

Hamilton County Plan Commission  
March 17, 2021

*Mr. Habig* called the official meeting of the Hamilton County Plan Commission to order at 7:14 p.m.

*Members present:* Diane Crim, Frank Habig, III, Jim Galloway, Mark Heirbrandt, Steve Schwartz and Tom Clover. Bill Root is attending through TEAMS. Absent: David Musselman and Kent Ward. Also present: Byron Settles, Interim Director, Aaron Culp, Legal counsel; and Linda Burdett, Secretary.

*Declaration of Quorum:* Mr. Habig declared a quorum with seven out of nine board members present.

*Guests:* See sign-in sheet.

*Communications/Reports:* Mrs. Burdett stated that anything they had has been passed out.

*Approval of Minutes:* Mr. Habig identified the **minutes of the February 17, 2021 meeting**. I do have four corrections. On the first page the word “attending” was spelled incorrectly. On page 10 “parts of White River” should have been “all of White River.” On page 11 it should be “ever since” not “every since.” On page 14 “areas” should have been “area.”

***Mr. Galloway moved to approve as corrected.***

*Mrs. Crim seconded.*

With no further comments or corrections... Mr. Habig called for the vote. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.**

*Public Comment:* Mr. Habig opened the meeting to the public for anyone who had something to bring up that was not on the agenda.

***John Chalfin*** stated he name for the record. I wanted to check and see where we were at with the noise ordinance being amended. (2) Then I was mis-informed. I was told that it would be covered at this meeting.

*Mr. Culp* stated that the noise ordinance was not under the zoning code.

*Mr. Habig* asked Mr. Chalfin what part of the county we are talking about. (2) Does that fall under Noblesville?

*Mr. Chalfin* stated that it was county. I live in Stardust Village. And adjacent to that property we have an area where they are holding wedding receptions and outside bands. And, it's very loud.

The fact is that it was loud enough that it knocked the screens off my window, so I have been trying to get an amendment to that ordinance. The original ordinance was written for Ruoff Center back when it was Deer Creek. And they said a half a mile away no more than 75 dba. But we registered, we pegged the meter. And then we got another certified meter and it was in excess of 120 dbas. It was bouncing between 120 and 130 dbas. That is as loud as a jet taking off standing next to it according to the CDC. So we're looking to get some parameters to reduce that noise level.

(2) *Mr. Peterson* stated that it was under Noblesville. They approved it.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* stated that we have the president of the city council right here. Maybe he can answer that question.

*Mr. Peterson* stated that there is a lot of noise that is generated from Hamilton County that gets through Noblesville. And then we get Noblesville complaints. It was actually in two places in our code. We have taken it out of the UDO ([Unified Development Ordinance](#)) and put in into a place where it can be administered, and fines levied.

Then our city attorney was going to reach out to the county attorney, Mr. Howard, and sit next to each other and discuss it. I'm not sure what the process is but it is being started.

I believe it falls to the sheriff's department. That's where we want it so it can now be enforced. When it's planning, you go out, and Linda works until 5:00 p.m., and then when complaints come in at night there is no way to enforce it. So, I think we're working on both of those.

*Mr. Schwartz* asked *Mr. Chalfin* if he lived in the county and this is happening in the city or are you neighbors. (2) *Mr. Culp*, maybe you can help...

*Mr. Chalfin* stated that he lives in the county and the origin of the sound is in the county. It's on North 10<sup>th</sup> Street and I live in Stardust Village. There is a strip of woods about 20 yards between us and then it butts up to the back of my house.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* addressed *Mr. Culp*. That would be great if you could reach out to *Mr. Howard* and then communicate back to *Mr. Chalfin*.

*Mr. Peterson* stated that *Lindsey Bennett* was who solved it at the last council meeting on March 9th.

*Mr. Culp* stated that just for clarification the way the county's ordinance is set up... the noise ordinance comes under the municipal side and not the zoning side. So, it's handled

by the sheriff's department and so that is who we'll have to work with.

*Mr. Schwartz* asked Mr. Culp who creates that. (2) Is does not generate from this body then?

*Mr. Culp* answered that it would be the county commissioners. (2) No. The county has always run that on the municipal side of things.

If someone came in from a variance from us, we would certainly look at that and we could attach conditions. I don't know if this particular property is operating legally or not. That would be something for us to look into and see whether or not they're complying with use requirements and if they are whether or not they have any conditions they are in violation of.

*Mr. Galloway* asked if this was really in our jurisdiction.

*Mr. Peterson* stated that this falls into the two ~~three~~ mile radius, so it is under the planning jurisdiction of Noblesville. It was approved for the use; however, the operations have gone beyond what we approved. It was approved as a "party barn" but they have expanded their interpretation of that.

Now the noise is generated in the county but we as a planning department don't have any say in how to fix it.

*Mr. Culp* stated that then we don't have any jurisdiction at all as this body, but the county does through its noise ordinance.

With no one else stepping forward... Mr. Habig closed the public comment portion of tonight's meeting.

*Correspondence:* Nothing to present.

*President's Report:* No report.

*New Business:* Mr. Habig began with **NBZA-S.U.-0002-03-2021** a Special Use. We are passing a recommendation on to the North BZA. It concerns establishing a dog kennel and training facility in an existing building. **Location: 505 West 266<sup>th</sup> Street, Sheridan, Indiana.**

**Mindi McMillan, of 405 West 266<sup>th</sup> Street, Sheridan,** stated her name and address for the record. I am in Adams Township and just north of Boxley, Indiana. My husband, Kyle, and I are the blessed parents of eight kids, and we've lived in Hamilton County for seven years. We recently purchased the adjoining farm next to our residence. We now own what was formerly known as the K & S Tree Farm.

Our new farm has the former commercial buildings of the tree farm. At one time K & S had 75 employees or at least that is what we have been told. This property has fallen in disrepair.

Three years ago my husband and I approached the county for a Special Use permit for our Australian labradoodle breeding program that we operate under Colonial Village Labradoodles.

We did not expand our program as we had hoped under our Special Use permit on our residence. We did continue breeding puppies but outsourced all of our training and grooming to off-premises locations.

We do not believe in traditional dog kennels. Our dogs live as family pets and all have their own family from the time they are eight weeks old. When they have completed their breeding time, they are spade or neutered and continue living with that guardian family for the rest of their lives.

Our momma dogs will only be staying in our kennel to deliver puppies. I have attached notes from our current and past guardians, and also from current and past neighbors.

We are not available to the general public. We would also like to keep our puppies that are enrolled in our training program on our premises instead of outsourcing all that training to Greenfield, Indiana.

Grooming would be offered to dogs that we produce only. And we would not make this available to the general public either.

Another unique aspect of our breeding program is that all of the puppies that we place as pets and therapy candidates are spayed and neutered before they go home to their new families, so we aren't increasing pet overpopulation.

The majority of our business purchases take place in Hamilton County. And many of our dogs serve within the community. Many of our dogs are trained as emotional support dogs for veterans suffering from PTSD, diabetic and seizure alert dogs, and all assist ability dogs for individuals with mobility issues. Our dogs are beloved pets in central Indiana homes and throughout the U.S., UK, and Canada.

The book we shared explains our program pretty well. We are coming tonight asking for a favorable approval.

*Mr. Habig* asked *Mrs. McMillan* how this differed from what they're already doing on their previous acres. (2) Have you come up with a maximum number of...

*Mrs. McMillan* stated that they don't have any grooming right now. We don't have any

training right now. And we are asking for an increase because we will now have 80 acres basically and 16,000 sq. ft. under air conditioning, heated and cooled and everything. We are asking to grow our breeding program a little bit because we don't want to keep having to come back and ask for permission. Because this is a new parcel we had to come back. (2) We would like to be able to have up to 20 dogs in boarding, up to 20 dogs in training, and up to 12 momma dogs having puppies. I don't see us ever reaching those maximums, but I also don't want to have a week where I could board 20 dogs for spring break and I'm saying no.

There will be no signs that say what we do. This is something that would only be for dogs that we produce in our program.

*Mr. Galloway* asked for clarification that this would be a maximum of 52 adult dogs, correct?

*Mrs. McMillan* stated the some of them would be puppies. So, it would be an 8 to 16 week program that we do for the training program. It wouldn't be 52 adult dogs. It would be 52 dogs over the age of eight weeks.

*Mr. Habig* asked if they would be willing to work with the department of health. (2) And, also the surveyor's office as far as the regulated drain?

*Mrs. McMillan* answered, yes. (2) Yes. We have them coming out tomorrow. They weren't able to get us squeezed in until tomorrow, but we will have all that certified in writing by the time we need everything.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* stated that he was on the Humane Society of Hamilton County board. Rebecca Stevens is the executive director. Anybody who knows her, she is very, very strict in regards to any type of operation for breeding. She has been out there. Says it's top-notch, very professionally ran, and always very easy to reach out to and answer any questions.

With no further questions from the board... *Mr. Habig* asked for a recommendation.

***Mr. Heirbrandt made a motion for a favorable recommendation.***

*Mr. Schwartz* seconded.

With no further comments... *Mr. Habig* called for the vote. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.**

***Old Business:*** *Mr. Habig* began with ***HC-0001-01-2021***. We are passing on a recommendation to the Hamilton County Commissioners. It is concerning the review of the proposed Hamilton County Plan Commission Comprehensive Plan 2020. ***Location: all areas of Adams Township, White River Township, Wayne Township and Noblesville Township under the building and zoning jurisdiction of the Hamilton***

**County Plan Commission.** At this time, I will turn it over to the team of Innovative Planning.

**Corrie Meyer, of Innovative Planning,** stated her name and company for the record. With me is Sheila McKinley with Burke Engineering and Darren Peterson with Peterson Architecture.

At the last meeting we presented a draft document of the comprehensive plan. There was a lot of dialogue around transportation, specifically, the maps and how we portrayed projects that are in the thoroughfare plan.

There are basically two sections in the comprehensive plan where transportation is addressed. The first section is in the existing township characteristics. This is the section where we are presenting information that we researched and analyzed. It included stormwater and flooding. It included transportation along with land use, economic development.

We had data available to us and then we summarized it in this existing section. In some of these areas like the transportation section we're showing maps so that people can identify information quickly and easily to see what other departments in the county are talking about.

Following the research and analysis, community input, we moved on to recommendations. Those recommendations are broken up into the categories of land use, economic development, storm and flooding, and transportation.

After your February plan commission meeting, the steering committee opted to meet to continue the dialogue around how we communicate the existing information that is out there. When we left the plan commission meeting in February there appeared to be a consensus of "we're going to remove the maps in the existing section" and "talk" about the information. The future road connections would be strongly worded in tentative study area language.

In that meeting the committee opted to leave the maps in to make sure that we're being completely transparent on how we're communicating accurately the existing information that is already available to the public.

Basically, we're adding another opportunity for the public to get information. Its not just coming out of the highway department or the thoroughfare plan because the only reason that I looked at the thoroughfare plan was because I was working on the comprehensive plan.

I want to show you the changes the we made in the plan as a result of the steering committee choosing to keep the maps in.

This is the map for Adams Township in the existing township characteristics. (page 30) The first version of the comprehensive plan on this map was a solid green line. We received feedback from the public that that seemed too final. We didn't disagree. A solid line does may it appear that a decision has been made. We then changed it to what we presented at the February plan commission meeting which was this faded out green oval blob image. It was very dominating on the graphic and caused alarm.

What we are showing here is, basically, the exact imagery language, the exact same graphic language that is in the county's thoroughfare plan. If you were to look at the thoroughfare plan, they show a faded gray oval study area. That's what we've indicated in the legend. That it's a study area for possible connectivity.

We have shown the county highway director this information along with the recommendations. There were no issues on his end. He continued to reiterate that it is a study area. They would do plans to find the best route and go through the public process of designing a road if and when the demand of traffic is needed.

There are two areas in Adams Township that are shown on the map. There is one area in White River Township (page 31) and its running north / south. And one area in Wayne Township (page 32) which is the long connection between State Road 38 and just north of 191<sup>st</sup> Street for a possible connection with Olio Road.

At the last plan commission meeting there was concern that information like this may decrease the home value or the property value.

I would like to reiterate that this is not new information. This is existing information that we're continuing to push out in other forms. I was very thankful to have so many people here at the last plan commission meeting talking about it. People are looking at the plan. They, like me, have never looked at a thoroughfare plan to understand what potential projects may or may not be coming down the line.

These are the three map changes that we made in the existing township characteristics section. They are just graphic changes. We did not make any changes in the actual text.

You, as a plan commission, have the opportunity to influence and / or enforce policies, projects, ideas across the county. You get an opportunity to influence how the highway department plans in the future and they incorporate best practices for planning as they move forward with their update to the Hamilton County Thoroughfare Plan. But it also allows you to create some programs like the "Rustic Roads Program" that was talked about in the last comprehensive plan and was never implemented. We felt that there was still value in that program and there is an opportunity for that to still be a valuable program for preserving the rural character in these three townships.

Underneath the recommendations there are no maps (Page 78) because that is not your

job as a plan commission. Your job as a plan commission is not to determine how many lanes a road is, or whether it is a boulevard; what the proper route is for new roads. That really comes out of the county highway department.

However, we want to influence how the county highway department moves forward in their next planning effort. So, we added some recommendation here.

There was a lot of feedback during the public input that there seems to be conflict on the roads between cyclists and farm machinery.

As a closing comment... somewhere in this document we talked about it being a living document. There are going to be times along the next ten years where you feel something significant has changed and you want to update the comprehensive plan. That is a process that is in the state statute where you can amend this plan and then it becomes a document as amended.

When the county highway department amends their thoroughfare plan, I would recommend to you to incorporate their new thoroughfare maps when their planning effort is done. That way both documents are consistent and both documents are communicating the same message to the public.

Those are the changes that have been made and the reasoning as to why they have been made since the last plan commission meeting. I would be happy to take any questions.

*Mr. Galloway* stated that on the Wayne Township map... the wording down below talks about improvements at Cyntheanne and 156<sup>th</sup> Street, 171<sup>st</sup>. [\(Page 32\)](#) There is no 171<sup>st</sup> Street. I think you're probably thinking 176<sup>th</sup> Street.

*Mr. Habig* thanked Mrs. Meyer.

*With no further questions from the board... Mr. Habig opened the hearing to the public at 7:48 p.m. for anyone who wanted to step up and address the board. Please state your name and address for the board.*

***Mr. Galloway moved to bring the comprehensive plan back on the table.***  
*Mr. Clover seconded.*

With no further comments... Mr. Habig called for the vote. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.**

***Joe Daniels, of 13764 East 186<sup>th</sup> Street, Wayne Township,*** stated his name and address for the record. I attended the last planning board meeting in February. When I left the meeting, I understood that the board had a consensus to that they were going to make some edits to the plan. One of which was to remove the definitive shading off the map and include just the language indicating if the tempo changes or from the thoroughfare plan.

I was surprised and a little bit disappointed to learn that there was a committee meeting and obviously they made these changes which was different than what I thought the board had agreed to. So I took it upon myself to meet with Mr. Davis at the highway department just to get some clarification. I was still a little unclear on, especially with regards to Wayne Township, the Olio Road extension, the north / south potential connector in eastern Hamilton County.

I would love it if Mr. Davis maybe could come up and clarify the second vote. What I understood from that meeting is information on this map specifically was taken from the thoroughfare plan which I believe was 2012 maybe 2009 but a while ago. Those studies I understood were done and finished.

In fact, Mr. Davis indicated that the thoroughfare plan would probably be updated. I guess I'm a little confused, as it pertains to Wayne Township because I didn't ask about the other townships, the shading indicated the recommended study. Who is recommending that study as this point? Because again, it's my understanding the study has been done. Recommendations were made almost 10 years ago, and it's outdated at this point. So is this an independent recommendation? Or is this the planning board? I would like some clarification on that. That would be helpful. Thank you.

*Mrs. Meyer* thanked Mr. Daniels for his comments. This area that we are showing is not a recommendation. It is us communicating that it is a study area and whether it was completed or not it is a study area. We don't have the capacity to tell the highway department what to do. We can make suggestions, but we heard loud and clear that the road connections and the expansion of the highway system is not a priority from the citizens. And there is concerns about these connections and how it impacts the rural character. Let me read ([page 78](#)) the first paragraph, "The overall theme from the public during the development of this comprehensive plan update, is as it relates to transportation, was that improvements to the county roads should not destroy the rural character.

So in the recommendation section we are not recommending that it is a study area. What we are doing in the existing township characteristics is that we are communicating that another entity in the county is studying this. There is a difference between existing and recommendations for the future.

From that standpoint, you as a body are not making a recommendation in this plan to study those road connections.

*Mr. Habig* asked *Mrs. Meyer* if the answer to his question wouldn't be... the county highway department is the one that determines those.

*Mrs. Meyer* answered, right. If and when in the future they opt to do that. The thoroughfare does need to be updated and in the last planning process the county went

through the update to the comprehensive plan and then they went through the update to the thoroughfare plan once the comprehensive plan was complete. As you heard, Mr. Davis believes that the thoroughfare plan does need to be updated.

*Mr. Daniels* stated maybe he could get a clarification on the map. I apologize if I've seen an older version. What I saw on the map... the shaded area was very clearly, the purple shaded area said, "Recommended study." So, I don't know if there's opportunity to change that language or, like I said, maybe I saw an older version. Again, we're all agreeing that the thoroughfare plan is outdated why we are including this, I guess, because it's old information. It was looked at almost 10 years ago. I'm still confused why we're adding it to this plan.

*Mr. Habig* stated that it may be outdated but it is the only document out there that we have to go on.

*Mrs. Meyer* stated that there have been lots of drafts. What it says in the legend (pages 30, 31 and 32) for the shaded areas is, "Study Area for Possible Connectivity. The language for "recommended" was removed.

*Mr. Daniels* responded, got it. Ok.

***Matt Hostrawser, of 13395 East 186<sup>th</sup> Street,*** stated his name and address for the record. I have the same concerns as Mr. Daniels expressed. Looking at the study area, the study has already been done. I'm still concerned about the mis-leading piece of this. It has been done. It's over 10 years old. Thankfully, Mr. Davis is here. But currently, there is no plans to do another study. There's no funding, there's nothing. There're so many other priorities that there aren't any plans to do another study. And, actually, the study that they did do was more than just the area you see as highlighted here. It was looking at several different possible north / south routes through the east side of Hamilton County. If we're going to say, "look at the study area," then let's show where the study area was which is a huge area. They need to show where the whole study area at the time was or remove it because there are no plans to do a study. Thank you.

*Mr. Habig* stated again that this is the only document that the board has to go on at this time. When the new thoroughfare plan comes out then we can amend the comprehensive plan with the new maps.

*Mr. Daniels* returned to the podium. So what plan are we referring too? I've looked at a lot of different things. I've looked at the thoroughfare plans up in the planning commission office, looked on their website and no where do I see the area that is currently shaded in on this map. I see a little extension on the 2007 plan that is out there and shows Pennington extending north from 186<sup>th</sup> to 196<sup>th</sup> but I don't see this one anywhere. I guess you need to tell me where I need to look. Can somebody show me the plan that we're referring to that has this purple shaded area?

*Mr. Heirbrandt* stated that because there were so many questions about Olio Road and that plan up there, just for everybody that's here and for on the record... you guys, Mr. Daniels and Mr. Hostrawser, you reached out to us and I think that you see we immediately responded; we accommodated. You held a meeting over at the highway department to really sit down and help try to understand what your concerns were and what we might be able to do to help with this plan. I brought everybody from the highway department here tonight because I wanted to make sure that we were fully transparent and communicate it as effectively as we possibly can because I couldn't answer some of your questions and nobody here on this board could at the last meeting. I hope that you will see that in this process - we immediately responded; we're here to listen. Mr. Davis, Mr. Thurman, Mr. Neal do you guys have anything you want to state about any of these questions?

*Mr. Daniels* stated that maybe he wasn't looking at the most recent versions but the maps he's seen from 2007 I don't see this being presented in the comprehensive plan. Thank you for all your efforts for over two months now.

*Mr. Davis* stated that on the thoroughfare plan there is a study area that shows that connectivity. It was probably there before the study that we actually did. The study that we did was back in 2009. It was pretty much the way we remember it, an extension of that area that you see on the thoroughfare plan. We've actually broadened that out. What we were looking to do was determine if we're going to have a good north / south connecting roadway system for the future in this area of the county what's the best corridor and the best location to do that.

The study that we did looked at Cyntheanne Road, Prairie Baptist and Victory Chapel as kind of the main primary corridors for us to review. The result of that study was the Victory Chapel Road corridor.

Our intent was to try to connect up with Olio Road. Olio Road is improved from 96<sup>th</sup> Street up to I-69. The county built a bridge over I-69 and it continues to slowly be improved as you go north. The city of Noblesville is currently reconstructing the area from 146<sup>th</sup> Street.

It's a little bit of the old purple area that had the connectivity piece on it and we broadened that out as a result of what you're seeing now. All it is is the result of a study that was done and as we told them in our office, we don't have any plans to study it any further at this time or create any projects to move further. Those would all be under us with county commissioners' approval, of course.

But we are looking for the future and as you know the county is going to be a half a million people here sooner or later. You can't stop it, so you have to plan for it. You're going to have to see justification for us to look at doing anything more than State Road 32. There is going to have to be something to drive the project to justify doing anything out there.

How you depict that on the map is your decision. I think we suggested the shaded area

because we don't have an exact alignment. We can have a line and we have a line but that isn't exactly what will happen. If we ever do go to creating a project, we will have to look at that again and we will have to determine: how is the best way to do that; what's happening in the area; how can we best avoid impacting people. So that exact line could shift considerably in the future if you ever do the project.

Our thoroughfare plan is full of these shaded areas as you know. They are studies that have been done or someday may be done as we look towards the future and try to plan ahead and try to be a little bit proactive.

As you know there has been a lot of growth around the Westfield area. A lot of studies that we planned to do, they're not even relevant anymore. There're not even appropriate.

It is a dynamic document. It's going to be changing. All we're doing right now is trying to identify if we are going to look at a corridor, which one would it be? It would be this one but that is as we know it today. As we plan for the future, we have to have some kind of plan otherwise I think we're being a little bit negligent.

I'll try to answer any of your questions the best I can.

*Mr. Habig* asked Mr. Davis if he had any plans for an update to the thoroughfare plan.

*Mr. Davis* stated that the 2007 plan is a little bit old. I think we do it every 14 to 15 years. So it's coming due. There would be public input as part of the process.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* stated that he felt it was important that Mr. Daniels and Mr. Hostrawser had Mr. Davis' direct contact information. I think what was said, too, in that meeting was that at any time there are any questions or any concerns that you or any of your neighbors have, you should feel free to reach out to me. You have my cell phone. You have my email. And you see that we respond really quick. We're here to try to give you as much information as we know to share with you. The whole purpose of putting this in this study is to be completely transparent to the public on what we know at this time. That is really what the intent is.

*Mr. Davis* stated anyone was welcome to stop by and ask whatever is going on at any time. That's not a problem at all.

Mr. Habig, Mr. Galloway and Mr. Schwartz thanked Mr. Davis for coming to tonight's meeting.

***Laura Volk, of 13441 East 191<sup>st</sup> Street***, stated her name and address for the record. We also have property on 186<sup>th</sup> Street. We're looking from 186<sup>th</sup> Street all the way to 191<sup>st</sup> Street on Pennington. I have several questions. I first want to thank Mr. Davis because he gave a great explanation of a couple of things that we were really curious about.

If Mr. Davis could come back up. Mr. Davis, thank you. I know you met with several of our neighbors and I really appreciate that.

You indicated a few minutes ago that the future studies could change the projected path of the corridor. Is that correct? (2) When you say it can change considerably, is your "considerably" like one mile in either direction or four miles in either direction? (3) So it's really not that much of a change from where it currently lies today? (4) You mentioned that it was only a study and the results of the study, but future studies could, as you just said, change this alignment considerably. By targeting this very small area in a "proposed study area" are you not harming individual property values when, in fact, this could vary quite a bit? Am I hearing you correctly? (5) I appreciate Mr. Daniels and Mr. Hostrawser coming up and talking about their meeting with you. I apologize that I wasn't able to be there.

*Mr. Davis* stated that the intent would be to try to follow what we have already studied and determined but how that would exactly go through could change considerably. Depending on how things develop it could move considerably from the corridor. That's why we show it as a swath through there. We don't know the exact alignment. We wouldn't know until there became a need and we had a good reason to determine where the exact alignment should even go. (2) When I say that I'm looking within probably a half a mile swath of that area one way or the other. (3) In terms of an exact alignment it should change. And again, that could all change with future development. There's a possibility that it may not even go on that whole corridor. (4) Yea. Our intent would be to try to follow that general area.

*Laura Volk* continued. Some of the stipulations that we talked about at the last meeting in regards to the homesites in that area was retaining the 10 acre minimums. If there are undeveloped tracks of land that fall immediately within that path, portions of that is a taking in order to put this road in. And then, therefore, they are unable to be built upon. What happens to the value of that property as it currently sits?

*Mr. Habig* stated that that would be considered a hardship.

*Mr. Culp* added, not only that but the county would have to pay you if they came through and took that land. That would have to factor into whatever it's going to do to the value of the property. Part of that would be looking at the possible uses but beyond that you can get a variance from the standards so if it is under 10 acres because of something like that, that's a hardship that you could argue and seek a variance to allow construction.

*Laura Volk* continued. My second question is for Mr. Davis. When you had your second meeting with Mr. Daniels, Mr. Hostrawer, and Mr. Hilfiker, you mentioned to them that there were several things that would have to happen in order for all of this to actually come to fruition.

The corridor mentioned up to State Road 38 would have to have studies done,

the money put in place and everything would have to be in perfect order for it to go up to State Road 32. Is that correct? (2) If you had to put a timeline for Olio to be a four-lane road up to State Road 38 what would you \_\_\_\_\_ ? (3) And then from State Road 38 to State Road 32. How many years do you think that would be? (4) Then going from State Road 32 to Pennington and Victory Chapel we would be, I assume, talking at least 2060 based on what your calculations have been so far?

*Mr. Davis* stated that the normal progression would be from south to north. Going north of State Road 32 would be many years out. Normal progression would be continued from 146<sup>th</sup> Street up to State Road 38. That is more or less a Noblesville issue at this point since they have annexed a lot of that in there. I know they tried to get some funding to improve that corridor. I don't think they've been successful. But they do have the funding to do the section from 141<sup>st</sup> Street up to 146<sup>th</sup> Street which they're building now. That's because there's growth out there. The Towne Center and businesses locating around 146<sup>th</sup> Street and Olio Road are driving some of that. Then we would be connecting to the state road system 32 and 38 with a nice improved corridor between those. That would be the things that I would see happening way before you ever go north of State Road 32. North of State Road 32 would have to be driven by a lot of residential development creating a demand for a north / south corridor. Something like that would have to trigger some way to justify moving an improved corridor north of State Road 32. (2) That's a good question but I'd say you're looking at 10 to 15 years. (3) That would be a good question. I think we try to plan in conjunction with the MPO ([Metropolitan Planning Organization](#)) and that is out to 2050. (4) North of State Road 32 it would be some time prior to 2050. But that is all very speculative.

*Laura Volt* continued. For the planning commission, and for Mrs. Meyer, and for everyone who has spoken at some point... we are talking 20 to 30 years where the area that is in question on the map could possibly be studied again and that area as mentioned is a huge area. It could move and it could shift from east to west at any given point in time because of current development. Keeping the area for study that is marked today on the map does not make sense to me and to a lot of people that I am neighbors to. As a committee and as a commission what's the angle on that? There has to be an angle for keeping that on the map. We're talking 20 to 30 years from now. This is a 10 year comprehensive plan. So why keep it on the map? (2) In the previous study that included Victory Chapel, Prairie Baptist Road, Cyntheanne it went a lot farther. So why is that not on the map? (3) I understand that it's a plan and it might happen, and it might not happen but in the meantime those of us who are literally sitting in the middle of this swath that you're referring to are going to be significantly affected for something that might or might not happen according to everybody who is speaking tonight. It might or might not happen in 20 to 30 years but in the meantime 20 to 30 years is going to affect our property value significantly. To include it as an area of future study is the problem. But to say it is an area for development going forward is something completely different.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* responded. To answer your question, it's what we've been saying several times... it's to be transparent. We know there's been a study already done, and it's our

job to make sure that the public knows that there was some type of a study in there. This may never, ever happen in our lifetime but because we know this information and it has been presented to us, we have to be fully transparent and be able to put this in there that there's a possibility that that could happen. (2) I don't know, but this is a plan. That's all that it is. That's all that it has ever been. It's just a plan.

(3) *Mr. Culp* answered. As you are aware this has been part of a plan for 14 years. And it is a part of the plan from the highway department, the body that actually has the authority to implement the plan unlike us. Has is affected your property values today? The plan is already out there. It is already published. All this does is provide another point of contact at which people can find it. The only reason that you even know this exists is because we included it in our plan which shows that the plan is working. It brought it to your attention and gave you an opportunity to raise this issue with the county, with the highway department so that you can deal with it long before it ever comes close to being a reality. But either we are going to take what the highway department, who are the experts and they're the ones who make the decisions, what they have planned, and we insert that into it or we don't. If we start editing it, we're editing something that we have no authority over. We have no jurisdiction over. So we either incorporate their information or we don't. If we don't, it hurts the impact of this plan because it is taking key information that people using this plan would need to know and remove it. Even if it's just that we've already done a study in this area and that there is a possibility that there would be a road there.

*Laura Volk* continued. That part I can completely understand. Mr. Davis has given us a timeline. Is it off the table to include a timeline for this?

*Mr. Culp* stated. I think what Mrs. Meyer suggested would be a good idea. This is the most up-to-date information as of today and as soon as that plan gets changed we amend the plans to incorporate whatever the new maps are and whatever the new thoroughfare plan is.

*Mr. Davis* stated. Mr. Neal just reminded me that with the thoroughfare plan... there are no timelines on those. We have those areas all over on the thoroughfare plan. Some of them have been there for 20 years or longer. There is no timeline on any of that. I will add that State Road 37 and 213 goes farther north than what we're showing in Wayne Township. When I say 2050, I'm looking at that corridor as just a speculative time.

*Mrs. Volk* continued. Has the area from Victory Chapel where it connects to 191<sup>st</sup> Street and goes all the way up to State Road 213... has that been studied? Is that what you're saying? (2) So why is that not reflected on the map? You're grain mark does not go all the way up to State Road 213. Why was that omitted?

*Mr. Davis* answered. That was part of the study, yes.

(2) *Mrs. Meyer* responded. It certainly wasn't omitted intentionally. This was the

information that we were given and so we were communicating what we were given. To follow-up on what Mr. Culp has said... these are not "proposed study areas." These are "existing study areas" and we're communicating that. We're not making a recommendation that it still be studied, or we continue to study it. It's that it is a study area. It's a fact. Each of the maps in this section do have a note on it, Mr. Culp, that say "currently proposed as of the date of this publication." And the date of the publication is on the front page.

*Mr. Davis* stated. The thoroughfare plan hasn't been updated since this was done.

*Mrs. Volk* continued. So will the area all the way up to State Road 213 be included then in the gray as a previous study area? If we're going to show it properly wouldn't it be included?

*Mr. Habig* asked if the study she is talking about on Victory Chapel Road would be the study about a road that already exists.

*Mr. Davis* clarified. It's that corridor. That study area went from the junction of State Road 38 and Olio Road up to the junction at State Road 37 and State Road 213.

*Mrs. Volk* asked. So a significant portion of that has been omitted from the map?

*Mr. Habig* asked. Would that study that you're talking about go to the north boundary of Wayne Township, and that would include widening or doing something to Victory Chapel Road, correct? The study area that we have shaded is actually new road and that's why it's there. There is a discussion or a study of a brand new road going up through there. We didn't include a road that was already there that would only be widened or improved and that's why we have that area shaded.

*Mr. Davis* responded. I think once you get into an actual project it could utilize part of an existing road. I would try to do that, of course.

*Mrs. Volk* asked. The fact that it is on the map, and just to be clear, that was the outcome of the study with Cyntheanne, Prairie Baptist and Victory Chapel. Is that why it is on the map? Because it was the outcome? (2) So, the study that we're talking about was not just that grayed out area. The study included Cyntheanne, Victory Chapel and Prairie Baptist. So why is all of that not included?

*Mr. Davis* stated. It was the study area and that was the preferred outcome of the study.

(2) *Mrs. Meyer* stated. We are not showing all of the areas that the highway department is studying. They study road widening. They study road improvements. The study area that we are showing is for possible connectivity. A new road. While their study may have extended well beyond this grayed out area those were existing roads that would have a different outcome because they would be expanded or improved in some manner. What

we're trying to communicate is that they studied a possible road connection between State Road 38 and Victory Chapel.

*Mrs. Volk* stated. Either we show the whole study area, or we don't. I don't understand. I'm really grasping at straws to understand. I'm sorry I'm taking so much of everyone's time this evening. The study is to determine which path is most appropriate and that was studied. So, if the study isn't true on the map then the study should include all of the area that was studied, correct? (2) Any of those roads are possible connectors. So I'll just end here for now. I firmly believe that the area, if that was truly the area of study, and those were the areas that were studied they should be reflected accurately as a "previous study area." Not doing so is not being transparent and that is what you were all trying to do. To be transparent about study areas.

Mr. Habig responded. I think if you started looking at everything that is being studied on all the roads, we would have to include the whole area. Because all the roads will eventually get studied on road improvements. Once again, we are talking about connecting roads.

(2) *Mrs. Meyer* added. Just to follow-up on transparency. The legend clearly says, "study area for possible connectivity." It doesn't say "complete" or "whole comprehensive study area." It says that this was the study area for the very specific purpose of possible connectivity. President Habig, I would be happy to make any amendments that you feel necessary. But I think we have accurately reflected what the highway department has shared with us and the information that is available to the public, and we are accurately reflecting that information in this plan. I think that as the highway department continues to plan, as the surveyor's department continues to plan on legal drains and things like that, they will continue to do their jobs and they are experts in those fields. We need to lean on them to do their jobs well and listen to the citizens as you have done here. I think as the independent departments continue to work their fields of expertise that you continue to listen to them and update this comprehensive plan accordingly when they change study areas or they change culvert improvements, road widenings because we show all of this information on these existing maps. It is not just possible road connectivity. We're trying to be comprehensive in everything that could be of possible interest to the public.

With no one else stepping forward to address the board, and no one else waiting on the phone to speak... Mr. Habig closed the public hearing at 8:29 p.m. We are passing a recommendation on to the Hamilton County Commissioners.

***Mr. Galloway moved to pass this comprehensive plan on to the county commissioners with a favorable recommendation.***

*Mr. Schwartz seconded.*

*Mr. Galloway* stated that with the gray areas. The key area is "possible connecting road." It doesn't exist today. The reason that Victory Chapel isn't in that is because that is an

existing road. It could be improved but that is where it's going. That is not a new road. I think that's why we need this on this map to bring it to people's attention. Like I said in our committee meeting... when this stands out it will get your attention where if you read it someplace you would overlook it. It is transparency from us so that everyone knows what's out there.

*Mr. Habig* stated that he appreciated all the hard work that they did. I think it is a great plan. We worked through a lot of hardships trying to get it accomplished. Kudos to you and your team. You've done a wonderful job.

*Mrs. Meyer* asked Mr. Habig to amend their motion. You are voting on the draft as it has been presented to you. Mr. Galloway brought up an error that needs to be amended. So maybe you could approve this with the correction on page 32 to read "176<sup>th</sup> Street" instead of "171<sup>st</sup> Street." I will make that correction and then that will be the document we will push forward.

***Mr. Schwartz amended his second to reflect 176<sup>th</sup> Street.***

***Mr. Galloway amended his motion to reflect 176<sup>th</sup> Street.***

With no further comments... Mr. Habig asked for the vote to pass on the favorable recommendation with the correction. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.**

*Mr. Heirbrandt* addressed Mrs. Meyer. Mrs. Meyer, I just wanted to tell you that your team did a fantastic job especially having to deal with Covid which was challenging. This is a difficult plan as it is to go through and make sure that we address the public. But to do it in a Covid pandemic, too, and doing things like Zoom and things like that to for some of these meetings. I commend you and your staff for everything that you did to effectively get this out there.

*Director's Report:* Interim Director, Byron Settles. Mr. Settles stated that for the plan commission, we will have a subdivision come in and two land use variances. Other than that, it is just day to day in the office.

*Mr. Habig* stated that it was his understanding that H.R. would go ahead and put that out that we are aggressively looking for somebody to fill the position. They will take those resumes in and narrow them down to three people. Then I would like those three people to present themselves in front of this board. If that sounds ok with the board, we will go ahead and move on with that.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he was fine with that as long as it meets county approval.

*Legal Council Report:* No report.

*Mr. Heirbrandt* thanked Mr. Davis, Mr. Thurman, and Mr. Neal for coming to this meeting tonight to address those questions. And also, for taking the time to meet with them and

anybody that wanted to come to the highway department and for spending the time to do that. Thank you.

Mr. Habig thanked Mr. Hall and Mr. McMillan for their work in the committee to get this through. I appreciate it.

The next plan commission meeting will be Wednesday, April 21, 2021.

With no further business to come before the board... Mr. Habig adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Habig, III President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Burdett, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date