to the commitments. I'll tell you what the commitments are which is that we are permitted two multi-tenant signs on 421 and one on 146<sup>th</sup> Street. There's a further limitation on the signage along 421 which is that one of those signs can be in the General Business frontage and one of those multi-tenant signs can be in the Professional Business. So, it's possible that the medical office building will need a multi-tenant sign. It would have to be as it is. It would have to be in the Professional Business area and it would be subject to a development plan filing to approve the location of that sign.
- Jones            Right. Then, what's going to happen with the gas station? What are they going to want? Right now, that is the sign actually that Roger and I have been corresponding on. Right now, they have a single-tenant what I would call a monument sign. It's somewhat illustrative of the issue we're confronting in dealing with purchasers is that the sign, I would say, is similar to what our preferred design is but it's not identical. It's not—to me, it's something that does not meet the standards of what the Plan Commission is going to be expecting and frankly what we expect as well. So what we're doing is, wanting to use this approved sign plan as part of our package that here's our Overlay Zone requirements. Here's our architectural theme that we develop. Then, the third tier being here's the approved sign package at least with regard to design. They still understand they need to come in and get the actual locations approved.
- ?                They also understand they need to comply with some of the approved design details?
- Price            Right. Yes, we heard that message loud and clear during the, uh—I think that was the December meeting. This is an outgrowth of those two meetings really and trying to get ahead of this.
- Franz            Do you think you're going to use all 11 of those single-tenant signs?
- Price            You know, it's possible we'll use fewer. I'll tell you why. We have a user potentially in the northeast corner of the project that actually takes more than one outlot and I don't think is going to seek or need two signs. So there, I think, there will be some economy in terms of not needing necessarily all the signs that are permitted.
- Franz            Okay. Is the residential component going to want any signage out on either 146<sup>th</sup> or Michigan?
- Price            I've not heard that request. I do not believe they will. That is something that we have in discussion now but there has not been a request for that to date, no. Frankly, that would be an offsite signage for that project. I think for that to



occur—I don't want to get too far ahead of myself but I think that would definitely require a collab with staff and probably a variance if that were sought. So it's not, but it's not contemplated today.

Franz Anybody else have any other questions? If there aren't any, would somebody like to make a motion on this matter?

Walker I will. If I can see my paperwork here in my office, my light's not too bright. I move that Docket #2020-43-DP to allow for the development plan approval of a master signage program for Appaloosa Crossing development as depicted in Exhibit 4-C zoned Rural Professional Business BP and Rural General Business GB and within the Michigan Road Overlay MRO be approved based on findings of fact in the staff report and recommended and submitted be approved.

Franz All right. Is there a second?

Lake Second.

Franz Is there any further discussion? Wayne, would you please take roll? You're on mute.

Lake You're muted, Wayne.

DeLong Hit the wrong button. Mrs. Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Yeah, aye.

DeLong Mr. Jones?

Jones Aye.

DeLong Mr. Franz?

Franz Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Walker?

Walker Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lake?

Lake Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lewis?

Lewis Aye.

Franz All right. Motion carries, 6-0. So, you have your approval. Thanks very much.

Price Thank you, Mr. President.

Franz           Onto the next matter on the Docket is Docket #2020-48-DP 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment Outlot I of the Appaloosa Crossing 3295 South US 421 petition for development plan approval for a 12,500-square-foot commercial building on Outlot I of Appaloosa Crossing which is zoned Rural General Business GB and within the Michigan Road Overlay MRO. Before I ask the petitioner to begin, we need to have a motion to accept first-class mail for notification of this matter. Is there a motion on that?

Grabianowski   So moved.

Franz           Is there a second?

Lake            Second.

Franz           All right. All in favor, signify by aye.

All              Aye.

Franz           Oppose by nay. Motion carries. Petitioner, please.

Ochs            Good evening, Members of the Plan Commission, Tim Ochs here this evening on behalf of the petitioner, 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment. As the Commission will recall, this was before you back in December. At that time, really we, I asked a question which was design following what I would call more traditional Zionsville theme or a design that was consistent with the architectural theme that had been established with Appaloosa Crossing based on the two development plans that had already been approved for Appaloosa Crossing. I think it was rather clear, I don't know maybe even unanimous but very clear that the desire was that the building adopt the architectural themes that had been established for the rest of Appaloosa Crossing. Architect went to work on that. Because of the holidays, I believe it took a little bit longer than we would have liked but he was able to accomplish that. The building remains the same in terms of size which is 12,500 square feet. There are certain aspects of the building that we were able to keep that actually harken or give a nod to the Zionsville theme, almost a Colonial style in the sense of a significant amount of brick, of masonry, of rectangular building symmetrical as it faces Michigan with a pitched roof and gables. At the same time, we changed—first, we changed the color palette to match the balance of the Appaloosa Crossing and the colors that had been established. Then, we started adding features and themes to tie it to the rest of Appaloosa Crossing that is the board and batten and the gables. There's metal roof on a portion of it to give it kind of the Gregorian theme that was established. We think we've struck a very nice balance so that this now does fit in well.

If you'll look at the site plan as well, you'll notice that there is parking that is located on the south side of the building. That parking, we will propose that it not be installed initially as is allowed in this zone of classification with the zoning administrator's approval but that should parking be needed that could be added. If it is added, the parking ratios would meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The other significant change that was made since the December hearing which was clearly expressed is the front of the building, the front entrance or front door if you will, is clearly facing towards Michigan Road. We

made that very clear. So, with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

Franz All right. Thank you. At this point in time, is there any members of the public who'd like to make a comment on this matter? If so, please raise your hand to be recognized.

Kilmer There are no hands raised.

Franz All right. At this point, I'll take staff's comments on this. Wayne, would you please do that?

DeLong Thank you again. An excellent report I provided to you by Roger Kilmer. Certainly, the staff is supportive of this petition. Certainly, the one comment that we've talked about certainly in the pre-meeting as well is the expectation of the Board of Zoning Appeals related to the standardization of certain elements, the building, the context of the building like has been discussed already. Certainly, another component is the lighting, the height of the lighting elements, the style of the lighting elements. Certainly, there is some room for a little bit of deviation here and there given maybe a manufacturer won't be available here in the future. In that same breath, is color temperature and similarity across the palette of the entire development. So that's, I think, an item that's still you know needs a little bit more fine tuning in terms of the Plan Commission's satisfaction with the lighting elements as they're proposed. I'm happy and certainly staff is prepared to take any additional questions.

Franz All right. Thank you, Wayne. At this point in time, I'll open up to Members of the Plan Commission for any questions.

Jones This is more, once again, kind of general. One, I do like the look of the building. It is a much better look, all four sides even though it's going to have one rear, kind of a flat surface but still I think it's a better design than the previous. By changing the roof profile to have it open in the center, kind of lowered the whole overall look of it that I think will tie in nice. If we just got done with signage, we've been talking about lighting. We know the overall plan is changing to add a residential component. Has there been any discussions, and this might go back to Wayne and Roger, about any kind of like either internal signage on the buildings or some type of minor monument signage? Eventually, you're going to end up with a pretty long drive behind the building with multiple buildings on it. What I'm seeing is, just no provision for once you're on the internal Appaloosa Drive to figure out what's what. Does that make sense? I mean, so I drive down behind Target and Home Depot and Kohls and Office Depot and all that stuff, and there's no signage back there. Thankfully, I've done it a hundred times so I can usually remember but for the average person using that kind of drive, there's just nothing back there to figure out where you want to go. What's the process involving something like that? Does it—who makes that call?

DeLong I think what you're touching upon is directional signage and that would certainly be something that the developer could look to provide and certainly something that's supported by the ordinance. I know that's not Mr. Ochs' charge this evening but certainly the staff can explore that with the developer. It could be

that the developer has no real desire to provide directional behind the buildings because if there was they could end up leading folks into the residential area. So, it might be purposeful that there is a lack of directional signage but we're happy to certainly explore that.

Jones Then, if the tenant, if 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment wants some sort of signage on the back of their building on the east elevation, is that a separate request then? I mean, currently they're not really showing any signage on the front other than the beer, wine, spirits piece.

DeLong So in the rural area, the signage ordinance is fairly helpful in terms of the amount of signage that one can put on a building. Certainly, I think what you're also driving at, Mr. Jones, is back in the day, 2006 when this project was originally approved, commercial signage on the back of the buildings may not have been an issue because it was facing towards a commercial integrated center. Now, that area is facing into a residential development and that light spillage might be something that you're touching upon in terms of the intrusiveness of the lighting of the glowing signs and/or other issues. Is that what you're touching upon?

Jones No, not so much lights, though. It's just general, you know, what's the word I'm looking for? Way finding, just straight up good old-fashioned way finding. When somebody is back there on Appaloosa Trail, you know, how are we going to be able to tell what's what from the backside of the building.

Walker You know, a lot of the stores over at Clay Terrace, they have printed on the door in very nice printing what the buildings are what you're entering for delivery people. Not that I hang out at people's backdoors a lot but there is printing on those doors that looks nice.

Jones The only reason I'm thinking about this is we just got done talking about the, you know, signage for the development as a whole, so. All right.

Franz Speaking of signage, has there been any discussion about where that single-tenant signage is going to go? I mean, I realize we just approved the signage language on the prior docket item but has there been any discussion on where the monument sign is going to go for this single tenant here?

Ochs We've been waiting for the approval that just occurred before this hearing to help determine that. We understand that if this is going to have us single-tenant monument sign that that would require that we probably have to come back just like the other two outlots that have already been approved. We have to go back and have that conversation with the developer now that their package is approved.

Franz All right.

Ochs We're certainly willing to listen to suggestions but because that decision has not yet been made.

Franz I mean, I don't really have—I mean, I'll let you guys decide that with the developer and figure out how that stuff goes. I got a question about the—why, I

mean, the lighting slightly different than what is being used by the other, I guess, it's the other two approved outbuildings. Is there a reason that it's different and not the same one?

Ochs           The reason it was different was because these light standards date back to what was originally I think anticipated by the developer and they haven't been changed. Assuming that there's no significant cost increase on the lights, 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment—these lights are not part of their branding. So assuming that there's not an appreciable cost increase, a significant cost increase, 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment would be willing to use the same lighting, same height, same style, same color temperature. That is not an issue for 21<sup>st</sup> Amendment.

Franz           Okay. I want to, you know, echo with what Mr. Jones said. I do appreciate your efforts to modify the building to something that fits better. So I appreciate that. It does look quite a bit better, so thanks very much.

Ochs           Thank you.

Franz           Is there any other questions, comments from anybody else? If there are none, is there a motion on this matter?

Jones           I'll go ahead and do it. I move that the waiver of architectural building design requirements be approved based on the findings in the staff report Exhibit 6 as presented. I move that the waiver of building materials be approved based on the findings in the staff report, Exhibit 6 as presented. I move that Docket #2020-48-DP to allow for the development plan approval of a 12,500-square-foot single-tenant building on Outlot I, the 1.5 acre +/- within the Appaloosa Crossing development zoned Rural General Business GB and within the Michigan Road Overlay MRO be approved utilizing the design flexibility section of the ordinance regarding parking spaces based on the findings in the staff report and the staff recommendations submitted findings of fact and subject to resolution of outstanding review items identified by the town engineer in Exhibit 5 of the staff report and submitted of a compliant landscape plan.

Franz           All right. So those are three separate parcels that require separate votes, correct? Can we do that?

Jones           We can do that. I'd agree to that.

Franz           So, Dan, you're on mute. So the first matter—we have to take separate motions. This is separate motions, correct, Dan?

Taylor          Yes.

Franz           Okay. So the first motion is there a sec—is there a second on the first motion?

Lake           Second.

Franz           All right. Is there any comments, discussion? Being none, Wayne, would you please take roll?

Zionsville Plan Commission  
February 16, 2021

DeLong Certainly. Mr. Franz?

Franz Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Walker?

Walker Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lake?

Lake Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lewis?

Lewis Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

DeLong Mr. Jones?

Jones Aye.

Franz All right. Then, motion carries, 6-0. Then, the motion on the waiver of building materials, is there a second on that one?

Walker Second.

Franz All right. Any further discussion? Wayne, would you please take roll?

DeLong Mrs. Walker?

Walker Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lake?

Lake Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lewis?

Lewis Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

DeLong Mr. Jones?

Jones Aye.

Zionsville Plan Commission  
February 16, 2021

DeLong Mr. Franz?

Franz Aye. That motion also carries, 6-0. Then, on the motion to approve the development plan, is there a second on that one?

Lewis Second.

Franz Is there any further discussion, comment? Wayne, would you please take roll?

DeLong Mr. Lake?

Lake Sorry. Aye.

DeLong Mr. Lewis?

Lewis Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Grabianowski?

Grabianowski Aye.

DeLong Mr. Jones?

Jones Aye.

DeLong Mr. Franz?

Franz Aye.

DeLong Mrs. Walker?

Walker Aye.

Franz That motion also carries, 6-0. So, you have your approvals. Thank you very much.

Ochs Thank you.

Franz Good night.

Ochs Good night.

Franz At this point in time, is there any other matters to be discussed?

DeLong I can provide some very quick updates for you.

Franz Okay.

DeLong Some more stuff on the forum-based code, the town is moving through legal review of the contract. So we look to have that taken care of fairly quickly. Your Zionsville gateway area, I don't have a specific update related to any future timing

but certainly the project continues to move through its iterations internally as we fine tune and research and come though the data that's come in. Certainly we'll have some output I would suspect in about 45-day give or take window for to provide for you. Also, want to touch upon some email correspondence that came to you through the email system related to the park. Certainly, the project was— some questions were asked of the Plan Commission, certainly as staff and your secretary, we responded and certainly I believe we copied you on that response. In the meantime, some additional correspondence has been generated. So I wanted to provide you an update to that as one of the questions was asked, is the park coming back as any sort of amendment for your consideration in any future iterations? The answer to that question is, staff does not have an answer to that question. We have given the petitioner, the park developer, information related to their secondary plat submittal that there is at least one component which is the central water system that doesn't match up with the preliminary plat that this commission saw about 18 months, 16 months or so ago. If that is the plan and that's the plan that's to be constructed, it would require the Plan Commission's approval. So that could be an amendment that you might see. The park, the project might move forward with a central water system that meets the drawing that you saw 16-18 months ago. So, I wanted to provide that update to you. Yeah, the staff continues to correspond with interested parties. We do have a meeting coming up virtually later this month to offer additional information. We'll move forward from there and provide additional updates as needed.

Franz All right. Thank you, Wayne. At this point in time, is there anything else? If there isn't, is there a motion to adjourn?

Lake So moved.

Franz Second?

Lewis Second.

Franz All in favor. Signify by aye.

All Aye.

Franz Oppose by nay. Oh, nobody said no, so good night everybody.