Steering Committee Notes
April 13, 2006

Steering Committee Members Present: Jen Smith, Karen Newberry, Joe Plankis, Dave Mueller, Bob Smith, Jack Bonham, John Boyer, Bob Horkay, Larry Snapp

Jen Smith began the meeting with a presentation of how she made changes to the rural section of the draft plan.

Jen Smith: The draft land use component seemed like a very "Vanilla" document to me. I found that the document did not represent all the comments of the subcommittees. I took all the material that staff provided for us and the subcommittee documents and reworked the plan for the SW subcommittee area.

Jen Smith's presentation: There are three distinct rural areas in the township, the SW, NW and NE. Each of these areas is unique.

- In the southwest, we have the Little Eagle Creek Watershed; and the area is mostly developed with large lot homes. The Northeast is wooded and has many ravines, and the northwest has row cropping and other agricultural uses.
- We should discuss each of these rural areas separately and adopt this approach for other areas of the plan.
- The plan has a good delineation between the rural areas and the new suburban area in the southwest.
- The plan does not adequately address the transitions that the subcommittee discussed.
- Rural lifestyle is not translated correctly. Rural lifestyle is not the same thing as rural character
- The southwest is largely developed; there are only a few farms in the rural area that could be developed.
- The southwest wants to be equestrian. Most of the area is horse farms. We need equestrian zoning here.
- Residents in the southwest want to preserve all features of Little Eagle Creek, not just 10 feet on either side of the creek.
- The southwest has an airport adjacent to them. Low density residential is compatible with the airport.
- Looking at the thoroughfare and sewer plans, Shelbourne Ave will be extended. Would it make more fiscal sense to extend the proposed 54 inch sewer line up Shelbourne Rd. and not through people's property?
- We need to bring in Bruce to discuss the fiscal implications of the sewer extension.
- Follow this process with each of the three rural areas.
- Modify the density from 1:1 to 1:3 or 1:5.

- Create a rural equestrian zoning district; the southwest will likely not develop more.
- The plan needs to describe rural and conservation subdivisions and give guidance on how to make decisions on when these uses are appropriate as well as when it is appropriate to allow increased density.

- **Greg Dale:** Good job, It is a good idea to treat each rural area specifically. Can you explain what makes rural character different than rural lifestyle?

- **Jen Smith:** It's hard to define rural lifestyle. We may not be people that make a living from farming, but we are gentleman farmers. We live the lifestyle. Rural character is like Cracker Barrel, it's a specific look or feel, and you don't live it.

- **Greg Dale:** So conservation subdivisions are not enough to create rural lifestyle? The density change from 1:1 to 1:3 is a major policy change. How do you decide when the higher density is appropriate?

- **Jen Smith:** The Castner Farm is a great example of an area that is conducive to a conservation subdivision.

- **Greg Dale:** Clarify what you mean by a conservation subdivision. Do you mean what is said in this document, houses on smaller lots with half open space?

- **Jen Smith**: Conservation subdivisions should be based on a minimum lot size.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** We see a difference between conservation subdivisions on sewer and water and those that are not. We want smaller lots to make water and sewer more efficient for the developer. The proposed conservation subdivision in the land use plan would not work for the Castner Farm proposal.

- **Greg Dale:** You can go smaller than half acre lots. You may want to have a policy of how small lots in conservation subdivisions can be. You can incentivize with density bonuses.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** Smaller lots give more open space.

- **Greg Dale:** Gross versus Net. Are we talking a 1:1 gross density?

- **Ginny Kelleher:** It is site specific. 1:1 in a conservation subdivision. 1:3 in other areas not in a conservation subdivision.

- **Jack Bonham:** What about the new suburban areas? I think you made a good compromise in the rural areas. How will it work in the northeast and the northwest?

- **Joe Plankis:** We need to see what the specific ideas for the subcommittees in the northwest and northeast were.

- **Jen Smith:** May be not the same rural lifestyle for all sections. For example, the northwest wanted narrow roads.

- **Joe Plankis:** The thoroughfare plan is based off the county's plan; we need to reflect any changes we want on that plan. The southwest may not be the only area with equestrian trails.

- **Jack Bonham:** Is it 1:3 or 1:5 density? Do we decide on which one it should be?

- **Joe Plankis:** Let's leave it on the table.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** We added terms and definitions at the end of the document. Jen knew the southwest the best; each steering committee member might pick an area and work on it harder to sift through the subcommittee input and plans.

- **Mark Werner:** I don't envy the steering committee's job. People in Hamilton and Boone counties as well as Indianapolis want to live in that southwest area. It is a very attractive area. We need to be financially responsible and preserve those types of areas and market them. That area's assessed value helps the whole city, don't screw it up.

- **Joe Plankis**: That area will pay its share in school taxes.

- **Jamie Kartes:** When did the southwest area end at Towne Road, doesn't it end at Ditch?

- **Kevin Buchheit**: It does end at Ditch.

- **Tammy Kartes:** How do you transition from the new suburban area to the rural area?

- **Kevin Buchheit:** This is a formative process. We are still going through the rural area. We haven't gotten to the new suburban yet. The rural part of the southwest ends at Towne Rd.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** There are two areas in the southwest. New Suburban will be discussed as its own entity. We need to discuss transitions.

- **Tammy Kartes:** I consider us to be rural.

- **Joe Plankis:** I understand. We are not there yet.

- **Greg Dale:** So we have two discussion points: We have three distinct rural areas. So do we do the same that Jen did in the southwest to the other areas? How do we do that? It can become cumbersome. Does each section need to be recast?

- **Joe Plankis:** If we get bogged down in the details the process will be longer. We are not getting some subcommittee input.

- **Karen Newberry:** Personally I think it is a great approach, but I think the consultants should take a stab at this. Use the subcommittee reports to build a draft for each area. We deserve a good product. It saves the steering committee time.

- **Greg Dale**: We did incorporate the subcommittee input into the draft. We just need to glean the local resonance and nuances. We haven't changed the approach or intent of the plan; you have just added local nuance. The nuances don't come through in this document. The plan is not perfect, but we did include the subcommittee comments in the draft.

- **Bob Horkay:** I like this. This process is more than gleaning local nuances. We need to look at each individual subcommittee. We need to bring the subcommittees back into the process.

- **Kevin Buchheit:** This is our first opportunity to see this. Can we add the local nuances as we go through the rest of the document?

- **Jen Smith:** I was not comfortable with the document at the last meeting. I needed to go through everything to get through the process. Maybe the steering committee member can take a couple of the subcommittee members from their area and meet with Greg. Greg can get those ideas into a draft then come back to us. There will be commonalities in some areas.

- **Greg Dale:** Should we have a meeting with all the rural areas? It's a good idea. It gives us time to reconfigure the subcommittees. Figure a two hour meeting per subcommittee?

- **Larry Snapp:** If we look at the notes from different viewpoints we may see new things.

- **Greg Dale:** Teree tried to work with all this body of knowledge. It lacks the local nuances.

- **Larry Snapp:** We were assigned to areas we didn't live in; maybe we should look at where we live.

- **Ron Thomas**: The corridors don't reflect the subcommittee input. The corridor subcommittee specified that there be o gas stations on US 31, and no industrial on SR 32. That is not what the plan says.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** Larry's idea is perfect. We should work through it with each subcommittee. Greg can't get everything from the reports.

- **John Boyer:** The subcommittees created a vision statement. Maybe we blended some ideas that should have been separate. We lost the differences that way.

- **Larry Snapp:** It's too generic.

- **Greg Dale:** We need to balance the subcommittee input. We needed to balance the ideas of the corridors subcommittee with those of the business park. There were conflicts between the subcommittees. We need a process to get the local nuances; maybe we should break it into chunks with each subcommittee.

- **Joe Plankis:** I am not in favor of resurrecting the subcommittees. Use key people from those subcommittees. Look at the logistics of it; we would need to meet on Saturdays and during the day. We should have some brief meetings with Greg and Teree. Don't drag out the process even more.

- **Jack Bonham:** The interested people will show up. We need a draft to work from. We have meeting this to death. Key individuals will be useful. Are we using the subcommittees or topic area? Look at the rural and new suburban areas. Existing suburban does not need a lot of work.

- **Greg Dale:** Good points. Should we organize the discussion by the concept map? Not everything on the map needs to be addressed. What areas will benefit from more discussion/?

- **Joe Plankis:** Well we should have 1 steering committee member and a representative from the corridors and business park subcommittees.

- **Jack Bonham:** The new suburban needs work.

- **Jen Smith:** Don't need to worry about existing suburban.

- **Greg Dale:** Local and regional commercial, industrial, and business park. Can go together.

- **Joe Plankis**: We want high grade commercial and industrial, we don't need more retail. Office is ok. We want a business park off of SR 32.

- **Jen Smith:** With the results of these meetings, the map may need to change. We need to discuss the map after these meetings.

- **Greg Dale:** Rural northwest is an area. Can the northeast and southwest be discussed at the same time?

- **Ron Thomas:** Villages may need to be discussed separately. Jolietville shouldn't go west. Lamong and Hortonville can be discussed together, and Eagletown and Jolietville can be discussed together. The villages are bigger than the circles on the map currently.

- **Kevin Buchheit**: Should Eagletown and Jolietville be discussed with the corridor?

- **Jen Smith**: Businesses in the village area are different than corridor businesses.

- **Kevin Buchheit:** They probably are.

- **Ron Thomas:** Villages are pedestrian oriented and mixed use. They are different than corridor businesses.

- **Bob Horkay:** Areas between villages and DT are corridor areas.

- **Greg Dale:** 4 discussion areas – New Suburban, Rural, Business, Villages. We will have a single day of meetings then come back.

- Bob Horkay – Business, Karen Newberry and Larry Snapp- New Suburban, Gloria Del Greco and Jen Smith – Rural, John Boyer and Gloria Del Greco and Bob Smith – Villages

- **Ron Thomas:** Edges need to be defined in the villages; we need to discuss the criteria for the correct size of a village or a town.

- **Greg Dale:** We tried to define a village. If anyone disagrees with that definition then we need to discuss it. If we want large scale TND- say it.

- **Jen Smith:** We need help with that.

- **Karen Newberry:** All new developments are not villages. New Suburban, not village like.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** Each area needs to address transitions.
- **Greg Dale:** Transitions keep coming up. We can add transitions for each section, which may cause duplication, or we can designate a single place in the plan that deals with transitions.
- **Joe Plankis:** Have one section for transitions. We can allow other avenues for developers to propose.

- **Ginny Kelleher:** So we will have a separate section for transitions, but each subcommittee will discuss transitions.
- **Joe Plankis**: Follow the southwest rural blueprint.
- **Greg Dale:** Only the base density and the lot sizes have changed. Let's go through the differences in Jen's document from the draft.
- **Jen Smith:** Second Page, second bullet – added criteria granting higher density. Appropriate uses - added rural subdivision, conservation subdivision, and equestrian, took out rural business.
- **John Boyer:** Northwest wanted rural businesses.
- **Jen Smith:** Some parcels have nice natural features so they can get increased density for preserving that area. They get increased density for creating natural areas. Example: riding arenas.
- **Greg Dale:** Separate section for conservation subdivisions. We will build a link from the rural section to the conservation subdivision section.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** We started to create the conservation subdivision definition. Look at Zionsville RE zoning and Boone County rural subdivisions.
- **Jack Bonham**: Do we have development standards for rural large lot **development?**
- **Kevin Buchheit:** That steps into regulation, not policy.
- **Greg Dale:** There is a policy question of whether to regulate aesthetics of large lot rural.
- **Jen Smith:** Rural subdivision allows subdivision control instead of a free for all.
- **Jack Bonham**: That process doesn't apply if it is allowed by right. We want to promote a rural atmosphere for the community.
- **Jen Smith:** Price will dictate aesthetics.
- **Greg Dale**: Do we need a policy statement encouraging the regulation of aesthetics of large lot development?
- **Jen Smith:** We shouldn't regulate aesthetics. It's an individual choice.
- **Larry Snapp**: How do large lots affect sewers?
- **Kevin Buchheit:** We did a sewer plan a year ago. We are working on the land use plan now. We will match the sewer plan to the land use plan.
- **Joe Plankis:** I am into aesthetics.
- **Karen Newberry:** We shouldn't have a policy regarding aesthetics. We are pushing our opinions on others.
- **Larry Snapp**: I don't support a policy on aesthetics. It's hard to compare large lot houses.
- **Jack Bonham:** We should have standards on the placement of outbuildings.
- **Bob Horkay:** Standards are needed. How do you get there?
- **Dave Mueller:** Ordinances will follow the plan. BZA gives variances for things we never thought of. There is a process in place to answer those questions. The BZA is that process.
- **Jack Bonham:** We need landscaping improvements. I am big on trees.
- **Bob Smith:** We should have standards on square footage of building, building standards, and yard standards.
- **John Boyer**: Standards are important.

- **Greg Dale:** We don't have a consensus. Should we add a policy that we will consider the use of standards to regulate aesthetics of large lot development?
- **Joe Plankis:** Jen add your thinking on each of these items.
- **Jen Smith:** Artisan farms are new thoughts. Encourage open space through incentives by creating new natural areas or preserving natural areas. Gives guidance on when to allow higher density.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** Minimum acreage for conservation subdivisions? Less than 20 acres is unfeasible. We needed to ask Greg about that.
- **Greg Dale:** Less than 20 acres or any defined size, they could only build 1:3 then? That is the implication of adding a minimum size to the conservation subdivision.
- **Jen Smith:** For those who don't have adequate road frontage under the current ordinance we created the rural subdivision option.
- **Mic Mead:** You can't allow 3 clustered houses?
- **Jen Smith:** Not under the area's current zoning.
- Gre**g Dale**: You can do smaller lot sizes than ½ acre to get the required 6o% open space.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** We have a policy to allow conservation subdivisions. The ordinance will make up the rest.
- **Greg Dale:** This sounds like a zoning debate.
- **Ginny Kelleher**: Minor subdivisions are for small parcels along the road, it limits driveway cuts. It still provides 3 to 5 acres for animals.
- **Jen Smith:** Density bonuses are unlikely to happen unless it meets all the conditions.
- **Joe Plankis:** Throw it in front of the planners. Put a number in, you can always modify it.
- **Greg Dale:** We agree on the general definition of conservation subdivision. Need to revisit the numbers in relation to conservation subdivisions.
- **Al Salzman:** Minimum acreages in conservation subdivisions could limit us. A small parcel could have natural features that want to conserve in a conservation subdivision.
- **Greg Dale:** The concept is more important than the numbers. We don't want small parcels masquerading as conservation subdivisions.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** Lift the good things from our definitions to use in the plan's definition section.
- **Greg Dale:** So we accept the main ideas, except the conservation subdivision definition.
- **Ginny Kelleher:** Under appropriate land uses, is residential attached or detached?
- **Greg Dale:** detached
- **Kevin Buchheit:** With the baby boom, we may want to allow granny flats attached to the primary structure.
- **Citizen:** Are we going to address the lots in Eagletown?
- **Greg Dale:** That will be addressed under the villages. We are not there yet.
- **Jack Bonham:** Is the Nineteenth still good?

- **Greg Dale:** Use judgment on what subcommittee members you will invite.
- **Jen Smith:** Do your homework. Smaller groups will be better.

- The chairman's of each group will be on the website. Will coordinate schedules with staff.
- No steering committee on the 19th of April.
- Staff will post a detailed agenda for the next meeting.