

The Madison County Plan Commission met on the above date at 9:00 A.M. with Wesley Likens, President, presiding.

Members Present: Wes Likens, Mark Gary, Phil Isom, Pat Manship, John Simmermon, Steffanie Owens, Rick Gardner, and Amanda Bousman.

Members Absent: Purdue Extension Agent

Also Present: Brad Newman, Director, Jeff Graham, Attorney, and Elizabeth Bruns, Board Secretary

Current Business

1. Prayer – John Simmermon
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll call taken with all members present.

Director Newman asked for nominations for President. Member Simmermon nominated Wes Likens, seconded by Member Gary. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **Wes Likens will be the MCPC Board President for 2016.**

Director Newman asked for nominations for Vice President. Member Isom nominated Member Gary, seconded by Member Gardner. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **Mark Gary will be the MCPC Board Vice President for 2016.**

Director Newman asked for nominations for Board Secretary. Member Isom nominated Elizabeth Bruns, seconded by Member Gary. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **Elizabeth Bruns will be the Board Secretary for 2016.**

Director Newman asked for nominations for Board Attorney. Member Gary nominated Jeffrey Graham, seconded by Member Owens. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **Jeffrey Graham will be the MCPC Board Attorney for 2016**

Director Newman asked for nominations for Director. Member Simmermon nominated Brad Newman, seconded by Member Owens. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **Brad Newman will be the Planning Director for 2016.**

Member Owens made a motion to approve the proposed 2016 MCPC Calendar with the amendment changing the November meeting to be Nov 15, 2016. Member Bousman seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. **2016 Calendar Approved.**

President Likens asked if anyone had any corrections or additions to the July 14, 2015 minutes. Attorney Graham noted for the record that the Commissioner's did approve Ordinance No. 2015-BC-0-15 amending the fee schedule as presented. Member Simmermon made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Member Isom. Vote was unanimous with one abstain Rick Gardner as he was not in attendance for that meeting. **July 14, 2015 Minutes approved.** Director Newman presented the Staff Report for Petitions 2015-W-007 and 008 for road frontage and width to depth ratio with a favorable recommendation.

1. Petition: 2015-W-007 & 2015-W-008
Address: Not Issued
Location: S side of 500 S, at Alliance Crossing Subdivision
Petitioner: Brian & Barbara Whitaker
Request: Relief of the Width to Depth Ratio on a proposed split and less than the minimum road frontage permitted for a parcel.

Attorney Graham expressed his concern with #3 on the Staff Report Findings of Fact. Generally with Waivers there has to be something unique to this property. If you flip that no to yes I think the findings of fact would be good.

Director Newman stated that this property is land locked and the only access is thru the subdivision.

Member Manship asked Mr. Servies if the plan is to have just one building lot and the other will remain agricultural use.

Mr. Servies said that is correct.

Steve Servies, Servies Engineering and Surveying – Right now there are a couple of high spots that would make a good home site and they are approximately 40' above Fall Creek.

A discussion took place regarding individual septic system versus connection to the Fall Creek Waste Management Sewer System.

Bruce Stanley – 5550 S Shadow Lane, I am the present owner of Alliance Crossing. My problem with this whole thing is I don't know when access was granted to this property. It wasn't by me thru Alliance Crossing. It might have been by Patchwork Partners but they are the owners of the land behind Alliance Crossing. Jim Stottlemeyer and I were partners and then he passed away. We had initially back in 2010 developed Alliance Crossing in 3 phases. Starting in Phase one which is the current phase we are in right now, the second phase is the agricultural portion and the third phase is in the back by Fall Creek. "Due to the economy and everything that has happened since that time, we weren't able to do that, uh Mr. Stottlemeyer at that time uh since we weren't going to develop that er uh we didn't have the money or the finances to go on and develop that and then he passed away."

The two sections that we were going to develop technically were owned by Patchwork Partners and not by Hoppes Development. Hoppes Development is the owner of the first section of that. Mr. Stottlemeyer before he died sold that property to a family member.

I never gave consent for access thru that property. As a matter of fact we had talked about this several times, Jim and I, over the years and when we developed the I helped him develop the property and when we did develop it we put an access in east west thru our division for the fact that later on during development in case somebody wanted to tie in from the east or the west they would have access thru our property.

Access to property requires a payment for access it's just not granted in this case. I'm a little confused about the County Road aspect of this when we did that development in 2000 we were to pave the road within so many years. At the time we started construction we had to put the base road in with concrete curbs. If we were going to allow people to access that they need to pay for it.

The Board continued the discussion over road being private or county, and what type of finish would be on the Private drive.

Attorney Graham stated that he would like to have more information gathered before this Board makes any decisions.

Steve Servies said that the roads went all the way to the edge of the subdivision. I did a boundary survey.

Commissioner Owens stated that she would like to make a motion to continue.

Director Newman stated he would like to point out that the recorded plat which was adopted in 2000 signed off by the County Commissioners it clearly states that they are county roads. It clearly states that the rights of way are owned by the County and it is stated that it is a public road.

Steve Hatfield – 5131 Margaret Way- I have several concerns. I was never notified about this meeting. Several concerns I would have would be the gravel driveway would be dusty, and my road is going to be worn out sooner than the other side due to all of the construction equipment coming thru. By having a gravel drive at the end of my road it may deter people from purchasing a lot if they see that gravel.

Greg Valentine – I represent Fall Creek Regional Waste and these folks have not been to any of our development meetings and a you are talking about a lift station and the least expensive is \$250,000 and the ones at Summerlake and Loves cost half a million dollars.

Member Simmermon asked if they could put a septic system in.

Mr. Valentine stated that if the Board of Health would approve it yes.

Commissioner Owens made a motion to continue this Petition to the next regular scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

Director Newman said that the next meeting is scheduled for the 8th of March at 9 a.m.

Member Manship seconded the motion.

Roll call vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Miscellaneous:

1. I had a request to research what the cost would be to update a Comprehensive Plan. Typically the biggest cost for the Comprehensive Plan is the public meetings. For a County this size I was told that we can count on having at least 60 public meetings, some of them will be with the general public and some will be with farmers, Realtors and other business professionals. Typically the cost for a county our size would be \$125,000 to \$160,000 for a Comprehensive Plan.

2. Unfortunately we are looking at an additional \$17,500 in order to complete our new Permitting Program. COG wanted to charge \$80,000 for the same thing.

Adjournment:

Member Manship made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Member Owens. **10:12:56 a.m.**

See attached Findings of Facts on the following page.

Wesley Likens, President

Elizabeth Bruns, Board Secretary

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. **Would the approval be detrimental to the public safety, health, or general welfare?**
No. The proposal will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or general welfare.
2. **Would the approval of this petition be injurious to the reasonable use and development of other property?**
No. The property is currently being utilized for agricultural purposes only. The establishment of an additional dwelling is more fitting to the existing zoning. The petition in no way would be injurious to the reasonable use and development of other property.
3. **Are the conditions of this request unique to this specific property, which would not be applicable to other property?**
yes No, the surrounding properties either have residential dwellings on them which have been there for a number of years, or the surrounding properties are large, vacant properties that are being utilized for agricultural purposes.
4. **Would the strict application of the regulations of the ordinance result in a practical difficulty in the permitted use of the property?**
Yes. If the acreage were not split and platted the land could still be used for agriculture. However, if the property was split without being platted, the Petitioners would not be able to build on either parcel.
5. **Would approval of this request contradict the intent of the Comprehensive Plan?**
No. The lot could still be used for agriculture and residential purposes.