

## October 4, 2012

The Ellettsville, Indiana Plan Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 4, 2012, in the Fire Department Training and Conference Room located at 5080 West State Road 46. Dan Swafford called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Phillip Smith led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Roll Call:** Members present were: Dan Swafford, President; Terry Baker, Vice President; Don Calvert, Phillip Rogers, Russ Ryle and Phillip Smith. Sandra Hash was absent. Connie Griffin, Director of Planning, and Rick Coppock, Bynum Fanyo and Associates, Town Engineer, were also present.

### Approval of the Minutes – September 6, 2012

Dan Swafford entertained a motion for approval of the September 6, 2012 minutes. Phillip Smith so moved. Russ Ryle seconded. Motion carried.

### New Business

#### **Richland Senior Center Project, Plan Commission Docket Number: 10042012-1, 15 Unit Apartment Complex, 5971 N. Brown Addition Drive, Petitioner Dennis Fisher**

**Connie Griffin, Director of Planning,** introduced the Richland Senior Center Project (“Richland”). It is zoned Residential 3 and is correct for the land use that is proposed. This is a multiple phase project over several years. This project is a 15 unit apartment complex with each unit having a laundry facility and one unit is ADA accessible. All other units are fully handicap adaptable. The building setback for the front yard is 25 feet and the rear yard is 10 feet. Each unit is 672 square feet and the dimensions of each unit are 24’ x 23’. The gross floor area is 11,899 square feet. The number of parking spaces proposed are 16 with two being handicap. The development review fees in the amount of \$300 were paid on August 23, 2012. The supervisors and Plan Commission members have reviewed the project site plan. The submittal dates of the development site plan were February 6, 2012, July 31, 2012, August 10, 2012, August 15, 2012, August 22, 2012 and September 5, 2012.

**Dan Swafford** asked if the Plan Commission has received everything that has been submitted to date. Connie Griffin replied she has given everything to them that she has received since delivery of the Plan Commission packets.

**Connie Griffin** continued with the introduction. The area is 0.9 acres. The project has met all planning requirements for the following: Open space, street width, handicapped access, parking and setbacks, emergency vehicle access, landscaping, site drainage and storm water quality. There will be a landscape buffer between the new apartments and the adjacent properties. Some trees will need to be removed but they will replace them with large, healthy trees by a professional landscape company. All exterior lighting will be limited, directed downward and will be designed to minimize new lighting affecting residential neighbors. A trash dumpster area will be enclosed and screened pursuant to the site plan.

On September 25, 2012, a letter was provided to Miller Architects. In addition, Rick Coppock, Bynum Fanyo Associates, Town Engineer, has provided his findings. If

approved the following would be required: Grading permit fees, parking lot permit and some street signs pursuant to §153.086. She has reviewed §152.129, the comprehensive plan and subdivision and zoning ordinances. The project is compatible with its surroundings. Stormwater management is adequate and has been reviewed by Rick Coppock. There is an adequate provision for green space in the landscaping. There is an adequate provision for buffering to significantly reduce the visual impact of similar developments. Adequate provisions for sidewalks and the possibility of public streets. All plans that have been submitted have been provided to the Plan Commission .

**Rick Coppock, Bynum Fanyo Associates, Town Engineer** has reviewed the plans. Some of the grading shown on the Crider and Knickerbocker properties will require a right of entry or easement before the project is started. The configuration of the roadway will have to be changed so it gets away from the Knickerbocker property. Stormwater detention meets the code. The Town Code has a local street being 24' of pavement with curbs and gutters on each side. Their plans show 25' of pavement including the curbs and gutters. Instead of having a 12' lane for each traffic lane they have a 10' lane which doesn't include the gutter area. The petitioner has proposed a roll type of gutter. They could change their plan to use a stand up or straight curb which is a 6" curb which would give them the required 24' of pavement for the portion in the public right-of-way on Brown Street. The curb and gutter allows for better access at any point to the Crider and Knickerbocker properties.

**Dan Swafford** asked if they will have a stub at the end on Brown Lane as it goes into the duplex. Mr. Coppock replied it will be the portion where the buses are located and he illustrated the same on the plans. Mr. Swafford asked if Mr. Knickerbocker accesses it from the road. Mr. Coppock explained he accesses his driveway from Matthews. The portion leading up to it is owned by the Senior Citizen housing. It is not an ingress and egress. It is used as a drive to serve an old house, Mr. Crider uses it and there's an house to the south of it. Mr. Swafford asked if it is an easement. Mr. Coppock replied the driveway leading up to Matthews is owned by Richland Senior Housing.

**Bernie Guerrettaz, Bledsoe Riggert and Guerrettaz**, explained there are two parcels and one is 30' long and the other is 10' wide and they're part of Lot 6. The 30' piece is an easement on Mr. Crider's deed. But there is a 10' strip and there is no easement his driveway actually crosses.

**Rick Coppock** continued presenting his findings. The petitioner has provided stormwater quality and detention on the south end of the site which outlets to an existing catch basin. Emergency vehicle access is through the existing driveway which goes out Matthews. Development plans are subject to the subdivision ordinance because they don't have their own section. Mr. Swafford asked him to further explain right of entry. Mr. Coppock replied a little of the work will be on the Crider property. Before construction can start they would have to have a right of entry. Mr. Swafford asked if Mr. Crider has been notified of the construction. Mr. Guerrettaz advised he and Dennis Fisher met with Mr. Crider on September 11, 2012. A plat in 1924 shows 30' and they're putting in a 25' wide back of curb improvement for the roadway so they're pretty tight. They'll be pulling the asphalt out, putting a curb in, putting in top soil and they'll put a row of five or six trees on the east side. They advised Mr. Crider of the meeting date. Mr. Fisher offered Mr. Crider trees as a visual buffer. Mr. Swafford asked Darla Brown, Town Attorney, if they have to have the legal documentation in

place before the next meeting. Ms. Brown replied it would be helpful but if they're making the representation Mr. Crider says okay then that's fine. Mr. Guerrettaz said Mr. Crider listened and didn't seem to have a problem but he didn't say it was okay. They've got to clean the asphalt up and that's the amount of disturbance they're doing on his property. They will make sure they have permission from Mr. Crider to get on his ground.

**Rick Coppock** showed the parking plans which is up for discussion. Parking would be in the set back. They can't get enough parking spaces without them having to back out onto the public right-of-way portion of Brown Drive. Mr. Swafford asked how many lots that would be. Mr. Coppock responded it would be seven or eight spaces. He doesn't see any other option for the parking spaces other than moving them off site. Mr. Swafford noticed the building sits at an angle. If they straightened the building would it help with parking. Mr. Coppock replied there would still be some encroachment.

**Russ Ryle** noted because the building jogs to the right, if it was changed to the left there would be more space to give to the left side of the building. Would that possibly get the parking spaces to where you could park a small car without backing into the street? Mr. Coppock replied it's a matter of it being in the set back. If you jog it the other way you can pick up 10' and then you get to issues with drainage in the back of the property. There are back out conditions throughout the whole site that have the same problem. Right now they're dealing with people backing out into a public street and into the set back. Mr. Ryle stated when they made a site visit the issue was the sloping of running water specifically from the new construction site into the existing retention pond. The issue was where the overflow in the current pond drains out. Is he comfortable with the slope in the current plan and that the water will actually flow into the pond? Has he determined where the overflow pipe exits? Mr. Coppock replied they've not determined where the overflow pipe exits. He's looked around the job site and explained by showing the plans, the path of the drainage to a catch basin. There have never been any drainage complaints from the area of the site. Mr. Ryle asked if there needs to be a second overflow drain added and, if so, where would the water overflow to. Mr. Coppock replied if it overflows, it's going to go down the edge of drive onto Matthews and then to the pipes on the south side and a drainage inlet on the north side.

**Russ Ryle** further noted, the plan shows the drive that comes off of Matthews and hits the south end of Brown is 8' wide. Is that correct? Mr. Coppock replied it is 8' to 10'. Mr. Ryle commented that is not code. Mr. Swafford said it is not a public street. Mr. Ryle said if it's emergency access for a housing unit then it needs to be brought up to code. He understands they're going to make Brown Street to code but it narrows. Mr. Swafford asked if there's not an improvement on an existing drive. They'll discuss this when the petitioner makes his presentation.

**Don Calvert** asked if there is a road that comes into the site from the existing housing. Mr. Coppock explained on the plans they'll remove a building and extend the road. It will be a private road and its 20' wide.

**Russ Ryle** asked if a private road is 20' and a public road is 24'. Mr. Coppock replied a private road consists of the rest of the roads in their development. Mr. Ryle asked if they're consistent with current code. Mr. Coppock responded the current code specifies public streets. Mr. Ryle asked if there's a spec on a private street. Mr. Coppock

answered not that he knows of. Mr. Swafford asked if the existing private streets are 20' or 24'. Mr. Coppock answered they're tied into the existing streets.

**Steve Miller, Miller Architects**, noted that Allen Street is actually 18½' which is actual black top width. They made their streets 20' wide and then they made a real wide radius for fire trucks. If the new private drive is taken out to Allen Street the north/south leg of it that comes into the main Richland property is 18½' and they were told to keep it consistent so they made it 20'. Then they did a sweeping curve so they could get the fire trucks through with a nice radius. Mr. Calvert asked if the Fire Chief didn't see any problem with navigating his equipment through there. Mr. Miller replied the Fire Chief said as long as he could get down the lane he wanted the radius coming into that lane. Mr. Miller showed on the plans the path and measurements of the road. Chief Davis said as long as the primary access could be from Allen and get the curve to get him in there, then he could get out of there as long as that radius was okay. Mr. Ryle commented on down the driveway to Matthews, it will come out as a T intersection. That's going to be a rougher turn especially for Engine 79 that has a bigger wheel base. They're going to be coming off of 8½' pavement to try to make a sharp turn on to Matthews. Mr. Miller reiterated the information they had was to get him around the curve. He hasn't heard him saying anything about turning on Matthews.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** added they will have to talk to the Fire Chief about that intersection. He can't speak informatively about it as this time. All he knows is coming around to the northeast and southeast corners of the building they have a radius that will hit his fire trucks. At this time, there is not a through access to get from the back side of the Crider and Knickerbacher properties. When this property goes in there will be. There will be a fire hydrant to the east that will give an insurance benefit to the homes.

**Rick Coppock** showed a map of the intersection in question. Mr. Ryle asked how wide both lanes of Matthews are. Mr. Coppock replied it's 22'. Mr. Ryle commented he wants to make sure the turn is adequate for fire trucks. It is the tightest point of the entire transportation plan.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** showed on the plans where new pavement will merge with existing pavement. They will wedge, level and taper into existing pavement sections. Mr. Ryle asked what the cross section looks like structurally. Will it carry a 40 ton truck? Mr. Guerrettaz replied it probably won't. But will it carry it once in 10 years or carry it every day? There may be snow plows that hit it. It may be that construction equipment tears it to pieces and it has to be fixed anyway. He appreciated Mr. Coppock's approach in his letter. It's exactly what a petitioner needs to get served by the public.

**Dan Swafford** really feels the project needs the piece of constructed road at this time. If they're going to use it as an emergency entrance, the road needs developed now and up to specs. Then the Town takes it over and into their inventory and they don't have to worry about maintenance. It's confusing to drive into that area because of the two one-way streets. He would like it to be another entrance or a fire truck and ambulance route. The residents can be better served when an ambulance can get up there with no problems. Mr. Guerrettaz remarked that is an off site improvement. Mr. Swafford stated it is still part of the project. Mr. Guerrettaz said it is a small track of ground. The ordinance states when parcels total five acres you are required to have two points of access. This is a separate one acre parcel. Mr. Ryle stated it is a separate one acre parcel but the complex is over five acres. Mr. Guerrettaz said he's not arguing about

whether it's a one or five acre project. It's for the board to decide. He knows the board is very concerned about cut through traffic coming off of Matthews and going through their development and the elderly people present on a daily basis. The layout works. It provides a lot of benefit for the area, the three neighbors and the other portion of the Richland Senior Center housing. Mr. Swafford reiterated he's discussing an existing area and if they're going to try and re-use part of it. If they are going to do future development wouldn't it be beneficial to do it now as opposed to the future when things are more expensive? Mr. Guerrettaz replied the petitioner has not mentioned an expansion. They don't have to disrupt Mr. Knickerbacher if it's not necessary. They're not putting the residents of the 15 unit development in peril. Mr. Ryle commented there's no reason the road can't be one way out except for emergency vehicles. Mr. Coppock commented one house does have access of the drive. Mr. Ryle asked if the section from Matthews up is not a down town street. Dennis Fisher replied they own it and it belongs to Richland Senior Housing. Mr. Ryle asked who plows the drive. Mr. Fisher replied they don't because they've never used it. They do all the plowing for all their projects.

**Dennis Fisher, Vice President of Richland Senior Housing**, explained they knew these issues would come up and they had an idea the Plan Commission was going to want a thru street. He has been on the board for 17 years. As for the parking issue, not everyone owns or drives a car. There is one parking place for each apartment. Allen Street quits where they're making their private drive come in. Jim Ragle plows to there, turns around and goes back. They plow all of their parking lots and streets and clean off the sidewalks. Fire Chief Jim Davis said as long as he can make the turn because he doesn't want to back up his truck. He also told them they could put up a gate with a padlock and give him a key. They've just paid off their first unit and it's 40 years old. The units will be upgraded and will have roll in showers with no tubs and a sprinkler system. Mr. Swafford noted although residents may not have cars, their families do.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** has worked for Richland for six to eight years. This is an unique entity within the community. They're providing the emergency access that Chief Davis asked for and they're doing it responsibly. Is it a major thoroughfare – no. The stormwater meets the code and they've built in certain safety nets with the drainage. He searched but couldn't locate the drainage pipe. They researched the ordinance and couldn't find any open space requirements. In the prior ordinance, it states the building cannot consume more than 35% of the property. This project consumes 31.6%. Almost one-third of the site is in green space. They are using a roll type curb so the Knickerbachers can get on their property. This is a low traffic, low volume, low speed area and the people driving it will be local and know what to expect. The county owns to the north. There's an allowance for a 15' drive on the plat. They're not phasing it. Trees are shown on the plan and they will replace any dead trees. Connie Griffin did a good job bringing up the trees and the replacement of the same.

The meeting was adjourned for a recess.

The meeting was called to order by Dan Swafford.

**Dan Swafford** asked if Brown Drive is going to be a public street. Mr. Guerrettaz answered it just happens to be in a dedicated right-of-way. It's landlocked to the south and east. There is a 30' easement for Mr. Crider but it is owned by Richland. Mr. Ryle said there is someone else who uses the same drive and who owns it. Mr. Guerrettaz replied it is owned by Mr. Harman and it is rental. Mr. Ryle asked if there are two houses that rely on Richland as the only access to their properties. Mr. Guerrettaz responded no, because they have road frontage.

**Dennis Fisher** explained no one knew Brown Road existed until they researched the property. No one has maintained it since 1924. Mr. Smith asked Ms. Griffin if that was true. Ms. Griffin replied the Street Department does snow plow the access off of Matthews and has put some asphalt on it. Mr. Smith asked if it's on the Town books as owning that road. Ms. Griffin answered no, it's not owned by the Town.

**Marian Jacobs, President of Richland Senior Housing**, doesn't understand the hassle they're having to go through on this project. They've spent \$50,000 to \$60,000 on engineering and related costs. The issue is a road that's 150 feet long. They own the private lane to Brown Street and other properties around it. If this isn't approved they will take their resources elsewhere. Chief Davis has no problems with taking his fire truck in and out. Mr. Swafford explained they're not being hassled. They're trying to make sure the project is being done correctly. Mr. Ryle asked how many total units are in their senior housing project. Mr. Jacobs replied there are 96 existing units, 14 in Stinesville and they're proposing to add 15 more.

**Carson Hayes, Management Agent for Richland**, advised each of their other properties are separate corporations with completely separate deeds. All of the 96 units are not one plat. There are five different corporations. The biggest concentration for one entity is 40 units. Operationally it is not one complex. Mr. Ryle commented functionally, from a traffic standpoint, it is a conglomerate of 96 units. Mr. Hayes said to talk about traffic they have 22 units at Maple Shades. Mr. Ryle asked if on the north side of Main Street they have 74 units and they're going to add 15 more. Mr. Hayes replied that was correct.

**Connie Griffin** advised she has submitted the information to Town Council for their review which is basically an introduction at their October 8, 2012, meeting. Then they will return to the Plan Commission in November for the second reading.

**Rick Coppock** said there is a lot of discussion on Brown Street. It is not in the street inventory because it is not paved. It's a public right-of-way that was set out when they subdivided the property. Mr. Swafford asked if now that it will be paved will it become part of the street inventory. Mr. Coppock replied no, because it has to connect to public streets. When the adjoining property is developed, then it would be connected for a thru road. Mr. Swafford noted when the parcel was laid out it looks like the connection point is Matthews Drive. Is the house across from McNeely not wide enough for a road? Mr. Coppock replied no, it's 15 feet. They probably provided half a right-of-way with the intention that the other parcel would provide the other half. In the past when they've laid out these plats they didn't take topography into account.

**Phillip Smith** asked if they'll maintain the snow plowing. Mr. Hayes replied they will take care of the whole thing. The board is adamant they're never going to let Brown

Street become something where cars can race through it. They've put in a gazebo and any night during the summer you'll find 10 to 15 residents in it and walking back and forth in the night. Any time through the day you'll see residents walking up and down it because it's a dead street. If people were to start ripping up through the complex then someone is going to get hurt. Mr. Swafford asked if Brown Street has sidewalks. Mr. Guerrettaz replied the right-of-way is 30' and no, they do not have sidewalks. Mr. Swafford asked if it's in Town Code for it to have to have sidewalks. Does it have to go to the BZA? Can they grant the variance? This is not going to be a private street. Mr. Guerrettaz replied it will be a private street in a public domain. Ms. Brown stated she is uncertain whether or not sidewalks are required on the roadway. She will take a look at it and let them know.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** advised normally the language in the ordinance states it is to provide the interconnectivity. There's no interconnectivity to the south so they wouldn't necessarily assume it would be there. Mr. Swafford said he is hearing maybe later there will be interconnectivity. If they're not going to provide an ingress or egress than that part of the development needs to have sidewalks. Later on if they do develop the street, can they force the issue of a sidewalk on this little strip? Mr. Coppock replied in other instances where there has been limited right-of-way they've not required them to have sidewalks along the street. In areas where there's hilly terrain they haven't put sidewalks in. If there were sidewalks on the south end he's uncertain where they would go. Mr. Guerrettaz asked if Mr. Swafford is concerned there's going to be a strip there. Mr. Swafford said that's correct. Mr. Guerrettaz suggested they make it a condition of approval if that strip ever goes through then that development would have to install a sidewalk on this side of the property and they'll put a pedestrian easement on it, on the back of the curb. That way, it will solve the problem for the future and make the connection if they need to do so. Terry Baker commented that was more than fair.

**Steve Miller** explained when they started on this project in February 2012, everything was great except they didn't know about Brown driveway. Ms. Griffin suggested they get with Chief Davis. They started out to come up from Matthews then Chief Davis thought it would be better to come in from Allen so they made the change and made the radius bigger. Other than the piece going down to Matthews is everything else okay? Mr. Swafford replied he's concerned with ingress and egress. It would be an easier way of going in and out for the residents. Mr. Ryle commented parking is a concern. Mr. Miller said when they first approached the Planning Department, they were putting in one parking space per apartment but Ms. Griffin requested three more spaces with one handicap space. They've been trying to figure out how to do a landscape buffer and still be in public right-of-way. Mr. Swafford asked how many feet Brown Street will taper to when it attaches to Matthews. Mr. Miller replied the curb maintains 24' wide but they extended it to 26' wide for the fire trucks. Mr. Swafford asked if they're going all the way to Matthews with new black top. Mr. Miller answered they haven't said new blacktop but they will improve it.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** showed how the pavement will extend on the plans. New pavement will taper into existing pavement. They may need to do maintenance on the existing pavement after construction equipment has been up and down it. They're putting their money into infrastructure and buildings.

**Dan Swafford** asked Darla Brown, Town Attorney, if they're putting in so much into this area and allowing access for emergency vehicles is there anything in the ordinances or codes to prohibit this from happening as they're proposing.

**Darla Brown, Town Attorney,** advised Section 153.052 requires the Plan Commission to review the development plan for adequate provisions for internal management of traffic and to also do an analysis of the capacity of adjacent streets to ensure they can safely and efficiently accommodate additional traffic. The issues they're raising about the pavement are valid points for the Plan Commission to consider. There are also code sections about their responsibilities to look at traffic problems and issues. Mr. Swafford asked if they need any studies on the remainder of the street to assist with their decision.

**Carson Hayes** said they won't make Brown Street a public road. They'll pull the project now and go elsewhere. A hundred percent of the board has agreed not to make it a public road. They flat out won't do it. They don't have to do it here because they have plenty of options to do it elsewhere. It would pull \$1,000,000 out of Ellettsville. Mr. Swafford said they're asking questions and he doesn't appreciate the threats. They're trying to discuss it in a civil manner. Mr. Hayes said if they're discussing a point that's a deal breaker for them, they're wasting their time because they will pull the project. Mr. Miller said he believes they've met everything on the north side to get in 90° parking. That was an emergency exit for Chief Davis, only. Mr. Swafford reiterated his point with the emergency exit. The Town gets their big fire truck up there and it gets hung up because there's mud or the gravel has washed out and the road hasn't been maintained. If someone's parents are living up there and they need an ambulance or there's a fire, it may not be able to get there if it is stuck because they're taking the emergency exit and can't get through there. Mr. Miller said they've improved it 100% so they've felt pretty good about it. Mr. Swafford can appreciate that part but he's more concerned with the rest of it. They've done everything they need to at that location, what about the rest of the area? He's just asking for clarification of what the emergency vehicles are going to do to get through there.

**Dennis Fisher** explained when construction is done that is Richland's road. They're not going to leave ruts in it. He's sure they're going to do something. But it's not going to be 24' wide with curbs down both sides and a sidewalk. Mr. Swafford said he's not asking for that. He wanted to know the width. When he first heard them explain it, he thought the 8' is going to be paved and it was just going to be an emergency entrance only and a dead end street. He thought it was going to be maintained. Mr. Fisher said it is suppose to be an emergency exit. Chief Davis is the one that brought it up. Right now the ambulance can still come in, back up and go out the same way they came in. They don't even have to use it.

**Darla Brown** asked if they're planning on having vehicles park in the setback or is it people will be backing out into the setback. Mr. Miller replied they will be backing out. Mr. Guerrettaz added there is no parking in the setback. Ms. Brown said in their response to Mr. Coppock and Ms. Griffin's comments, they seem to indicate they they're willing to widen roads to 24' throughout the development. Mr. Guerrettaz replied sidewalks are 5' so they're okay with them. The road is okay because they're looking at a 25' foot print. The question now is the type of curb they use. The street will be built to that width and the cross section previously discussed. The Town can select the curb section for them to use and they will put it in. Mr. Miller said he thinks



they're being asked if they're going to do 24' wide throughout the whole development. The answer is no, just on Brown Street. The pavement section will exceed the Town spec but will be constructed toward the Town's specifications. Mr. Guerrettaz explained they looked at Allen Street and some other streets that exceed their widths. There will be a retaining wall and they want to have a little bit of room between the building and the curb and not have to build a bigger wall. The north drive will have to be built. With the assistance of the plat he explained that 20' is ample in certain areas.

**Connie Griffin** explained the schedule for completing the process. This meeting is the first reading. They will go to Town Council on October 8, 2012, as an introduction to keep them aware of what the Plan Commission is meeting on. In November they return to the Plan Commission for the second reading. Anytime from now to November, questions can be fielded through her to the Petitioner. At the November meeting if they're prepared and feel like they're ready to make a motion to approve the project they would do so on that date. If they're not satisfied and still have other questions, they can make a motion to table it and continue to the next month's meeting. Mr. Ryle asked once that process is completed, will they need two or one Town Council meetings. Ms. Griffin replied it's just an introduction so they couldn't actually make any motions. Mr. Ryle asked at some point will the Plan Commission send this plan on with or without a recommendation. Ms. Griffin answered the Plan Commission either approves or denies a development. Mr. Ryle confirmed it does not go back to Town Council. Ms. Griffin replied that was correct. Ms. Brown noted the reason the ordinance was changed was because Town Council members wanted to be kept better informed of construction projects going on in the Town. Ms. Griffin said some of it had to do with subdivisions and when the Town Council signed off on them. The Town Council wasn't aware of what the projects were.

**Terry Baker** commented seniors don't have two cars per dwelling which is what they would normally require. Are there any plans for putting signage "for residents only" at the parking places to keep visitors from taking up those parking spaces. Mr. Hayes replied they assign parking for the residents. If Phase 3 doesn't end up having as much congested parking and the ground is contiguous they could always put in some type of a walk going back into overflow parking. They'll keep it in mind because they want to make sure that everybody gets in to see their family. Mr. Baker confirmed it will be assigned parking and his only concern is that the resident will have a place to park. Mr. Hayes answered it will, for each resident.

**Carson Hayes** commented earlier in the meeting he wasn't trying to cause problems. Their dollars are so tight. The cost of trying to run Brown Street the rest of the way for that third would blow the project. Visually wise, one of the things they want to do is assisted living at the nursing home because they own that ground. They want Ellettsville to be a premier place for all types of living. Everyone is getting older and, as they get older, get physical challenges. They're trying to do a lot of different things that will help people not have to go into the nursing home. They really feel it's not good for the residents to have traffic roaring up through there. While egress is a very important issue, he thought they would zero in on the fact they're installing roll in showers and have washer and dryers. They've spent a lot of extra money to make this a state of the art usable facility as people age in place. In a meeting such as this to spend 99% talking about a road that's going to get somebody killed if they roll them up through there instead of talking about how this is really going to benefit folks aging in

place is disappointing. He didn't mean any disrespect. The reason their architect was asking if they have any other concerns, is because they came hoping to get that special meeting because of funding being so tight. They've already put it out for bids because they couldn't wait any longer. If there's anything substantial with the building they need to know so the contractor can have a fairly set price. If they get approval, they're going to start throwing dirt. They're going to make sure they chip and seal the road in question. Mr. Swafford asked them not to feel as if they're treating them any differently than they do everyone else.

**Rick Coppock** presented an illustration to clarify how to get 24' of pavement. He sketched two 12' lanes with a 6" standing curb. Whenever there is a 6" standing curb, and wherever you have a driveway, they're going to have to know that ahead of time to prep that section of curb and actually make a cut at that location. What they propose is 25' with a 2' roll curb on each side where you can drive over it at any point. It's more common when you do a subdivision because you don't know where driveways are going to be all the time.

**Bernie Guerrettaz** stated Carson Hayes said it well, there are some issues here. Once they get approval they're going to be getting construction permits and Rule 5 which they'll start within the next week. Mr. Swafford said the only thing he could see happening is if they have to make a variance for something and whether or not the Plan Commission could make that variance or if it has to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals. That's something the Town Attorney will be looking in to. Mr. Guerrettaz commented the Plan Commission has been able to look at waivers when they're materially not messing up what the ordinance says.

### **Adjournment**

Terry Baker made a motion to adjourn. Don Calvert seconded. Dan Swafford adjourned the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

---

Dan Swafford, President

---

Terry Baker, Vice President

---

Denise Line, Secretary Pro Tem

---

Don Calvert

---

Phillip Rogers

---

Phillip Smith

---

Russ Ryle