

ELLETTSVILLE PLAN COMMISSION

September 11, 1997

Board members present: Patrick Wesolowski, President, Terry Baker, Donald Ashley, Sandy Gann, Diana Evans, Geraldine McIntyre, Secretary.

Board members not present: Charlie Merrimon

Also in Attendance Rick Coppock, Town Engineer

President Pat Wesolowski called the meeting to order.

COMMENTS:

- ANNEXATION MEETING ON TV:

Geraldine stated that you might have seen us at the annexation meeting with Bloomington Council. We are now in the process of hiring people to do our annexation.

President Pat Wesoloski stated that he watched the annexation meeting on TV. We had some people in Ellettsville who spoke well for the annexation. But we had a so- called businessman who spoke against it. Pat stated that this really bothered him.

NEW SEWER MANAGER INFORMATION:

Geraldine informed the Plan Commission that the other night they looked over the applications for a new sewer manager. They have 3 good candidates and no decision has been made yet.

MINUTES:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

THOMAS ROAD 30 ACRES REZONE R-2 PUD TO R-1:

Phil Tapp with Tapp Bledsoe Company is representing the Sutherlens for the development. The request this evening is rather simple. A couple of years ago or a year and half ago this property was annexed into the Town of Ellettsville with the zoning as R-2 PUD. The client at this time wanted to develop this property with duplex housing on it. It would either be all duplexes or part duplexes or part single family, etc. There were several neighbors who were upset with the R-2 zoning and what could happen with this size residential development so to help bring everybody at ease with it we decided to bring it in as R-2 PUD. This would limit it to duplexes and residential development and things like that. Since that time, the developer went by the way side if you will.

Then the Sutherlens purchased this property. They have no desire to build duplex housing. They want to develop single-family homes according with the R-1 zoning which is the most restrictive single family that you have in your ordinance. So it will be know variance from the Ordinance being requested with this.

Mr. Tapp said that is our request for this evening. Mr. Southerlen and myself are here to answer any questions.

Pat asked if we would have more control with a PUD that just a R-1. It was stated that with a PUD we do. Pat said he would like to see this as R-1 PUD. He opened it up to the other Board members.

Donald Ashley stated that he wanted it to be R-1 PUD and he asked Rick if we could do so at this time. Rick Coppock said we could do so. It can be R-1 or R-2 also. We would want to see what requirements you want on it.

Don Ashley said if we relent the PUD, we have know say so, I think we want to do this. I still want R-1 PUD.

Diana Evans stated there is a new ordinance that you are not aware of that is being drafted. All new additions will have to put in the detention ponds first. I think that is the reason for the PUD. Your land would come in before the Ordinance is passed. You would just have to put your detention ponds in first. That would be the only thing for the PUD.

Geraldine stated that these ponds would have to be inspected. Sandy Gann said her concern is the detention ponds. Terry Baker said he will go along with the R-1 PUD, he is not willing to go R-1 straight.

Mr. Tapp said before you vote on that could he have a little conference with Mr. Sutherlen? Pat Wesolowski said before you talk, he would like to have some discussion, okay?

Geraldine stated she wanted it R-1 PUD.

Pat asked Mr. Sutherlen what type of housing are you planning on putting in here?

Mr. Sutherlen stated it will be single family housing. Pat said the cost factor would be what, what price range are you looking at. We are looking at 94 homes, what is the price range of homes you are looking at putting in here? Mr. Sutherlen said it will vary, right now it would be due to what is selling. Pat asked what type of infrastructure have you laid out here, buffers, green space. With 94 homes your looking at approximately four trips per household now, is that what they figure?

Mr. Tapp said it would be closer to 10 trips per day.

Pat asked have we looked at the impact of the traffic here.

Mr. Tapp said not since we did the previous R-2 PUD, which allowed for 128 dwelling units at that time. So in essence what we are doing is actually reducing this by 34 dwelling units. If anything it is a down zone from what we originally came in with a year and a half ago. It would be giving up the duplex units, giving up the higher density that could have been approved 128 units with smaller lots on it to go back to the R-1 really reduces things. So they did not do any new traffic trip generations to the County Highway from what they did originally.

Diana said because it is less numbers.

Pat asked if there are sidewalks? Mr. Tapp said per the Ordinance, the Ordinance requires sidewalks. Pat asked about curbs and gutters? Mr. Tapp said yes. Pat asked if there any green space? Rick said the tree plot is what you are referring to between the road and sidewalks. Pat said right. Pat said that when the other developer came in, if he is not mistaken, he thought he was going to have park of some sort of green space for the people in the area so the children wouldn't have to play in the streets necessarily. He is not saying park, park it was green space so the children would not be playing on the streets and in the cul-de sacks. There was a long discussion. Pat said he would like to see a more up dated or plan so he could study it.

Rick said that will come with preliminary plat, this is just for zoning. Pat discussed his feeling for a while. Geraldine asked where the entrances would be in this development? Pat said there are 2 entrances. Geraldine said which is your main entrance? The answer is Apache Drive.

There was some discussion over the plans.

Mr. Tapp said when we first brought this through a year and half ago that the main entry would line up with Apache or Tecumseh, then they had another one in an inadequate location for site distance. The County Highway definitely wanted this one lined up, one of these two and that is what we did. The commitment for detention up front with the development, he guesses is an obvious and certainly that is a must. The reason they have two facilities on her is because of the topography of the property, there is a hill top, and there is actually two drainage basins that go through there this property. So they have to install one up front for this basin and they have to have one over there.

There was more discussion over the plans.

Diana asked before when we had Burches addition going in, the Plan Commission requested that he put both of these roads in so you would have 2 ways out. Would that be impossible? Mr. Sutherlen stated that is the way it is set up, it would be difficult since these are a good piece apart and with this being in three phases.

Pat asked if they wanted to go some place and talk? Mr. Tapp stated that the only question he had with R-1 PUD was the reason. Diana stated the holding ponds.

Mr. Tapp said this is the only reason. Basically they don't want to seek any variance from the R-1. They wanted to do your infrastructure, the R-1 standards, sidewalks, right a way, tree plots, everything by the book and this sounds like the reason for the PUD over and above your strict guidelines is just to make sure the detention ponds are up front.

Diana said they have a drafted ordinance and it just so happens that it won't be until she thinks the meeting of the 29th. We had to move their Town Council meeting down a week. That is an ordinance that the Council is looking at. She didn't know how else for Mr. Sutherlen to be aware that it was coming up with this big of an addition unless we put the PUD on there so you would know that they want the holding ponds in first.

Rick Coppock said actually that really wouldn't be an issue because before you have preliminary plat that should be an Ordinance already.

Geraldine said then you are not planning on having any place for kids to play or anything in there?

Pat wanted to know the census for someone living in that house. Rick said 2.74. Pat said we are going to have at least 100 kids there. There was discussion on this.

Mr. Sutherlen said where do you draw the line on that, do you just have basketball goal, or tennis courts, or do you have ball fields.

Pat said you are right and that is a valid question. There was more discussion on this.

Terry Baker said if you want something he thinks about the most we can expect is green space area and if the Town wants to develop it into a park and put basketball goals or anything else. If it is made available to do it that way, that would be great. That way the developer is not out money doing a park that he is going to be responsible for and everything else. He thinks if the space is made available to the town and let the town do the thing, then it is going to be uniform in all the additions, if the town plans that area.

There was more discussion on this.

Pat said you are going to have a little community here. I assume that a developer would want to entice people to buy here. Green space would help. I don't think you would like for this to be low income and they would be of higher standard. We have an abundance of low income housing in this town. A long discussion was held. Pat said he realizes this is a meeting that your request to change the zoning on it. Mr. Tapp said back to his one question, with this PUD, if you put the PUD on it the detention ponds is what you are looking for, there is consideration for the park.

Sandy Gann said he is just talking about the difference between the PUD verses the regular R-1, the real reasons for having the PUD.

Diana said in her opinion it's the holding ponds. Geraldine said they will be inspected.

Don Ashley said with this PUD it is very simple over the past 2 to 6 years everything we have rezoned or put in a new addition and we don't hold on a certain amount of control things happen and there is nothing we can say about it. But as I understand that with a PUD it allow us a certain amount of leave way.

Rick Coppock said then you can have additional requirements on it.

Diana said PUD is additional requirements.

Don said he thinks we need that and that way I would want the PUD. It is not only with the detention ponds. Yes, we have had a lot of trouble with detention ponds. Don discussed his opinion with the Commission.

Pat asked if this was going to be low-income housing? Mr. Sutherlen said there is very little low income even the government doesn't have low income or subsidized housing anymore. Farmer Home has put out up to \$250,000 for the whole district. A long discussion was held.

Pat stated that when we approve this new addition with a R-1 PUD we will be looking at it. We will be holding people responsible for it. There will be no changes made. What is said on the plans will be done. If not we will take other actions to make sure that it is completed. There have been other times when people said things would be done and it wasn't. So what we want is control for the town people. He stated is has know problem with the R-1 PUD.

Geraldine stated that when we get a new sewer or utility manager that person will know how lines should be laid out in new developments. She also said at this time you are not being singled out it just happens that you are the first one to come before us.

Pat said with the new Utilities manager who is to say that he might look at this and say the truck-line is inadequate. The County Highway may say that there is to much traffic.

There was more discussion.

Rick said for PUD you need to explain what you are looking for, what are your additional requirements.

Diana said if you make it PUD you have to have a list of what they need to do.

Diana said they need to know up front why we are putting a PUD on it.

Pat said he would like to table this if at all possible to the next meeting. He would like to get with the sewer people, streets, all the department heads and study it more.

Rick said we are not voting on the plan.

There was a very long discussion on this.

Mr. Sutherlen said we are just asking for the zone and this could be discussed at the preliminary. There was more discussion.

Mr. Tapp said when we gave you this plan before for R-2 PUD we gave you a list of restrictions. We also gave them to the neighbors too. We said it will be 128 unit duplexes and single family. We will have road, shrubs, detention ponds and infastructor. We came back and tell you will have less density by 34 units and the same thing

out there we have back yards for kids to play in. We just want to make it less dense. Sandy said she likes that idea.

Mr. Tapp said if the R-1 PUD is clear to me that you want restrictions on the detention ponds that will be up front.

Pat said Rick made a statement that if we go with R-1 PUD, do we have to give them a list of requirements we want and all we have is the detention ponds and right to enforce them?

Pat asked Rick if when the preliminary plat comes back and it doesn't have any green space do we have the right to request it? Rick said you don't have the right to require ground for green space. Don Ashley asked Pat what he meant by green space. Pat stated like for an area for a park or where children could play. There was a long discussion on this subject.

Donald Ashley said the problem he sees with this (Park) is your saying that you think each developer ought to give a lot or what ever to the town, that the town can develop into a recreational facility because he is not going to take the liability of some child getting hurt there. We are going to have to bring that back to a public situation. That is what you are basically saying and when you tell the developer you want to take lot 75 for him to have green space. You are talking about taking these dollars he plans on using for his development he would ----- it. If he gives you that he has to make up that difference on the rest of the lots. Melvin said sometimes you can't.

There was more discussion on this.

Diana said she thinks the holding pond and the enforcement is the two things for the PUD.

Don Ashley made the motion that we change R-2 PUD to R-1 PUD on Thomas Road 30 acre addition out there. Basically what we wanted stipulated with PUD because we want to check and make sure the holding ponds are in first, and they are basically the way they should be, and what they should be as to best we can do, and we want a certain amount to able to enforce a little bit till to get up to the point here where they are actually building in that since. We want to make sure there is a lot of green space is going to be there we want tree plots this kind of thing just basically what the rules are that is why we want the PUD on it.

Rick said so the PUD is going to be constructed to R-1 standards, the detention ponds are going to be built first, the detention ponds will be built not necessarily in there phases they will be built at the start of the project. Then we are going to design the ponds at 10 year predevelopment rate 100 year proposed storage. Prior to any phase approvals we will have to have detention ponds certified that they are built correctly. Rick said we will have Phil certify that they are built according to his plan. Diana said Rick is just clarifying the motion. Diana Evans seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0.

-
ADJOURNMENT:

Diana Evans made the motion to adjourn. Donald Ashley seconded. Motion passed 6-0.