City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION
AUGUST 16, 2005
Minutes

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Plan Commission met at 6:00 PM on Tuesday, August 16, 2005 in the Council Chambers, Carmel City Hall, Carmel, Indiana. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Brainard administered the Oath of Office to Kevin Heber, newest Plan Commission member.

Members Present: Jerry Chomanczuk; Leo Dierckman; Dan Dutcher; Wayne Haney; Kevin Heber; Dianna Knoll; Mark Ratterman; Rick Ripma; Madeleine Torres; Susan Westermeier, thereby establishing a quorum.

Department of Community Services Staff in Attendance: Matt Griffin; Adrienne Keeling; Mike Hollibaugh, Director. Also in attendance: John Molitor, Legal Counsel

The minutes from the July 19, 2005 meeting were approved as submitted.

G. Matt Griffin reported on an item brought up at last month's meeting. At the time a petitioner agrees to fund a pedestrian path, the funds go into the General, Non-reverting Fund for the City and the funds can be used for any street project—a path, an intersection—whatever is most pressing. Currently, new staff member Karen Rygs who functions as Transportation Systems Coordinator is exploring the option of breaking the Alternative Transportation Fund away from the General Fund so that the monies would be specifically targeted for alternative transportation projects.

H. <u>Public Hearings</u>:

1h. **05060038 PP Amend and 05060039 SP: Little Farms Addition, Lots 31-33 (Replat of)**
The applicant seeks approval to replat 9 lots on 2.25 acres:
The site is located at the northwest corner of Ethel Street and West 104th Street.
The site is zoned R-3/Residence within the Home Place Overlay.
Filed by Chris Badger of Badger Engineering & Associates.

Chris Badger, Badger Engineering, 117 West Elm Street, Lebanon, 46052 appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. The petitioner appeared before the Commission approximately 10 months ago on this same project. However, the project has changed and the new

ONE CIVIC SQUARE CARMEL, INDIANA 46032 317/571-2417

developer, R.G.Thomas Consulting has taken over the project. The major change was to remove a cul-de-sac.

Apparently, the cul-de-sac made it very difficult to access the lot for building purposes. The alley would only be used for fire access. Currently, there was a variance hearing for the reduction in the front yard setback and approval for the variance was granted. The name of the development has been changed to Clay Commons.

The storm lines connect to the west of the property and the petitioner is currently working with Keith and Kimberly Norman to get the easement approved. The Normans have a concern with existing trees and would rather not have them removed. The petitioner has agreed to continue working with the Normans to find a distance that is acceptable to everyone.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition; no one appeared. Members of the public were invited to speak in opposition to the petition; the following appeared:

Remonstrance/Unfavorable:
Gary Cantrell, 10445 Ethel Street, was opposed to the alley but would support the original plan of a circle rather than an alley. Mr. Cantrell distributed a petition signed by 11 surrounding neighbors who are opposed to the alley.

Keith Norman, 1220 East 104th Street, was not in favor of the alley, simply because it will abut his property. Most alleys are littered with garbage, cars, etc. Headlights from traffic into the alley would be intrusive to Mr. Norman's property. Currently, there are 4 pine trees where the road terminates, and those would be cleared. Mr. Norman expressed major concern with the drainage in this area. It seems as if the drainage was altered as a result of the construction of Habitat for Humanity homes and the area now floods when it rains. The understanding is that there will be some sort of retention pond on the property, but who will be responsible for cleaning that out when it fills in with silt; if it does fill with silt, will it flood the area even more? Mr. Norman also felt that the proposed construction is not consistent with other homes in the immediate area.

Pat Robinson, 3277 Smokey Ridge Circle, Carmel, property owner of 10423 and 10425 Ethel Street, directly opposite Turner Drive, was opposed to the alley. The alley is a potential for trash, including large appliances and furniture, drug users, and broken windows from persons in the alley throwing rocks. Mr. Robinson was also opposed to the setback variation from 30 feet to 25 feet and requested that the limits within the Ordinance apply to this petitioner just as those limits have applied to him. One property in the immediate area has a 90-foot setback, the Habitat for Humanity Homes have a 35-foot setback; the house on the corner has a 50-foot setback. Mr. Robinson's property at 10423 and 10425 Ethel has a 45-foot setback.

The public hearing was then closed.

Rebuttal, Chris Badger: Originally, the property was purchased by Tom Lazarra. Tom Lazarra did not purchase the property for or through Habitat, he owned it and worked for them. Secondly, there

were three variances on the original petition that were needed. One was for lot coverage, one was for a setback, and one was a buffer-yard issue. Then, Tom Lazarra ended up selling the property. The proposed use is a better use; any street or alley that is not maintained would be a problem. The petitioner could write in the covenants that the Home Owners Association of the nine lots would take care of the maintenance of the alley. The developer has added "No Parking" signs in the alley, the alley is one-way from Turner, and the cul-de-sac was not advantageous to any kind of development. A tree preservation plan is in place and on file with the Department.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The lot size is compliant with the zoning; the setbacks would be from the right-of-way and not the pavement. This item would typically go the Subdivision Committee for review, and that is the Department's recommendation at this time. Please note that the setback issue (appeal) will be before the Board of Zoning Appeals in September.

Mark Rattermann asked about the type of structures; Chris Badger responded that the homes are single-family, attached homes with two-car garages.

Dan Dutcher asked about the "alley" approach; Matt Griffin responded that alleys are a good tool to use and in this situation, it is more an after-thought in that it will be used for emergency access only. The Fire Department reviewed the turning radius required for their equipment, and as far as the Dept is concerned, it does not add any extra connectivity—it is only there for access.

Rick Ripma asked about the drainage issue and requested more information for review at the Committee level.

Madeleine Torres recalled a development in the Meridian Street corridor that had an alley for emergency vehicles only. The specific project was not really a paved street, but grass with pavers underneath. Could that same design be applied to this project, since it is emergency access only?

Chris Badger responded in the affirmative and thought Madeleine's suggestion was an excellent idea. It could be mowed and maintained and would probably deter parking because it would look like someone's yard.

Docket No. 05060038 PP Amend and 05060039 SP, Little Farms Addition, Lots 31-33 (Replat) was forwarded to the **Subdivision Committee** for further review on **September 6,** 2005 at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

2h. Docket No. 05060040 Z and 05060041 ADLS: 116th and College PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 12.4 acres from R1/Residential and B6/Business to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhome, retail, and office uses.
The site is located at NE corner of 116th Street and College Ave.
Filed by Timothy Ochs of Ice Miller for Equicor Development Inc.

Zeff Weiss, attorney, Ice Miller, 3400 One American Square appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. The actual petitioner is 116th Street Center. Also in attendance: Greg Small, Mark Zuckerman, Brian Zuckerman, Don Guinup, Engineer, and T. J. Swanson, technical support.

The property consists of 12 acres and is located at the corner of 116th Street and College Avenue. The property runs approximately 850 feet on the north side of 116th Street and 750 feet north along College Avenue. This particular property is a "sister property" to the corner of 116th and Guilford. The current proposal is for a PUD mixed-use development of both office retail and multi-family, townhome community.

The proposal is both for a rezone of the property from its current B-1 and B-6 Business to a PUD and simultaneously, ADLS approval. Three buildings are proposed for the east side of 116th Street, another at the corner of 116th and College, and a third building would be north on College. There are three points of access: one on 116th Street, two along College Avenue. The 116th Street access would be right in/right out only so as to improve the traffic flow. There is a parcel between the corner project at 116th and Guilford and the current proposal that is owned by a Mr. Snyder; he was unwilling to participate in either the PUD or the potential sale of the property. Someday in the future, there may be inter-connectivity between the parcels.

There is a high parapet wall that gives the appearance of being a higher building; also, the building on the corner of 116th Street and Carmel Drive is a two-story building and typical uses expected are professional-type offices, realtor/offices, maybe a physician/dentist/neighborhood-type use, some potential retail, maybe a dress shop, but definitely a neighborhood center.

The petitioner has submitted a lighting and landscape plan. The lights are down-lighting, designed to minimize spillage and are consistent with the area and in the development to the east. From an overall perspective, the proposal includes 60 townhomes on five (5) acres, three (3) buildings on the out-lot being proposed, the user is yet unknown—hopefully a free-standing restaurant or a single user that would be aesthetically pleasing and consistent with the type of design being used in terms of building materials. The petitioner would return to the Commission for ADLS review of that particular out-lot location.

Also included in the packet is a list of permitted uses and excluded uses. The excluded uses specify no filling station, no auto repair, no sexually oriented business, etc. In the original site plan, there is proposed inner-connectivity not only to this center but hopefully, in the future to the east. The Department has encouraged the petitioner to tie into future development to the immediate east. There is connectivity to the north into the residential community. Traffic from the residential community could go north toward the City Center by going north to Guilford Road, north and then to Carmel Drive; to Meridian Street, traffic would come out onto 116th Street and head west, towards Meridian Street. The petitioner is willing to work with the Department regarding traffic flow. Street parking is being considered along College Avenue.

ONE CIVIC SQUARE CARMEL, INDIANA 46032 317/571-2417

The petitioner has met with neighbors on the south side of 116th Street. Their concerns include and are focused in large part on the widening of 116th Street and the change in character of the area as a result. There was also concern about the large power poles on 116th Street generally east of Guilford and those were disconcerting to the petitioner as well. The petitioner (along with the City) was instrumental in convincing the power company not to bring the poles farther west in a way that would impede the development currently under construction or the proposed development. Lastly, the Equicor principals are first-class people that have done several developments in the community and who also live in the community and hope to be here a long time.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of or opposition to the petition; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: The Staff has been working with the petitioner in terms of playing up the idea of making this development more an urban-functioning area or small node. At the Committee level, a re-design will be seen where there is no pedestrian path out front as opposed to moving the path up to the building edge and having a sidewalk and area for outdoor seating, etc. Some of the re-designs should be displayed at the Committee level. In addition, there are some items in the Department Report that should be further explored at Committee. The Department is recommending this item be forwarded to the Special Studies Committee on September 6th.

Mark Rattermann asked if there were cross-easements between the residential section and the commercial section for parking. This can be explored further at Special Studies Committee.

Zeff Weiss responded that currently, there are cross easements for ingress and egress.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if any thought had been given to performing a traffic study in order to determine the impact this development as well as on-street parking would have on the entire area.

Zeff Weiss responded that he was unsure if a traffic study was necessary in light of the fact that one was done in connection with the expansion of 116th Street that anticipated the development likely to occur, not only currently but in the future. From a traffic flow perspective, some traffic data can be made available that already addresses the impact of this particular piece of property. Regarding the on-street parking, this is an issue that has been raised by the Staff wanting to view it for the new "urbanism" look. The petitioner is happy to work with the Department and the Committee to address this.

Docket No. 05060040 Z and 05060041 ADLS, 116th and College PUD were forwarded to the Special Studies Committee for further review on September 6, 2005 at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

3h. Docket No. 05060042 DP Amend/ADLS: Carmel Science and Technology Park, Blk 11
The applicant seeks approval for a medical office building.
The site is located at the SW corner of Carmel Dr. and Guilford Rd. and is zoned M-

3/Manufacturing.
Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale.

Mary Solada, attorney, 2700 Market Tower, Indianapolis appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Ross Glare, Bremner Health Care, (formerly Bremner & Wiley) Dan Grubert of CSO Architects, and Bob Doster, Schneider Engineering.

The proposal is for a medical office building to be located in the Carmel Science and Technology Park that is similar to another building with the office park in terms of type of masonry and other details. The building will be Georgian Architecture, not more than 52,000 square feet.

The petitioner will be seeking a variance for a second sign. The proposed building will be a multi-tenant office building. The Department would like a closer look at some of the issues relating to landscaping, buffering, pedestrian circulation, etc.

A few minor changes are anticipated prior to the Special Studies Committee on September 6, 2005, and the petitioner will work closely with the Department.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of or opposition to the petition; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The Department will continue to work with the petitioner on the remaining, outstanding items from previous comments and looks forward to seeing additional items referred to in the Department Report. The Department is recommending this item be referred to the Special Studies Committee on September 6, 2005.

Commission Members Comments:
Dan Dutcher asked what the expectation was as far as trails along Carmel Drive—there are no trails depicted on the site plan.

Matt Griffin responded that trails are expected in this area and the Department will be working with the Engineering Department to see how those will be handled—whether paths or sidewalks will be installed, and if they will be installed in conjunction with another project. It definitely will be developed according to the Alternate Transportation Plan and City Thoroughfare Plan.

Dianna Knoll was concerned with the three entrances to the office building and that there are already a lot of left turns on Carmel Drive that causes problems and this could be an opportunity to eliminate some of the traffic situation.

Mary Solada responded that the petitioner had met with the Carmel City Engineer and the Assistant City Engineer regarding that topic. The petitioner has agreed to provide that the access off 122nd Street would be right in/right out. The curb cut should be carefully located, particularly considering that improvements are planned at Guilford and Carmel Drive. Again, the petitioner will bring more details to the Special Studies Committee.

ONE CIVIC SQUARE CARMEL, INDIANA 46032 317/571-2417

Mark Rattermann said he had the same issue—whether or not the left turns will stop. If there is no left-turn lane westbound, it will be a big problem. Mark would like to see the City allow proposed changes that would provide for a left-turn lane. If not, that is a big concern.

Mary Solada responded that the petitioner had been asked by the City to make substantial contributions to the intersection of Guilford Road and Carmel Drive, including right-of-way, including engineering, including the existing drainage being added to the proposed drainage. The petitioner is hopeful that there will be some give/take in terms of their willingness to dedicate substantial resources to the effort in return for trying to work out a safe situation at the curb-cut. More detail will be provided at Committee.

Jerry Chomanzuk asked whether or not Carmel Science & Technology Park has an association.

Mary Solada responded that the petitioner has actively been researching that with the help of Hamilton Title. There is an Association that was resurrected last year and the petitioner will speak to the Association about some plan approval issues and whether or not the Association has jurisdiction over the pond. The seller, REI, will be submitting comments and the petitioner will report at the Committee level.

Docket No. 05060042 DP Amend/ADLS, Carmel Science and Technology Park, Blk 11 was referred to the Special Studies Committee for further review on September 6, 2005 at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

4h. Docket No. 05060043 PP: Laurel Ridge
The applicant seeks approval to plat 17 lots on 47.12 acres with the following Subdivision Waivers:
Docket No. 05060044 SW: 6.03.04 – Connectivity
To seek relief from providing stub streets to adjoining properties.
D**ocket No. 05060045 SW: 8.09.02 – Alternative Transportation**
To seek relief from providing a pedestrian path along Ditch Road.
Docket No. 05060046 SW: 6.03.19 – Access to Arterials, Parkways, and Collectors
To seek relief from houses fronting collector streets/200 foot required separation from collector streets.
Docket No. 05060047 SW: 6.03.22 – Acceleration/Deceleration, and Passing Lanes
To seek relief from providing acceleration/deceleration and passing lanes.
Docket No. 05060048 SW: 8.09.02 – Private Streets
To allow the construction of private streets serving the entire subdivision.
Docket No. 05060049 SW: 8.09.02 – Cul de Sac Length
To allow cul de sacs to exceed 600 feet in length.
Docket No. 05060050 SW: 6.02.01 – Subdivision in Floodway/Plain
To allow subdivision of land within the floodway and floodplain.
The site is located at the SE corner of Ditch Road and W. 106th Street and is zoned S1/Residential.
Filed by Joseph Calderon of JBC1, LLC for JB Cohen.

Joseph Calderon, attorney, 600 East 96th Street, Carmel attended the meeting on behalf of JB Cohen. Also in attendance was Jeff Cohen of JB Cohen.

The proposed development is a very low-density subdivision; 17 lots proposed on 47 acres and is in keeping with the S-1 Zoning Classification. The acreage size for the lots ranges from 1.2 to 2.8 acres and is compatible with the existing subdivision development that lies to the east. The proposed development backs up to Laurel Wood on the east; the width of the lots is actually in excess of those found in Laurel Wood. The petitioner believes he is also compatible with the estate development that has taken place on Ditch Road over the years.

The petitioner has met with the adjoining neighbors as well as the property owners of the metes and bounds lots on Ditch Road to discuss the development. A letter of support has been submitted to the Commission from the residents of Laurel Wood. One entry is being requested on Ditch Road; a gate would be featured and located so that traffic conflicts would be avoided. The gate is set back significantly off Ditch Road, more than 60 feet off the curb cut, and would be after the turn-around feature. There will be significantly landscaping featured around the gate and set back so that it does not appear to be entering a prison. The gate area has been engineered so as to provide a bus waiting area closer to Ditch Road.

The community will have a significant masonry wall and details will be provided at the Committee level. The community will be served by municipal sewer and water; significant landscaping will be added around the perimeter as well as preserving landscaping on the shared, common boundary with Laurel Wood. A private declaration of Restrictive Covenants will be included that provides the minimum square footage of homes proposed in this subdivision will be 5,000 square feet. There will also be various and sundry restrictions including maintenance obligations. The street is proposed to be a private street, built to either City or County standards (whichever is more strict.) This will be discussed more thoroughly at the Committee level.

It was not the intent of the petitioner to create a project that would require a lot of waivers, however, there were some things built into the Subdivision Ordinance that do not accommodate a development such as the one being proposed. Examples: stub streets; connectivity; alternative transportation; floodway/plain, etc. These can be explored further at the Committee level. Note: The petitioner does show a pedestrian path on 106th Street, but has requested a waiver for the pathway on Ditch Road. The plat does accommodate a proposed round about at 106th and Ditch Road.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition and the following appeared:

Tim Sams & wife Suzanne, owner of 10 acres at 10404 Ditch Road, opposite the entrance to the proposed development, was in favor of the project but concerned that no one had contacted them to talk about it. Mr. Sams did not understand the purpose of the technical waiver for floodway/plain.

Members of the public were invited to speak in opposition to the petition; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Rebuttal:
Joe Calderon stated that the Subdivision Ordinance has a blanket statement that no development shall occur in a floodway/plan. Technically, dirt will be moved and there will be some activity, however, no structure will be built within the flood plain. Mr. Calderon responded that he would be happy to discuss the proposal with Mr. Sams or Mr. Sams could contact the Department as well.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The Department is still working with the Hamilton County Highway Dept and City Engineers to determine the feasibility of some of the waivers in terms of road construction, etc. The Department does not support the waivers from pedestrian paths and this should be discussed at Committee. The Department recommends this item be sent to the Subdivision Committee on September 6, 2005.

Commission Member Comments:
Dan Dutcher questioned the number of waivers being requested on this property. Dan Dutcher was particularly concerned with waivers regarding private roads per the gated entrance and the requested waiver regarding trail requirements are especially troubling, since the recreational paths for this specific area on the alternative transportation route; we would undermine the plan if we waive the requirements on Ditch Road. This could be discussed further at Committee.

Regarding the floodplain issue, would it be possible to have a depiction that reflects the proposed building lot lines and the floodplain? Simply because a development is proposing very nice, expensive homes on large lots, it is not a reason for the Plan Commission to be more favorably disposed to grant waiver requests.

Madeleine Torres wondered if the petitioner could explain the impact the development would have on the drainage—there is standing water in this particular area as well as two retention ponds that overflow into the street. Also, is there a long term plan for Ditch Road that proposed widening in the future and if so, which side of the street.

Matt Griffin undertook to research the status of Ditch Road as far as future roadway improvements.

Kevin Heber commented on the alternative transportation—if an option is available to take a side path, he will usually "go for it;" if it connects to something like 106th Street, even better to go for it.

Mark Rattermann felt that these issues were tied together. The challenge is that the side path is connected with the issue of the flood plain and the drainage issue—it all comes into play here. It will be a major bridge in order to build a side path; the topography is really challenging. There may be some creativity that could be done to allow the path to be constructed.

Madeleine Torres commented that it would be difficult to connect to the pathway in front of Laurel Wood because they have removed the path west of their gated entry—there is no paved pathway currently in being—however, to the east of the gated entry, the pathway does exist. Is there any intention to replace the pathway, or why was it removed?

Matt Griffin responded that he would research the situation.

Dan Dutcher noted that his version of the Thoroughfare Plan identifies Ditch Road as a collector street that would ultimately be four lanes with an associated ten-foot path.

Rick Ripma questioned the cul-de-sac length—how much does it exceed the Ordinance, and why does the Ordinance specify 600 feet for a cul-de-sac length? Rick Ripma also asked that the petitioner bring a drawing of the entry way and the gates to the Committee.

Matt Griffin said he would research the reason for cul-de-sac length and respond in the Department Report.

Docket No. 05060043 PP, Laurel Ridge and companion Subdivision Waivers were forwarded to the Subdivision Committee for further review on Tuesday, September 6, 2005 in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

***Note:** Wayne Haney exited the meeting at this time and did not return.

5h. **Docket No. 05060051 PP: The Retreat of West Clay Primary Plat**
The applicant seeks approval of 32 lots on 23.49 acres:
The site is located near the NE corner of Little Eagle Creek Ave and W. 141st St. and is zoned S1/Residential
Filed by Jim Shinaver of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: John Isaacs and Sean Sullivan, Centex Homes.

The petitioner seeks approval to develop a 23.49-acre parcel of real estate into a 32-lot subdivision to be known as The Retreat of West Clay. Centex is not seeking a rezone for this parcel nor are they seeking any variances or waivers. The property is located north of and adjacent to 141st Street and east of and adjacent to Little Eagle Creek Avenue.

The anticipated price range of the homes within The Retreat of West Clay is expected to be between $300, to $450,000. There are two entrances into the subdivision. The first entrance is off 141st Street; the second entrance is on the northwest portion of the site adjacent to Little Eagle Creek Ave.
The landscape plan provides for a boulevard treatment at the entrance to the subdivision. There are also some common area ponds throughout the property located on the southern portion of the site near 141st Street, internal to the site, and the third pond is located on the northwestern portion of the site. Included in the landscape plan is some sitting areas within the common areas—one in the northwestern portion of the site; the other being in the northeastern portion of the site. A pathway system has been incorporated that connects the two common areas. There is significant landscaping around the perimeter of the site and interior to the site. The homes proposed for The Retreat of

West Clay would be an up-dated version of the homes exhibited in the informational packets. However, the up-grades primarily relate to the interior finish of the home.

A neighborhood meeting was conducted August 11th. The homeowners required to be noticed were the same ones that were sent notices for the neighborhood meeting. The meeting was productive and the understanding is that Sean Sullivan and John Isaacs will be contacting some of these neighbors regarding follow-up visits at the site. Many of the questions asked during the neighborhood meeting related to some of the landscape treatment around the perimeter of the property. It was beneficial to meet with the homeowners with a copy of the landscape plan and walk the property and further explain to them how the landscape plan would be put into place.

Again, no variances or waivers are being request—this is a primary plat application pursuant to the ROSO standards.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of or opposition to the proposed development; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The proposal does meet the Ordinance and the petitioner is not asking for anything additional. There were a few minor issues raised at TAC, one of those being the boulevard. The Department is working with Engineering to verify that everything is acceptable as presented. Otherwise, the Department is recommending this item be forwarded to Subdivision Committee on September 6th.

Commission Member Comments:
Dianna Knoll complimented the petitioner on providing something interactive in the open space—it was nice and the landscaping was good. However, the amount of retention ponds seems excessive. Dianna Knoll challenged the developers to look for alternatives to the detention/retention ponds. Basically, ponds cannot be used—you can't swim in them, sit next to them, ice skate on them. There is landscaping that can be done around the ponds that would discourage geese.

Docket No. 05060051 PP, The Retreat of West Clay Primary Plat was forwarded to the **Subdivision Committee** for further review on Tuesday, September 6, 2005 at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

6h. Docket No. 05060053 DP/ADLS: Weston Pointe Retail Center
The applicant seeks approval for multiple commercial/retail buildings.
The site is located at 11055 N. Michigan Rd. and is zoned B-2/Business within the US 421 Overlay.
Filed by Ronald Bell of Williams Realty Group for PL Properties, LLC.

Ron Bell, 9830 Bauer Drive, Indianapolis appeared before the Commission representing the Williams Realty Group. Also in attendance: Civil Designs, Engineers, George Small, architect, and Jackie Haynes, Williams Realty Group.

The site is zoned B-2/Business and is within the US 421 Overlay. The petitioner is proposing to construct approximately 80,000 square feet of office and retail on this site. A bank has leased the southwest corner of the property and negotiations are under way for the other two out-lots.

There is a large courtyard, bricked on both sides, and should be a very interesting opportunity for a restaurant in that location with outdoor seating. In the back of the center is a small building, 7,000 square feet, primarily used for a residential real estate office already located in the area. The large building to the rear is a two-story, 25,000 square-foot office building that will become the corporate headquarters for Williams Realty and they will occupy the majority of the building.

The petitioner has complied with comments from the Department and pulled the office building closer to Weston Drive in order to accommodate a better streetscape and traffic flow as well as allowing for visual aspects to come through Weston Drive through the office buildings into the back for greater traffic flow, more open space, and a little greener look in the rear of the property.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition; no one appeared. Members of the public were invited to speak in opposition to the petition, the following appeared:

Remonstrance/Unfavorable
Brad Spanhauer, 3854 Constitution Drive, The Westons Subdivision. The Westons Subdivision and in particular, Monitor Lane has become a dumping ground for construction traffic in the Michigan Road area. Has the developer received any further information as to the automatic traffic signal on 421?

The Public Hearing was then closed.

Rebuttal:
Ron Bell said that the developer, Bremner & Wiley, Williams Realty Group, and the prior owner of the property as well as REI and Browning Investments would all join in an agreement to pay for the traffic light as the warrant becomes available.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The Department Staff will continue to work with the petitioner on any outstanding items and look forward to seeing additional details at the Committee level. The Department is recommending this item be forwarded to the Special Studies Committee on September 6th.

Commission Members Comments:
Dan Dutcher asked the petitioner to review the pedestrian/bike access from Michigan Road throughout the proposed development. It looks as if there are trails, but it is uncertain how they will flow and where the connections are.

Ron Bell said that the Staff had them to have a pedestrian way through the area, across the parking lot and then back into the Subdivision so that pedestrians could walk to the Shopping Center.

Dan Dutcher asked the Department about the design standards on Michigan Road and if that had been discussed.

Matt Griffin responded that at this point in time, re-designing the aesthetics of Michigan Road has not been discussed. Right now it is in line with what the Overlay intended—suburban development. At this time, it may not warrant become more friendly in that urban sense. In terms of how the path interacts with this development—as the out-lots come in, they will also explore the option of having a direct link from the out-lot to the path in order to encourage pedestrian traffic to the site.

Mark Rattermann asked if the Department was aware that the City Council adopted a resolution last year strongly opposing additional traffic lights on 421.

Matt Griffin responded that he would search for information/history on the approval for the traffic light.

Jerry Chomanczuk said he was a little disappointed with the renditions—color elevations would greatly enhance the Committee's ability to understand what will be presented at this location. This project is like a miniature version of Clay Terrace, even though it is a couple of small buildings—black/white renditions do not do justice and color elevations would be appreciated for review at the Committee level.

Docket No. 05060053 DP/ADLS, Weston Pointe Retail Center was forwarded to the Special Studies Committee for further review on Tuesday, September 6, 2005 at 6:00 PM.

I. <u>Old Business</u>:

1i. **Docket No. 050300019 PP: West Clay Colony**
The applicant seeks to plat 23 lots on 40 acres. The site is located at the NE corner of Hoover Road and W. 116th Street and is zoned S1 (Residential).
Filed by Michael DeBoy.

Kevin Roberts, Michael DeBoy Land Development Services appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. The proposal is for 23 lots on 40 acres located at the northeast corner of West 116th Street and Hoover Road. The Subdivision would be known as West Clay Colony. Renderings of the landscape plan were distributed to the Commission members. A lake exists on common area #2 and that will remain as part of the commitments submitted to the Department.

*Note: The Agenda erroneously omitted the Subdivision Waiver being requested: Docket No. 05060054 SW, 6.05.07 Orientation of Home.

The commitments allow natural, masonry materials or EFIS; the landscaping plan has been adjusted to provide sufficient buffers along the perimeter and Scott Brewer has given his verbal approval for the landscape plan. A tree preservation plan is in place for the trees along the perimeter of the site.

Rick Ripma reported for the Subdivision Committee. There was considerable discussion regarding the paths on this development—size and placement. To date, it has been established that there will be a ten-foot (10') path on 116th Street and a six-foot (6') path on Hoover Road. The petitioner intends to keep the current pond. Some of the homes back up to the street and are not within the Ordinance and additional landscaping was to be done in order to ensure a good view from the back of the home. The Committee was also comfortable with the additional landscaping. The petitioner was to submit a revised drawing showing the landscape view from the street. With some exceptions, the Committee had approved this petition 4-0.

Kevin Roberts stated that he had spoken with Larry Hemp, landscape architect, and an impasse was reached. Larry Hemp felt that whatever rendering was made of the landscape view from the street would not be entirely representative.

Department Report, Matt Griffin. With the commitments coming from the Committee, the Department is in favor of the proposal and recommends approval of both the primary plat and the subdivision waiver. As submitted on the commitments, there are a few alterations in language and the Department needs to work with the petitioner to be certain the commitments match with the intent. Specifically, the side elevations along Hoover Road and 116th Street (all visible side elevations) would be wrapped in stone masonry or similar material as opposed to just the elevation along those streets. The petitioner is willing to make those changes.

Dan Dutcher referred to minutes from the Committee meeting and the commitment was made that the paths along 116th Street and along Hoover Road would be constructed at the time of development.

Matt Griffin concurred. The commitments recite that they will install the paths before any occupancy of those stretches occur.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to continue this item to the September 20th meeting, thereby allowing the petitioner and the landscape architect an opportunity to present revised elevations, seconded by Jerry Chomanczuk, Motion Approved 9-0.

2i. D**ocket No. 05050004 Z: Arden Townhomes**

The applicant seeks to rezone 12.72 acres from R1 to PUD for the purpose of developing a site with 100 proposed townhomes. The site is located at 1940 E. 136th Street and is zoned R1 – Residential. Filed by Jim Shinaver for Buckingham Properties.

Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also present on behalf of the applicant: David Leazenby and Sara Nasutti, Buckingham Properties, Rich Kelly, EMHNT Engineering, Bill Fehribach and Matt Brown, A & F Traffic Engineers.

Buckingham is seeking to rezone a parcel of real estate from an R-1 Residential zoning classification to a PUD in order to allow the construction of single-family townhomes. The

common address of the real estate is 1940 East 136th Street. The real estate consists of approximately 12.72 acres, north of and adjacent to 136th Street, west of and adjacent to the Carmel High School football stadium, south of and adjacent to the Cool Creek Apartment and east of Range Line Road. The plan shows an approximate pathway to the future Cool Creek Trail that is intended to provide a connection and access to the Monon Trail on the west side of Range Line Road.

Located north of and adjacent to the subject site are parcels zoned B-3 Business; located north of and adjacent to the real estate is a large residential apartment complex known as Cool Creek Apartments. Located farther west of the real estate are additional parcels zoned B-1, B-2, and B-3 Business as well as I-1 Industrial. The property is also adjacent to the Carmel High School Football Stadium and in close proximity to Keystone Avenue.

Although the parcel is zoned R-1 Residential, it is surrounded by some fairly intense uses. It is the petitioner's belief that developing this parcel as a townhome development will allow for the property to serve as a transitional buffer between the different, adjacent uses.

The Special Studies Committee reviewed the proposed development on July 5th and again on August 2nd. The majority of the Committee discussion pertained to the impact that the proposed development may have on traffic on the adjacent roadways as well as some site design issues, including density, the number of parking spaces on the site, and the site amenities as well as other amenities that would be adjacent to this site.

Since the last Committee meeting, the Buckingham Companies has made some additional revisions to the site plan and those are contained in the information brochures.

David Leazenby, Buckingham Companies addressed the Commission to discuss the revisions in the site plan and the overall project. As previously mentioned, this is a fairly unique site, 13 acres, to be rezoned for townhome development. It is important to note the surrounding land uses as previously stated.

There was discussion at Committee concerning the demographic profile. There are two different profiles; one is age group 25 to 35, the other is age 50 to 60. The average income is average or a little above for the City of Carmel. A two-car garage is provided per unit and the owners will not fill that. The building site provided for 100 units with an entrance off Smokey Row Road, a little flood plain along the entrance, tree preservation area, landscaped courtyard area through the middle of the site, and several areas allocated for detention.

The issues at committee were the number of units; the potential traffic implications of those units; the amenities being next to the creek; and the trail being an inadequate amenity for this particular site. The revised site plan reflects the reduction in the number of units from 100 to 90, a couple of meaningful open spaces and the positioning of the street that has now been moved slightly to the east to allow for greater tree preservation at the entrance; the entrance is also moved farther away from the bridge. Additional travel lanes have been added to exit the property as was called for in the traffic study. The decrease to 90 units corresponds to a density of 7.08. Extra parking has also

been added to the main areas. The parking ratio has increased, the tree conservation area has increased, and the open space is up to 51% of the site.

This particular site is desirable because of its close proximity to football, tennis, basketball, a park, the high school, the library is within walking distance, the Cool Creek Trail and eventual access to the Monon Trail and all of the Old Town area, not to mention Ritter's and Dairy Queen.

The traffic study by A & F Engineering was done for Arden as well as Traditions on the Monon, a circulation study for the high school in March, 2003, and A & is currently doing work for the City of Carmel. A & F has a long history of providing traffic recommendations in this area and a strong reputation for providing accurate information and analysis. The recommendations help all of us plan for our roadways, the capacity and the adjacent land uses not only for Carmel but surrounding municipalities as well. Bill Fehribach with A & F is available this evening to answer any questions.

The first traffic study summarized that the current level of service on Smokey Row and adjacent intersections is level service A. If the proposed rezone were to be approved for 100 units, it would still be level service A. The issue with this first traffic study is that it was done in July and not when school was in session. However, A & F used data from December 16, 2004 that was done when school was in session. The data from December was put together with the data from July and a new analysis was created for the August Committee meeting—the level of service was the same, "A." This project was compared to another townhome project on Hazel Dell that was a similar size and the analysis was deemed to be accurate. The Traditions on the Monon was taken into account, and the traffic engineers are saying that the adjacent roadway and intersections will operate at level service A today, and will continue to do so if the rezone is approved.

The traffic analysis was sent to the City Engineer, and a letter from Gary Duncan in the Engineer's office concurs with the analysis done by A & F Engineering. The numbers have been adjusted downward to reflect 90 units rather than 100 units, and the reduction in trips is slight. Traffic control officers will regulate traffic at the school two times per day. There are some delays when the officers stop traffic to allow the students to cross. Overall, it is not a level of service problem.

In summary, the property is a unique site that is surrounded by a lot of intense and diverse uses. It is close to the center of Carmel, and with all of the amenities and attractions the City offers, the townhomes will have a high quality of architecture with outdoor amenities for people to gather and a beautiful preserved, natural area that will remain.

At this time, the petitioner is asking for a recommending vote to the City Council.

Jerry Chomanczuk reported for the Special Studies Committee. Several steps have been taken to address the issues; the number of units has been reduced by 10%, but where there is still difficulty is in the area of traffic. The traffic study originally started out with a report that focused on a study that was performed at the end of June—a non-school day. Subsequently, another report was generated that was focused on Traditions on the Monon with intersections nearby. Again, the dates of the report were December 20 and 22nd, non-school days. The third meeting it was pointed out

that the study was actually performed December 16, and that is now documented. All along, there are certain assumptions being made—the 800-pound gorilla is the school. The Committee felt that it was critical that an accurate traffic study be submitted, not one based on assumptions, not 10% additional based on another study, but a traffic study that was focused on Arden, its point of egress, the Keystone/Smokey Row intersection, and the Range Line Road intersections. The Committee felt that the report was suspect. With such a high volume of students, if 10% of the student population is factored in, about 350 to 400 cars are entering the driveway on a regular school morning. Jerry Chomanczuk asked the petitioner if he were willing to do a traffic study on the one point of egress with two intersections on a regular school day.

Mark Rattermann commented that it did not make any difference whether or not he saw another traffic study—the traffic is bad at this location and it is the school. Mark Rattermann said he lives adjacent to the Townhomes at Hazel Dell, and that was not a big impact. This project is similar, but fronts differently. However, they did compromise by reducing the number of units and Mark Rattermann felt the proposed development would not seriously impact the traffic.

Jerry Chomanczuk reiterated that the Committee did not feel comfortable with the traffic report and some of the assumptions that were being made. Some committee members felt that the traffic study was pieced together in order to justify this development. The long-term plan for Smokey Row was that there was nothing in the foreseeable future that would address road improvements. The Committee voted an unfavorable recommendation for this petition.

It was discussed whether or not to send this petition back to Committee for additional review or whether this should be forwarded on to the City Council. The petition goes to City Council either way, and the petitioner runs a risk of a recommendation up or down. It was determined that the traffic questions could be looked at further at the Council level. The petitioner has complied with the request of the Commission and addressed the issues.

Dianna Knoll complimented the petitioner on the revisions and the overall look of the project. However, the problem is getting in and out of the project. We all know there is a school there, a library in close proximity, etc., but getting in and out of the site will not only compromise the people who buy there but all of us who already live there. If you look at the map, going from US 31 and avoiding the congestion at 146th Street, it is a straight line over to Keystone. Traveling east/west Carmel is difficult itself and getting a shortcut over to Keystone is attractive. At this time, we don't even have the impact of Traditions on the Monon. It is a very good-looking project, but still too dense for the area.

Dan Dutcher asked about the link between the Cool Creek Trail and Smokey Row Road and eventually the Monon.

Matt Griffin said the Department was looking to the petitioner to clarify how the link would be accomplished and perhaps "walk us through the site." In regard to the balance of the proposal, traffic is obviously the largest issue and we must defer to the experts, the traffic engineers and notably, the City Engineers as well. Information provided states that the road will operate at the

same level of service with this project—that says this project will not cause any significant changes, however, it will add to the existing problem. The City would want to enter into dialogue with the applicant in terms of when future improvements are needed along Smokey Row, how the applicant would be involved in the process.

Dan Dutcher felt that the proposed development was a good use of the property. It is not realistic to expect that this property will not be developed and townhomes is an appropriate use of the property. The only way to address the traffic issue at this point is through the density reduction.

Madeleine Torres said the petitioner had addressed the Committee's concerns thoroughly. Yes, there will be an increase in traffic—there will be an increase with any development being presented in Carmel. If the density were reduced slightly, would it really help the traffic that much? The petitioner has done a thorough job in addressing the concerns.

The future round about at the intersection of Smokey Row and Range Line Road was discussed as far as correcting this intersection. The round about it a road improvement only and will not alleviate the traffic problem in its entirety.

Susan Westermeier asked for clarification on the Cool Creek Trail.

David Leazenby said the "spur" does not yet have full right-of-way or control by the City. The petitioner has mentioned the potential linkage to get to the Cool Creek Trail, given the fact that this spur is planned on the City's Trail plan. The petitioner is not making a commitment, only recognizing that it is adjacent to a future trail connection. David Leazenby said they had not been told if right-of-way was needed from their property for the trail—it is shown just off the Arden property in a right-of-way that was the old inter-urban. The City would like the trail to run along the eastern boundary of the property along the fence. The fence delineates the western boundary of the school parking lot. There is a wedge of property between the school and Arden that the school owns, and there is room for a trail to go through, but there are no formal plans or agreements with the school or the City.

Bill Fehribach, traffic engineer, President of A & F Engineering, addressed the Commission and explained that if another traffic study were done, they would literally go out and count the traffic again, after the start of school in a few weeks. To that traffic count would be added the generated traffic on the sheet distributed this evening. Mr. Fehribach said he felt confidant that the new traffic study would have about the same results as those already given. Looking at the numbers, one car per 1.4 minutes will not change the result of the traffic study.

Leo Dierckman commented that this project really does not add that much; the real problem is the transportation connected with the school—a lot of students drive rather than taking the bus.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to forward **Docket No. 05050004 Z, Arden Townhomes** to the City Council with a favorable recommendation, seconded by Madeleine Torres, approved 6 in favor three opposed (Chomanczuk; Knoll, Westermeier)

3i. Docket No. 05050001 DP/ADLS: Nightingale Home Healthcare
The applicant seeks approval for an office building on 1.23 acres±. The site is located at 1036 S Range Line Rd, and is zoned B-3/Business within the Carmel Dr-Range Line Rd Overlay.
Filed by Mark Swanson of Mark Swanson Associates.

Mark Swanson, Mark Swanson and Associates, and Dennis Lockwood, Mark Swanson & Assoc. appeared before the Commission representing the applicant.

Mark Swanson gave an overview of the proposed development. Nightingale Home Healthcare center is seeking approval to construct a new facility at 1036 South Range Line Road. The new facility would consist of 30,000 square feet on a site that now contains an existing house. The plan provides for the existing house to be demolished and the new facility constructed. The owner has currently vacated this house and moved to temporary quarters until it is demolished and the new facility constructed.

One of the issues on the project was parking. The new facility will accommodate initially 40 employees and it is designed to accommodate 51 employees. The Ordinance requires one parking space per 300 square feet—100 parking spaces are required. The site plan shows 75 parking spaces on site, including 15 or 16 beneath the building. The petitioner has been working with the Department and the Redevelopment Commission Director, Les Olds, to show the project, explain the owner's needs and to discuss issues such as parking and other items.

Prior to the owner moving from the existing house at this location, Nightingale acquired a lease with Rich's Furniture directly to the north, for an additional 27 parking spaces. That lease is still in existence today and was needed at the time Nightingale was utilizing the residence as their office, primarily because the parking lot for the existing house accommodated only 25 cars at that time.

The petitioner has been working with the Department to accommodate their planning concepts for urban parking; because of that, the location of the building has been adjusted to accommodate some concepts for future parking in and around the property.

The second issue was primarily the elevation of the building from Range Line Road. To the front elevation that faces Range Line Road, the petitioner has added a limestone-color lower area of the building from the ground up to the top of the first floor windows; this will be "topped out" with a limestone trim. Windows have also been added to the east elevation at the right side of the building. The building materials are primarily brick and the size of the entry has been reduced approximately 10 feet.

Committee Report, Jerry Chomanczuk. As mentioned by the petitioner, a lot of re-design went into the building at the Committee level. Everything introduced, including the re-design of the atrium up front was looked at as a positive change. One of the contentious issues remaining is parking area. As mentioned by the petitioner, there is sufficient parking for their current requirements and some growth requirements, and they have a lease with the neighbor to the north for additional

parking. The committee felt that even though the development did not meet the Ordinance as far as parking is concerned, it was an adequate explanation of the situation. Les Olds, Director of the Redevelopment Commission appeared before the Committee and made a strong statement on behalf of the petitioner as to how the development would add to the overall plans for Range Line Road. The vote at Committee was 2 in favor, Mark Rattermann opposed.

Mark Rattermann reiterated that the parking situation is inadequate and this particular project almost meets it. The concern is that parking is being borrowed from an adjacent user and that means the spaces are being double-counted. Rich's Furniture counted the parking spaces when their facility was approved, and now we are allowing those same spaces to be counted here as well. As a public policy, we cannot let this continue. Overall, the building design is great, great architecture—it is just that parking is the only issue.

Jerry Chomanczuk referred to the on-street parking situation and language in the Department Report. If the on-street parking is a reality, the Committee is looking to the Department and the City for assurance that it is well founded.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. The issues regarding on-street parking—on-street parking is a reality and the Department is working with Engineering to put this in place and that will be seen at the Committee level. Regarding this particular project, it is certainly reality—there will be parking on Range Line Road, perhaps the distant future and not the near future. There will be parking in front of this building and the one to the south. The Department is in complete agreement as to how to interpret the Code, and while it does allow for shared parking facilities, the catch is that the parking facility must be adequate to provide the correct number of spaces for both users. If they both need 100 spaces, the lot must be sized to accommodate 200 spaces. In this particular situation, the Staff is not really looking at the parking lot to the north to accommodate the additional parking required for this site. Typically we would require the applicant to obtain a variance from the parking requirements. However, this particular site is part of a larger, planned node from the CRC that will in the future include a parking lot to the south that has additional parking to off-set the differences seen here. In the short run, this site will have 75 spaces on site; in the long run, per information from the CRC, there is a lot to the south that will have additional parking for not only its user, but this user as well. In the short run, if there is an issue of parking, Engineering would be willing to implement parking along Veterans Way—also a part of the plan. On-street parking on Range Line Road will be done in the future, when the area becomes more urban and more slow.

Jerry Chomanczuk made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 0-5050001 DP/ADLS, Nightingale Home Healthcare**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, **Approved** 8 in favor, one opposed (Rattermann.)

4i. Docket No. 05060011 DP/ADLS: Guilford Road Condominiums (Townhomes) The applicant seeks create an 8 townhome buildings containing a total of 37 units on 2.15 acres. The site is located at the SW corner of Main St. and Guilford Road and is zoned OM/MU (Old Meridian/Mixed Use).
Filed by Mark Monroe for Guilford Real Estate Partners, LLC.

Mark Monroe, attorney, Wooden & McLaughlin. One Indiana Square, Suite 1800, Indianapolis appeared before the Commission representing Guilford Real Estate Partners in their Development plan and ADLS petition for the site located one property south of the southwest corner of Guilford Road and Main Street.

As noted, the site is zoned for multi-family development within the Old Meridian District. The petitioner has proposed 37 condominium units and appeared at the July 19, 2005 full Commission meeting. The petitioner addressed comments from public hearing in Plan form at Special Studies Committee on August 2, 2005.

The front façade was presented at the Special Studies Committee on August 2nd. The revised plan includes several revisions to the façade, including the addition of stone detail around the entire façade, including the front, sides, and rear, and dental molding at the top of the façade and on the side of the building. The lattice material that was a part of the entry detail now is made of stone. The portal windows were moved downward for more symmetry with the front façade. All of those changes are listed in the packet.

Based on Committee comments, the petitioner added additional landscaping to the north property line to better buffer the site from retail and auto repair shop to the north.

The petitioner is requesting approval this evening and welcomes any questions at this time.

Committee Report, Jerry Chomanczuk. The petitioner has addressed several of the concerns that were raised at the public hearing. Several of the design items were explained and maximum buffering on the northern boundary was needed. The Committee pointed out their concern with the number of windows on the side of the units and felt that three was inadequate. After seeing the renditions, it seems that it is out-of-balance. Parking was somewhat an issue, however, the Committee felt that with the two spaces provided within the building underneath, as well as two spaces allocated in the driveway to the individual units, 4 spaces would be adequate.

Mark Monroe responded that the petitioner has added both shade trees and evergreen trees along the northern boundary. Note: The repair shop also has a landscape buffer, so there will be two landscape buffers between the respective projects. Mark said that in consultation with the Department, the petitioner is willing to add an additional, identical window.

Department Report, Matt Griffin. The project meets the Ordinance, but there are still some concerns with the side elevations. The Department would like to see how the side elevations are being addressed on the site plan. The only remaining issue is a landscape plan approval from Scott Brewer.

Dan Dutcher asked if there were a way to obtain a commitment regarding the parking.

Mark Rattermann said his only concern was guest parking. There is plenty of parking for residents, but if there are guests, they will be parking behind someone else's unit and there will be confrontation. Mark asked the Department if there were a requirement in the Ordinance for parking on Guilford Road.

Mark Monroe responded that there is no requirement in the Ordinance for that, however, the City, along public streets within the Old Meridian District has general plans for on-street parking, including parking along Old Meridian Street. The petitioner is dedicating the appropriate right-of-way along Guilford Road to provide for the parking, perhaps 10 to 15 spaces.

Jerry Chomanczuk made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 05060011 DP/ADLS, Guilford Road Condominiums (Townhomes),** seconded by Rick Ripma, **APPROVED** 6 in favor, 3 opposed (Dutcher, Rattermann, Torres).

5i. Docket No. 05070002 OA: West Home Place Setback Amendment
DOCS seeks to amend the Zoning Ordinance, *Chapter 23E.09: West Home Place Commercial Corridor*, in order to reduce setback requirements.
Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Adrienne Keeling, Dept. of Community Services appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. This Ordinance Amendment was introduced at the July 19 full Commission meeting and was referred to the August 2nd Subdivision Committee meeting, and is returning to the full Commission with a 4-0 favorable recommendation from the Committee.

The Ordinance Amendment would reduce the setback requirement in the West Home Place commercial corridor within the Home Place Overlay District.

Rick Ripma reported for the Subdivision Committee. The Committee did review the Amendment and felt that the proposal was proper and needed to be put in place. The Committee voted 4-0 to approve the Ordinance Amendment.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. None at this time.

Rick Ripma made formal motion to forward **Docket No. 05070002 OA, West Home Place Setback Amendment** to the City Council with a positive recommendation, seconded by Dianna Knoll, **APPROVED** 9-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.

_____
Leo Dierckman, President

_____
Ramona Hancock, Secretary