

Hamilton County Plan Commission
February 17, 2021

Mr. Habig called the official meeting of the Hamilton County Plan Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

Members present: Diane Crim, Frank Habig, III, Jim Galloway, Kent Ward, Mark Heirbrandt and Tom Clover. Bill Root is attending ~~[attending]~~ through TEAMS. Absent: David Musselman and Steve Schwartz. Also present: 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: Nothing to present.

Approval of Minutes: Mr. Habig identified the ***minutes of the January 20, 2021 meeting.***

Mr. Galloway moved to approve the minutes.

Mr. Heirbrandt seconded.

With no 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. And with no one stepping forward to address the board... Mr. Habig closed the public portion of the meeting.

Correspondence: Nothing to present.

President's Report: No report.

Old Business: Mr. Habig began with ***H.C.-0001-01-2021.*** This is a public hearing. We are passing a recommendation on to the Hamilton County Commissioners concerning the Hamilton County Plan Commission Comprehensive Plan 2020. Mrs. Meyer, I'll turn it over to you.

Corrie Meyer of Innovative Planning stated that this was a continuation of the presentation on the comprehensive plan. At the last meeting I went through the comprehensive plan and each of the sections. Following the presentation, we received several comments from the public, from staff, and during the public meeting. We have made changes to the draft and I just wanted to highlight a few things. The original draft of this plan addressed the preservation of agricultural

land. We added some language to continue to promote livestock operations and to preserve that agricultural economy. It is on page 54 of your plan.

We added, “promote to keep active farms in agricultural use and protect jobs in the agricultural economy.”

This recommendation is new. “Maintain that development and performance standards for new or expanding agricultural / livestock operations shall be objective, sustainable, proactive, and science based.”

And then the last one is, “Maintain coordination with IDEM for CAFO / CFO (Concentrated animal feeding operation / Confined feeding operation) permits and concurrence with IC-13-18-10 which is the code that currently regulates the sizes of CAFOs.

We updated one map in particular on page 61. There is currently a manufacturing zone that’s used for mineral extraction. It is just north of 216th Street and east of Cumberland Road. On this map I did change it back to agricultural use.

I have included all of the feedback that we received in the appendix document. The recommendation in the comprehensive plan originally was to specifically address this 10 acre rule. Through the steering committee process we decide to pull that back and said that that is a zoning ordinance issue and that this comprehensive plan needed to state that “we needed to revisit that rule.” There is still support and people with different opinions regarding the love/hate of this 10 acre rule.

Mr. Galloway made a motion to bring the comprehensive plan back off the table.

Mr. Heirbrandt seconded.

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

Mr. Habig invited anyone who wish to address the board to step up to the microphone.

Joe Daniels, of 13764 East 186th Street, stated his name and address for the record. I would like some clarification on the Olio Road extension that is in the plan. I’ve seen several versions of the plan all of which seem to impact our property. We actually have two properties on that road adjacent to each other. My wife and I operate a small farming operation. We raise thoroughbred racing horses. I am wondering if this is going to impact our livelihood. I don’t know if somebody can speak to what version has been approved or is up for approval. And also, I’m not clear on the time. I’ve heard this is a 20 year plan and I have also heard this is a couple year plan.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated there was a similar question at our last meeting about that. There were a

lot of email correspondence back and forth to that person. There was some discussion on how far we should take this out.

Mrs. Meyer addressed Mr. Daniels. I apologize. I mentioned that we updated some maps. This is a 10 year comprehensive plan. There are other plans in the county that may have different timelines. From a transportation standpoint our recommendations in the plan are very light. There are two recommendations. It is to update the thoroughfare plan – provide an efficient and safe transportation plan for the growing population and a variety of road users. The other one is to establish a “rustic roads” program.

We intentionally went light on transportation recommendations because the last time around is, they finished the comprehensive plan and then they moved right into a very detailed thoroughfare plan.

The maps that we have shown in the document are a reflection of programs that are already planned either by MPO which is the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Hamilton County Highway Department, or INDOT.

Christopher Burke helped us pull these maps together to communicate broadly what is on the books and / or what ideas are on the books. Previously in the former draft we had a very straight line. It was green and it showed a very permanent path for Olio and / or other townships.

In an effort to improve our communication here, what we have shown is the general area of a proposed road connection instead of a specific path in all of the townships. The Hamilton County Highway director informed us that this is “an idea.” We know long term there is a desire to have these roads connected but it is not scheduled; it is not funded; and it is not designed.

From a comprehensive plan standpoint our purpose here was to communicate things that are going on in the county.

Mr. Daniels asked Mrs. Meyer to clarify if and when this could be up to move forward. What would the process look like and what would the timing look like just so we understand how we can get involved and have input?

Mrs. Meyer stated that the next step would be in the thoroughfare plan. The highway department hasn’t decided if the MPO is going to lead that effort or the highway department. There is not currently a time on when to start that update, however, there is an existing thoroughfare plan that’s on the website today and it shows future projects. I would encourage you to stay connected like you are today for this upcoming planning effort to talk about future road connections and safe routes to schools and things like that.

Mr. Ward asked about page 32 of the final draft. You’re showing the heavy green line in Wayne

/ Noblesville Township, and you've altered that in your new proposal for the area?

Mrs. Meyer stated that the one you got yesterday has this very broad general line. This is an "idea" of road connections.

Emily Smith, of 13144 East 186th Street, stated her name and address for the record. *Mrs. Meyer*, what's the best way for us to stay updated on the thoroughfare plan. Should we just frequently visit the website or? I won't be contacted directly until my property is directly affected.

Mrs. Meyer stated that she would be happy to collect email addresses. *Mrs. Burdett* has a great email list. There is a comprehensive plan Facebook page. I was actually planning on shutting that down but maybe we leave that open and continue to post updates. The staff can post updates and make sure that we're continuing to get information out through email or Facebook. We can work with the county departments to make sure it is up-to-date on their website as well.

Mrs. Smith asked if it was decided the right-of-way that Olio Road extension would be or is that a future decision. (2) I live in Wayne Township and one of my concerns would be primarily the improvements of Boden and Olio Road and just getting to those particularly for our high school students that live up in Wayne Township. They have to cross both State Road 32 and 38 with only two way stop signs. If we were to go to Noblesville Schools and have to cross State Road 37, they would have stop signs. I would like that to be a top priority of either a roundabout... (3) How does Noblesville get their attention? They're going to have a new one at 146th Street and Olio and they have them on down State Road 38. (4) Is that what we can depend on from this... (5) And then just general road improvements. Do you guys know of a timetable of when those roadways will be improved, particularly Olio Road?

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that nobody knows yet. It hasn't been planned or funded. (2) I have had several conversations with people at the state because those two crossroads are state owned roads through INDOT. I would encourage you to send me an email and I will forward it directly to the people at the Greenfield District of INDOT and try to get you some answers about what's in their plans. (3) Noblesville was probably very assertive in it and continued to get public input and push, push, push. (4) Absolutely. I can't help you if I don't know so as long as you communicate with me and tell me what you need, I'll do my best to help you.

Mr. Habig asked if there was any way she could keep in touch with the county highway department.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that he would get her in touch with our county highway. At our last meeting we had somebody asking about Olio Road and we can't provide answers that we don't know. As they develop, we search for funding.

Mrs. Smith stated there was also something mentioned on the transportation plan that there would be an improvement to the bridge over Stony Creek and 186th Street. Does anyone know what that was pertaining to? That is a relatively new bridge. (2) It's on the plan you provided so if it's on there I feel I can ask. If you don't know the answer that's fine. (3) It is stated in the plan... "the preservation of floodplain." I have some concerns down the creek from where I live by Stony Creek and the IMI property with the large berm that they've been able to build in the floodplain. If we're looking forward, I have to look to the past to know what to expect in the preservation of our floodplain. The berm keeps getting larger and higher, and they keep carving out more land to cut off from Stony Creek. That is more of a comment than a question right now, but it is a concern of mine because I live around a lot of low farmland. If that is bought by someone who wants to develop it, they will want to raise that for their own protection which would make my property very vulnerable to flooding. I just ask that the protection of our floodplain be enforced. Thank you.

Mr. Habig stated that once again you're back at the county highway department. (2) In the comprehensive plan, once it's put into place, the highway department will use that as a tool to come up with their thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Heirbrandt offered his email address and personal cell phone number to Mrs. Smith so she could reach him anytime and he would try to get the answers she needed.

Matt Hostrawser, of 12395 East 186th Street, stated his name and address for the record. Looking at the new map I'm even more concerned because it is now wider and it could potentially negatively impact even more people from a home value standpoint because some people are likely in 5 years, 10 years, 30 years to want to sell their house and with this very wide range almost a half a mile wide out there as a potential road that will negatively impact people as they go to sell their homes.

I completely agree with getting things out there so people can see it, people can talk about it, but this is very concerning from a home value standpoint for everybody and even more people than that now fall under this green line. I would like some idea about what can be done about that. Can we go specifically to what the MPO has which still negatively impacts people but not as much? Another thought is, could we have language as has been stated several times that there's no definite plan for this, the exact route is still TBD (to be determined), and if you look at the MPO this is beyond 2045 even? So, is there some language then that you could add to this? Ideally, personally, selfishly, I'd like to remove it all together. But again, I'm all for open and honest communication.

Mr. Culp stated that he thought it was important for him to understand what our role is. We have absolutely no jurisdiction or control over the roads. The roads are handled by the highway department or the ones owned by the state. We are just incorporating their plans into ours. (2) That I would defer to her but to the extent that we want to try to encourage them to do certain

things with the roads, the best thing that I would recommend, as Mr. Heirbrandt suggested, is to talk with the county highway department. They are the ones who will be involved in making that decision. Even if they're following the MPO's plan the county highway department will be aware of what's happening and what the timeline is. I do anticipate once this plan is complete, they will look at updating their thoroughfare plan. This one was done in 2007. We're just, by and large, trying to incorporate information from other agencies based on what it sounds like they plan to do with the roads.

Mr. Hostrawser answered, but this isn't. That's why I struggle. Look at the MPO. This map doesn't match the MPO one, but it references the MPO plan, but this line doesn't follow it. (2) What the concern is, is what your plan is showing is not subject to become a final public document.

Mr. Heirbrandt addressed Mr. Hostrawser. I think that you can be a witness to everybody. When you came here last time, we were very responsive. We immediately got in touch with you. Got you in touch with the highway people. Those are the key people that are involved in this and would even know if there were ever any plans to move forward. They didn't even know. It is so far out there right now. A lot of this is speculation. This is more of a planning exercise than it is anything. You come back in another year and there's going to be some things that will probably change from it too, and we'll have to do that. You have my email. You have Brad Davis' email. You even have my personal cell number. Call me. I'll do my best to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. Hostrawser stated... Mr. Heirbrandt is absolutely right. You have done a great job. Mrs. Burdett is great as well.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that we're not trying to hide anything. (2) We can put in there that at this time there are no plans or funding. (3) Some of the modifications that we made to it are because of your comments. We did this because you wanted to see it.

Mr. Hostrawser stated that his concern is as a homeowner. Would you guys pay the same price for a house that looks like it has a road going through it compared to a house that might not have a road going through it? If it is so speculative, and I understand your point with the other departments, but can we at the very least have language put in it that states this is speculative and not anywhere near definite. (2) Again, I do think it should be taken off. It's still your plan and I know you're pulling from other groups. (3) I thought you were going to go with the MPO map.

Mr. Heirbrandt asked Mrs. Meyer is she had any other suggestions. You've done a lot of these comprehensive plans. How can we best help him?

Mrs. Meyer stated that the language in the plan today states, "A new road to connect Olio Road

and Victory Chapel Road has been proposed in the MPO long range plan but a schedule for completion has not been set.” We can certainly strengthen that language and broaden it to make it much more loose. The other thing we can do, at your direction, is we can certainly take off these infrastructure improvements that have “TBD” or “not yet planned” or “not yet scheduled” and not incorporate them. We opted to incorporate them because we know that other departments are thinking about it and there may be an opportunity for you as a body or for the public to influence how it happens. So that’s why we incorporated this. While it is not your jurisdiction... you may have an opportunity to influence how it happens. I’m happy to broaden the language, strengthen that it is speculative, and even maybe pull out a separate chart that says, “these are projects not funded, not designed, and to be determined” and list them separately “for future thought only.”

Mr. Hostrawser stated that this was even beyond the MPO’s 2045.

Mr. Heirbrandt said, let’s just strengthen the language. Would that be helpful?

Mr. Hostrawser stated that the language would be a good start. Ideal would be to remove it. Thank you.

Julie Hoffmeister, of 13553 East 191st Street, stated her name and address for the record. I am in support with my fellow neighbors in that this is not something that we want, and we certainly don’t want this in our back yard. We’re all here today because we don’t want it in our back yards. If it is something that is completely speculative this has caused a great stir in our area. You’re going through multiple homes. You’re going through areas that have been developed. I don’t know when this was initially speculated or if all these homes were there. I wouldn’t have built my house there if I had known that you were even thinking about this. I want to live in my quiet rural neighborhood surrounded by other people that are on 10 and 15 acres that want the same things that I do. And this is not what we want. I would agree that we would like to see this stricken and I think as a group we will continue to fight to have this re-looked at. If I look at it and drive around this would not be the path that I would go down. You’re going through homes. You’re going through creeks. You’re going through a lot of area that just doesn’t make sense to me as a person who lives in that area when you could go five miles in the other direction and come to a different area and not have to go through all of our homes and impact our livelihoods. I would agree with Mr. Hostrawser that it is something that I would like to see not just the language changed but if it’s just speculative there’s no chance that it has to be re-visited, then it would be nice to see some action, and have it removed. (2) I don’t disagree with that but if you look at that area where you’re looking at putting that road and you survey the people that are in that area where you’re going right through our homes... you’re going through homes that have no intention of selling or developing. We moved there for the purpose of getting away from that. So, if you’re taking a road and taking it from nowhere to somewhere and going through all of our homes which is of no benefit to any of the people in that direction then why would we not be here? There’s nothing south of us. There’s nothing north of us. And you’re going right straight

throw us. I don't disagree that you're looking at expanding the county and the demographics, but in that area, you've chosen to go through miles of acreage of land of people who have developed, who have spent time grooming this land who want to be in that area not in a subdivision. I purposely took my family out here to get away from all of that so that my children live on 15 acres where they play outside all day and they don't sit in front of a tablet with the exception of their new school structure. This is very concerning to us because you're impacting the people that wanted to get away from it, to go nowhere. There's nothing there and every single one of these properties that you're going to go through is a home that has been developed for the sole purpose of getting away from that. If you talk to anybody around that area, we'll all sell. We won't want to be there anymore if you do that.

Mr. Habig stated that we all have to be very well aware of the fact that the population is increasing in Hamilton County. More and more people are moving in and we're trying to figure out ways to get them through the county. It is definitely going to change the landscape. I've been around here for a long time and I've seen things happen that I would never have guessed. The best we can do is somewhat plan for them in the future.

Mr. Heirbrandt asked Mrs. Meyer if this really needed to be in there.

Mr. Galloway stated that this will never be built until there is a need for it. That will determine where it goes in the future. That could be 25, 30 years from now. I remember years ago when they first started talking about this. They were considering going over to Prairie Baptist Road. There was even talk about going all the way over to Cyntheanne Road and then possibly back to Pennington Road. What Mrs. Meyer has drawn on here has widened that. Someday there will be a road through there. Whether it connects at Prairie Baptist or Cyntheanne, nobody knows yet. Someday down the road, as this changes, there will be a thoroughfare go through there.

Mr. Culp stated that one of the main reasons that we have this, and we know there are roads that aren't being built yet but are proposed, is so as we're planning, we can ask that question. When there is something in that area we say, "oh, there is a proposal to have a road there let's look and see if the road's happened." It's not because the road is happening or because we say the road should happen but it is so it alerts us to check into it because that might affect the land use around that area. It is just an information point for the plan commission. It is just there for helpful purposes. It's not there to establish anything.

Mr. Galloway stated that when the planning stages get started then the input from the neighbors could change the direction of that.

Mr. Heirbrandt answered, absolutely. It happens all the time.

Mrs. Meyer asked if it makes sense to keep the strengthened language of all of these projects that are in these other plans so that you're informed, and the public is informed about potential

“to be determined” projects but maybe take all these “to be determined” projects off the maps that implies that a route has already been established or that the location is firm.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that maybe that’s the answer.

Mrs. Meyer stated that there’s not a right way and a wrong way. It’s just how we’re communicating it. These maps are a graphic representation. They are not construction drawings. They’re not legal documents that represent the actual highway department’s routes.

Mr. Galloway stated that the thoroughfare plan years ago showed primary arterials and secondary arterials. If I remember correctly, Pennington Road at that time was identified as a primary arterial. And I do know that any developments that have been done on a primary road takes more right-of-way and I know that those things have already happened in some of these areas. Is Pennington Road still identified as a primary arterial road on the thoroughfare plan?

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that the thoroughfare plan changes all the time. Look at east / west traffic that was proposed through Arcadia.

Mr. Galloway stated that what is interesting is that the county takes property from you if you develop along what was identified then as a primary arterial. Now what happens to that 20 years later when they decide the primary is “over here” the county has still got that right-of-way. The way it all happens is happenstance really. There’s no cut line drawn at this point, but I do know that that affects development.

Mr. Heirbrandt asked *Mr. Kiphart* if they had run across this in past comprehensive plans. (2) What do you suggest? Do you suggest that it stay in a plan like this? It could go either way.

Mr. Kiphart stated that proposed thoroughfare plans are something that gets peoples’ attention. (2) My opinion is... change the verbiage about it to let people know more about the fact that this is an initial planning project, there’s no funding for it, there’s no detailed plans for it. I would think though as a property owner if that was even being considered it would be good to know. It helps a property owner plan in the future. Of course, these people don’t want their properties purchased for a road, but the roads have to improve if we’re going to promote development. People have to have a safe place to go. I think it ought to be left in and the wordage changed.

Mr. Habig stated that he thinks that helps people from getting blindsided at least to have an idea in your mind what might happen in the future instead of totally eliminating it and all of a sudden “boom” the dozer are moving in. At least that way you’ve got that in your head, and you can start taking steps towards getting to the public hearings and having your voice heard, calling in and sending emails.

Mrs. Joannie Wert stated that she had a caller.

Mr. Habig stated that they would need to * 6.

Laura Volk, of 191st Street, stated her name and street name for the record. We are very new to the area. I have not attended any of the past meeting. I'm curious. Where can we find the studies that have been done to determine what makes this new proposed road path so attractive? The fact that a lot of this is in the floodplain and as Mrs. Smith mentioned it would be a very expensive project. I'm curious about the "end goal." What is the end goal of this road? It is to connect Olio to State Road 213? The end goal has never been mentioned to my knowledge. If that's the goal, then why not use Prairie Baptist or another road that is already established that runs north and south that has already got the path in place? It seems like there are some things to consider there. And lastly, we already live on a 55 mph road. If you put another 55 mph road such as Olio and we live on two 55 mph roads that are basically intersections I don't understand how that is good for anyone, anyone's children. We have a lot of children right around us, next door who are outside all the time. That is not safe. I don't understand how that would be a good thing for anyone. Can anyone answer any of those questions? (2) What is the plan commission doing to help the residents of Noblesville and the residents of Hamilton County? What can we expect? Are you on our side? Or are you on the side of INDOT?

Mr. Habig stated that he would have to say that that is county highway.

Mrs. Meyer stated that what we are doing is communicating what these other departments are talking about. I can't speak to the justification or their science behind their long range plans. I would encourage you to go to the Indianapolis MPO's website where you can find the long range plan. And that website is IndyMPO.org

(2) *Mr. Culp* stated that the plan commission for Hamilton County, first and foremost, we don't have jurisdiction over the city of Noblesville. We only have jurisdiction over unincorporated parts of Hamilton County which would include parts of Adams Township, all ~~{parts}~~ of White River Township, parts of Wayne Township, and a very small slice of Noblesville Township but not within the city of Noblesville. Secondly, a plan commission's purpose is to look at land use. We look at what areas should be commercial. What areas should be residential or agricultural. What sort of conditions do you want attached to that use? Do you want to limit the size of the business? Or limit the number of tenants you can have in an apartment complex? And you're looking at trying to control density as well as the overall use of the land itself.

We incorporate information from other departments because the roads that are going to be in the area are a part of that. You're not going to plan to put in a heavy industrialized business on a road that is two lanes and isn't suited for having that kind of traffic there. So you take a look at that and it's all a part of the plan. But at the end of the day the only thing we have jurisdiction over is land use itself. All of this other information we're using and trying to decide on what types

of land uses should be permitted in various areas. Whether there should be restrictions. How we should allow land to be subdivided? What conditions should be applied in those instances?

And its things like that that we have jurisdiction over. But we have no say in the discussion of whether or not a road is put in or where that road is put in. We don't have any voice or any vote in that process. All we're doing is reporting to you what someone else is doing. And that is the information you're getting through this plan.

I would argue that not only is that information important to have in the plan because it tells us that someone is considering that possibility, but none of you would have known about that were it not in this plan. The very fact that we incorporated that information alerted you to someone somewhere is talking about doing this which allows you now to mobilize and communicate that you don't want that to happen. That's part of what this process is intended to do. It is intended to try to pull all this information together and allow the public to know what's going on in a very clear and transparent way.

I don't know if that answers your question or not, Mrs. Volk. I was just trying to explain in general what we do.

Mrs. Volk answered, yes, it certainly does and I'm not trying to diminish the work of the plan commission whatsoever. It seems like this is a really great forum for people to come and see the opinions but at this point... they're just opinions. Other than all of us banding together from a homeowners' perspective there are no _____ that can come out of this. Does the plan commission make recommendations on anything to discuss as part of the comprehensive plan? Are there any recommendations that are put forth by you? (2) If there is anything I would like everyone to take with you is... we can't live on 465. Our 465 bypass is 55 mph and we can't have two 465s going right by our house. I essentially live at Stony Creek and 191st Street. I would have two 55 mph roads connecting right there not to mention what the access would look like, not to mention what would _____ for our children. There's no win with this plan. I don't understand. So clearly the neighbors need to band together.

Mr. Culp stated that there are recommendations put forth in the plan dealing with different areas as well as comments. They're not binding recommendations by any stretch because they're areas beyond our control.

Mrs. Crim stated that she wanted to mention something about the old thoroughfare plan. I have a copy of it in my office and I see it every single day. Ever ~~every~~ since I first saw it about 20 years ago it worried me because we live in Wayne Township. We live on Prairie Baptist on Stony Creek and when I saw there was a possibility that this new "super country road" was probably going to go right through my front yard I thought... "oh, no. If we had known that, we probably wouldn't have moved out here." The people that I know in Wayne Township live out there because they

like country living and they don't want expansion. They don't want subdivisions. In fact, one of my neighbors is so worried about subdivisions that every time land becomes available, he buys it up so he can farm it and not have anybody living on it. He doesn't even like the 10 acre properties but that is beside the point.

My question at that time was where is this road going to go? What's it for? And I was told at that time that it was because they were going to do some kind of "super expansion of State Road 37" and they wanted to connect that portion of Wayne Township to State Road 37 out around Strawtown. They were so sure that was going to happen they bought property on the township line with White River to build a new fire station which never materialized because it would not have worked for Wayne Township at all. It would have helped White River.

I think that people like to make long range plans and the people in the cities don't really understand people in the country don't want to live in the city. And that's why they bought property out there. They like quiet. They like to be able to go out in the yard and yell and not be disturbing anybody.

I might be wrong but that is what I was told about what the road would be for. I'm not happy about it that they've moved it over possibly to Olio because there are other people in this room where it would go right through their house.

So where ever it ends up going, if it even happens, there is going to be somebody who doesn't like it because it's going to go through their property. We can't totally stop growth, but we can try to control it. As long as we can remain independent and be Wayne Township, we have more opportunity to control that than if we succumb to the city leaders and become part of Noblesville.

The state is constantly trying to make townships go away and Wayne Township is on a target list. There was a House Bill that just didn't make it out of committee, thanks heavens, because Wayne Township was on a list of 100 townships to consolidate with the city.

The city wants our land, but they don't want our problems.

Mike Hilfiker, of 13370 East 186th Street, stated his name and address for the record. My main concern about this is I've been out there for 20 some years and I've been informed of about everything that is going on out there, but I knew nothing about this until two days ago when we got a flyer in our mailbox. If I'm missing out on this information how many other people are missing out on this information? How do we get more connected and get the information about this stuff? I get letters in the mail that I'm in the floodplain and I should have flood insurance from you guys, but I got nothing on this. I know a lot of other people didn't also.

Mr. Habig asked Mrs. Meyer how she got that information.

Mrs. Meyer stated that the Olio Road information was provided to them by the Hamilton County Highway Department and from the MPO. (Metropolitan Planning Organization) How they communicate their information I am unaware? I do know that a thoroughfare planning process should have a public input process as part of that. The last plan that was done likely had that same input methodology. From our comprehensive plan process, we had three township meetings in each of the townships. Then we also had a Facebook page, and we did several mailings as part of our process to communicate the comprehensive plan, not specifically, what the other county departments are doing.

Mr. Hilfiker asked how he was supposed to know there was a Facebook page. (2) I've got a family and a life, and I have a lot of stuff to do so shouldn't I get something in the mail or something saying, "hey, this is what's going on" instead of spending all my time researching for stuff like this?

Mrs. Meyer stated that for the comprehensive plan we put that out in our mailings, and we had people share it. It was in the Hamilton County Reporter. (2) Sir, I don't mean to argue with you, but we did do several mailings and I apologize if the mail list we received from the recorder's office _____ property owners. We sent mailings out and we did our best to communicate that the information was out. I know there were several meetings in White River Township that neighbor's mobilized and went around and collected their neighbors. Part of it is your individual network and I'm thrilled you're here and that you had a neighbor put something in your mailbox to help you understand what is going on. We did our best from a team standpoint to get people informed.

Mr. Daniels returned to the microphone. Do I understand the last time that this happened was 2007? Is that accurate? (2) I would like to make a proposal. We've heard there have been several configurations of this plan from the MPO and also from the highway department. Obviously, nothing is set in stone. From a property value preservation standpoint, for peace of mind, I'm wondering if we couldn't just pull the imagery off of this and make the language a little bit broad. If and when it become definitive or there are next steps and there is action, I would advocate for the board to include it.

Mr. Habig clarified that it was 2006.

Mrs. Meyer stated that the Olio Road extension came from the thoroughfare plan. It must have been 2007.

Mr. Daniels stated that... yes, it sounds like at some point there's going to be a thoroughfare going somewhere north / south, right. We don't exactly know. Today this is the current thought. My thoughts are... it is subject to change and it's so long term; it's still 10 years out; there's nothing in the planning stages for this to move forward. Why not pull the imagery out? In my perspective and I'm sure people can chime in, to me... when you see that map it's a little scary.

And if we were to go sell our property now, I think that would have a diminished effect on our property values. If anybody did their research to understand what was going on and read the comprehensive plan, I think it would have a real impact. And again, maybe it will never come to fruition. I don't know if this is reasonable, if this has come up before, but that would be my proposal.

Mr. Habig stated that Mrs. Meyer found it somewhere out there so somebody's got this idea. We try to be as open as possible to let everybody know what is going on out there. We can sit here and play dumb and say, "We don't know anything about it" and not put it in the comprehensive plan. Which would be better for you? To see that there is something out there that people are talking about and at least you guys are getting fired up right now and it's time to start getting with the highway and voicing your concerns? We could just hide it, but Mrs. Meyer did the research so somebody is talking about it out there. Is it better that we start hearing about it before it's in our back yards?

Mr. Daniels stated that he was not interested in hiding information. What I hear is that this is "an idea." There is nothing definitive to it supposedly yet. The way I understand the process and I trust that you're following the best practices here... my suggestion is - if it is not definitive and it's been "an idea" maybe there's a statement in there, right. We talked about that. I think I would be comfortable with that. To your point... we're not hiding it but when you highlight that huge section, to me, that's jarring. I believe you all need to be transparent. I'm not saying you shouldn't be. Is there another way to communicate the information without making it flashing that, "Hey all these properties in this highlighted area ~~areas~~ are subject to devaluation or change?"

Mr. Habig asked, you mean take it off the map but maybe have a version of these as "projects that are not funded", "are being talked about" or something like that instead of having that map.

Mr. Daniels stated that he would advocate for that. I would feel a lot more comfortable. Again, there is a plan for it and somebody's talking about it. It's in the pre-planning process. So to have it on the map and I've heard several times that the map has changed multiple times over the years, if we were sitting here saying, "hey, you may not like it but somewhere in this area something is definitely going to happen in 10 years" then yes to your point let's show everybody. Let's be transparent so we can plan. What I'm hearing now is... it's a plan from maybe 14 years ago, maybe longer, who knows? And, could it change again? Absolutely. Again, the verbiage in there I think I'm fine with. I think what concerns me is just that map. The highlighted area. Thank you.

Mr. Habig asked Mrs. Meyer if that was a possibility that they could just take and word it and say that these are projects that are in consideration, but the funding is not there, dud, dud, duda, and not show anything on the map as far as what somebody has planned.

Mrs. Meyer answered, of course. Our goal in this comprehensive plan was to be communicators

but we were also listeners. Your mission that you set out for this is that it was rooted in citizen input, so I think we are hearing clearly that there is concern on how this is graphically represented. We can communicate this proposed road in words and not in a graphic form. That is certainly a possibility and we're happy to make the change.

Mr. Habig asked the board how they felt about that.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that he was fine with that.

Mr. Galloway stated that he was too as long as they stated that this is in the future and there may be an Olio Road extension to be determined where it's going to go.

Mr. Clover asked if it were not in this form on a map would all of you be here tonight discussing it. (2) And we're trying to expand information rather than shrink it for that very reason to be forward looking, to be forward thinking. We are not proposing that road. We're just putting it on there saying someone has thought about it.

Julie Hoffmeister returned to the microphone. If you're telling us this was based on a drawing that was done in 2007, lots of us weren't even there. This was proposed when the homes weren't there. There has been a lot of development in that specific area since that proposal was put in place and I think that's probably why you've got folks that are so upset. We weren't there when you started to talk about that, and the road wouldn't have impacted because you were going through all farmer's fields. There is a house right across the street on 191st Street where this proposal goes through a huge pond that they just built. They spent a lot of money to develop this farm acreage and that road goes right through their pond. There are a lot of things that are there now that weren't there when the MPO was put together. You're now putting in a comprehensive plan based on things that are now in there that weren't there before. (2) I understand that, but I think you have also said that over the years that has moved based on development and change. If it changes in that 10 years, then our property values are impacted for the next 10 years by something that we then have to go back for them to say, "oh, that's not really going to happen anymore." That's where we're coming from. Those homes weren't there when this proposal was put there based on what it looked like, what was going to work in 2007. When do they look at that? How do they look at that? How does this all tie together? Because it seems like everybody is on a different path and then you talk about how your relationship is just about the property. You tabled the discussion about the 10 acre parcels. You don't need a major thoroughfare to connect 15 homes. You need a major thoroughfare to connect 1,500 homes. Part of it does tie into that with the roads because you're making decisions about what can be built in that Wayne Township area which is exactly why we moved there and to be a part of that. So if you're not going to stand to make those decisions to preserve that rural community living then that road does change because you're connecting a lot more people because you've allowed more people to move in there. You're not involved in that road, but you're involved in whether or not that road needs to be there and right now... it doesn't. But if you change your

requirements and let a subdivision go in just north of my house then that road needs to be there probably. Those are questions that we have too. How are you going to preserve our life that we've chosen because of what you had established for us? And, now you're talking about changing and that road doesn't happen.

Mrs. Crim stated that she didn't know when the Promise Road extension first started that idea, but I think when that gets completed it will take some of the pressure off having to have another one just next door in Wayne Township. Mr. Peterson, do you have any idea what Noblesville's plans are?

Mr. Peterson stated that he didn't have any idea right now. ***Darren Peterson, of Peterson Architecture***, stated his name and his company for the record. I think it's the same kind of things. What's the role of this body? We have plans in Noblesville. All the roads are being looked at. We have to consider this road and where it's going, where it's coming from. I'm sure the MPO if it's on paper I'm sure they will re-evaluate it when it comes time. If there is not a need, they're not going to put the road in. But the last thing that I've seen that we want to do is take it off and then suddenly something happens somewhere in the county that creates a need for this, and it gets accelerated and is now suddenly like this gentleman said, "he didn't know about it." I think it is more important to keep it out there. The same with Promise Road. It's on our plans as well. Don't know if it's going to happen. We know we're a growing community. We know we're a growing county. And we know we've got to look at our roads. This is also a safety issue. There will come a point at which Olio Road is no longer safe. I don't know when that is going to happen, but part of the comp plan is also to look at those land uses and certainly we're not going to propose an industrial use somewhere that would require that Olio Road be improved tomorrow. That is part of the plan too. They all work together. We're just reporting what another county department has thought of or MPO has thought of. Here's where we're at today.

Mr. Culp stated that his question is if they pull it off the map... are we just transferring the uncertainty from a clearly delineated area to an entirely new Olio Road. Right now we're saying, "in this area there could be a road or a bypass." And then we take it off and we say, "somewhere along Olio Road there is going to be a bypass" so now instead of the residents who are in this area being concerned now all of them have to be concerned. Either way, if we are going to report this honestly, the county is planning at some point to have a road there.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that the whole point of this was to be transparent. That's why it's so difficult to me because we're talking about stuff that nobody knows is even going to happen at all.

Mr. Culp stated that this was not limited to roads. Some of this we're predicting based on the market, and general trends, and what we think will happen in 10 years. If you look at our plan from 13 years ago, sometimes we're right, sometimes we're not. The farther out you go the less

accurate you are.

Mr. Galloway stated that he thinks they should leave some of the verbiage in. It's ok with me if we take the map out. But the verbiage that someday it is being considered that there be an Olio Road... (2) I agree. Identify the area. I don't think this green line really identifies the total area of where it could be. It could go over to Prairie Baptist Road. It could still go to Pennington Road. But some day there will be a road in there someplace.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that they have to be honest. That's what we're here to do. (2) If we weren't honest about this, we would be criticized later on by somebody else.

Mr. Culp stated that whether or not it's reflected in our map... it will still be on the thoroughfare map and on the MPO and those are the two maps that actually determine what happens.

Mr. Heirbrandt added, those mean more than this.

Mr. Galloway stated that in the old comprehensive plan... he didn't see anything that addresses that issue. Apparently, we adopted this in 2006 and then did the thoroughfare plan in 2007.

Mr. Heirbrandt commended Mrs. Meyer and Mr. Peterson and her whole team for what they did. You went out to the public. We have tried to do this through a Covid era. And tried to get it out through every type of media – through mailers, we have tried to over-communicate this to get people to come in and tell us what it is so that we can try to address it. What you guys have done has been incredible. That is all that we ever asked was we wanted to make sure that we got out to the public, we got their information, we listened to them, we incorporated a lot of things in this comprehensive plan from those meetings. A lot of it was driven by the people out there whether you know it or not. I understand your concern. We will try to modify this to some extent, but we have to be honest with it. I hope you can respect that.

Jim Flanders, of 14847 Strawtown Avenue, stated his name and address for the record. For those that are concerned about this road project... my family has been involved in two road projects in the last three years. Both of them when we met with the county, I said I have two options I will accept and one option that I will not accept. Guess which one they went with? I go on the county highway website once a month and look at that. They're always doing improvements which we need, but they need input, too.

Mrs. Meyer, I think early on you said on page 54 there is a map with the current acreage for lot size and I'm not finding it in what Mrs. Burdett emailed to me today.

Mrs. Meyer stated that under rural land use and then on page 57 it says, "revisit the minimum lot size. Recommendations to revise residential code to permit a tiered lot size rather than all

size having a minimum of 10 acres.”

Mr. Flanders stated that there is terminology, as I was reading this this afternoon, that I have not observed before and maybe it was in there. On page 54 Greenfield Development Impact Fees. What is that? (2) And, on the minimum lot size that’s not really laid out in here then, right? (3) It seems like the terminology in the report is really encouraging some things and other things they’re penalizing like it’s a big deal to encourage equestrian activities but I see nothing that encourages cattle, hogs, sheep but you have included some terminology on “*maintaining development for and performance standards for new or expanding agricultural / livestock operations*” on page 54 but I still want to have the option to put a confined feeding operation in. I’m actually looking and would love to have something like that. I would hate for myself or my following generations to not have that option. I would not want something in this that would restrict that.

Mrs. Meyer stated that the Greenfield Development Impact Fee is a mitigation tool to encourage development to shift towards in-fill or urban areas rather than consume rural land. It is a tool that the county can use to encourage the preservation of rural land. (2) Correct. However, *Mr. Flanders*, you may recall it was originally in the original draft and we got feedback that it was not the right time to re-visit it or we didn’t spend enough time with the public understanding what that minimum lot size needed to be.

Mr. Hostrawser returned to the microphone. Thank you for listening. I know it can’t be fun sitting in those chairs at times.

Just to go back to the Olio Road extension to be sure we’re all on the same page on what decision you may make. It is my understanding you decided to take off the green line from the map and have verbiage that talks about the Olio Road extension. Is that the decision that was made?

Mr. Galloway stated that’s how he feels about it.

Mr. Heirbrandt agreed.

Mr. Habig stated that as long as they state the fact that they are looking at that I can see taking it off the map.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that as long as there is an explanation that its...

Mr. Hostrawser stated that on the long range transportation plan from the MPO they even say that it’s beyond 2045.

Mr. Habig asked if he had any callers.

Mrs. Joannie Wert answered, no.

Mr. Habig stated that we would entertain a motion on passing a recommendation on to the county commissioners.

Mr. Ward stated that he would like to table this for one more month so they could digest what they were just handed this evening. I didn't get a copy of it for some reason. ***I would like to table it, so moved.***

Mr. Clover seconded.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that he came here tonight wanting to move this thing forward but if it's going to take another month to digest this, I want to be as fair as we possibly can and I want to dot every "i" and cross every "t" and if this gives the public more opportunity to ask questions, I'm all for it. (2) We've been working a year and a half on this, what's another month going to be?

Mr. Habig stated that he was the same way. If we're unsure of it and want to make sure that we have everything...

Mr. Galloway stated that he was ready to move on but... maybe there will be something else come out of it. Personally, I'm ready to vote on it but it's fine if we go another month, too.

After minimal comment... *Mr. Habig* called for the vote to table the comprehensive plan until the March meeting. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.** We will table this for another 30 days to make sure we got it all right.

Mr. Habig told *Mrs. Meyer* that he appreciates everything she's done.

Mrs. Meyer stated that she would go ahead and make those changes that were discussed tonight and this week.

Mr. Heirbrandt asked *Mrs. Meyer* when she would have those changes to put on-line and put on Facebook. I want to get as many comments as we possibly can.

Mrs. Meyer stated that the current draft is on the Facebook page. I believe it is also on the Hamilton County Plan Commission website. Our protocol for posting things thus far has been for the board to see it first before we posted it, but I would be happy to post this at the same time I share it with you as well. The Facebook page is @planHamiltoncounty

Mr. Clover asked *Mrs. Meyer* if there was any value in expanding that area on the map to not be

so definitive as to somebody seeing their property right smack in the middle of where this road might go, might not go. It sounds to me like it could be very different in its final approval.

Mr. Galloway stated he felt they would be better off just to leave it off.

Mr. Habig thanked everybody in the audience for coming out and taking part in this and everybody on-line, too. We will go ahead and have another meeting here in another month and see if we can't finalize this plan. You're all welcome back. Tell your neighbors. Inform everybody.

Mr. Heirbrandt added, yes. Please tell everybody.

Mr. Habig stated that this was tabled until the next plan commission meeting which will be Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

Mr. Heirbrandt stated that Mrs. Meyer has gone above and beyond. She's went above more meetings than what was originally proposed in her proposal. And to be fair to them... because they are being asked to come back again... time is money... that they should get us a proposal because they're coming back. I just think it's fair.

Mr. Habig stated that he agreed.

Mrs. Meyer addressed Mr. Heirbrandt. Commissioner Heirbrandt, I'm not usually one to turn down money but actually our contract had a "not to exceed" and while this is an extra meeting, we still have room in the budget so I'm happy to attend it, no additional charge.

Mr. Heirbrandt and Mr. Habig thanked Mrs. Meyer.

New Business: Nothing to present.

Director's Report: Mr. Kiphart stated that he had two things. I want to give Mrs. Burdett special thanks and also Mr. Settles for submitting to FEMA our CRS, our Community Rating System, annual report. Mrs. Burdett puts in a tremendous amount of time and work when doing that every year and Mr. Settles assists with mapping and looking up all the properties that have floodplain information and helping get that information out to the public as was mentioned tonight by one of the people.

Also, I have submitted to Mr. Habig my resignation. My last day as plan director will be April 16th. In the meantime, in March I will be out of commission for two to three weeks.

This could very well be the last plan commission that I attend because I believe the plan commission meeting in April is probably later than the 16th.

It has been an absolute privilege for me to work for 32 years for this plan commission, for the board of zoning appeals in doing my best to serve the public, the county commissioners, and working with county council particularly at budget time.

Thank you very much. I have enjoyed it. I have been a very fortunate person. I have truly enjoyed every job that I have had in the planning field even the four years I spent in the Air Force. I was able to do engineering and planning and so I have been a very fortunate person.

It's time to retire. There's a lot of things that I want to do. I was originally thinking about the fall and then I was told by somebody... "don't do it in the fall. You'll be confined to your house too much and retiring in the spring is the best time to do that."

I thought a lot about that, and I absolutely agree. Thank you again for all of your support. It's been great.

Mr. Ward, Mr. Galloway and Mr. Heirbrandt thanked Mr. Kiphart

Mr. Habig thanked Mr. Kiphart and added... "you've been a good friend and a great mentor. And, you've done a great service to Hamilton County and I appreciate that."

Mr. Kiphart stated that as he's said... "if between the plan commission or the commissioners there is anything that I can do to help after that, let me know."

Ron Hall, of 11225 East 241st Street, Cicero, stated his name and address for the record. I know everybody here appreciates the work the Mr. Kiphart has done. I just feel having worked with Chuck from the very first on the plan commission, he is the only plan director that the county plan commission has ever had. His contributions have been understated because nobody sees what going on behinds the lines. This county owes an incredible debt to Mr. Kiphart for his professionalism, for his ability to work with people who as we all know sometimes are upset, he has a calming effect, he's a great communicator, and his shoes will be virtually impossible to fill.

I, too, have enjoyed a 32 year process with Mr. Kiphart and this occasion deserves more than just Mr. Kiphart standing up and saying that I'm going to be retiring. There are very few places we can find in this county or other counties where somebody has made such a huge contribution to the planning services.

I personally want to thank Mr. Kiphart for his professionalism and his friendship for over 32 years. Chuck, we are going to miss you very, very much.

Mr. Kiphart thanked Mr. Hall for his words. Thank you plan commission.

Mr. Habig stated that he would need a motion to accept Mr. Kiphart's resignation.

Mr. Galloway moved to accept Mr. Kiphart's resignation effective April 16th.
Mr. Heirbrandt seconded.

With no further comments... Mr. Habig called for the vote. **7 yes votes... 0 no votes.** Mr. Habig added... that's with a heavy heart. With Mr. Galloway and Mr. Heirbrandt agreeing.

Mr. Culp stated that with Mr. Kiphart going to be out of the office for some time... I spoke with Mr. Howard and we would suggest appointing Byron Settles who has worked with Mr. Kiphart to be acting planning director for the times when Mr. Kiphart is not in the office between now and when a new planning director is hired. **While Mr. Kiphart remains in the office, he will be our planning director but when Mr. Kiphart is out of the office then Mr. Settles would be empowered to act in that role until someone is formally hired.**

Mr. Heirbrandt asked if Mr. Settles was fine with that.

Mr. Culp stated that that was his understanding.

Mr. Heirbrandt so moved.
Mr. Galloway seconded.

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

Mr. Culp stated that the county has an ordinance that governs hiring people which requires that everything be published, and they collect resumes and they go through a screening process and interview process. So the county will go ahead and do that. Depending on the response we may be asked as a board if we want to be participants in the interview or if we just want a recommendation. And that is something that the plan commission can decide. But the plan commission will be the one who formally appoints whoever the new planning director will be.

The next plan commission meeting will be Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

With no further business to come before the board... Mr. Habig adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Minutes approved as corrected March 17, 2021 by a vote of 7 yes... 0 no.:

<i>Bill Root</i>	<i>Jim Galloway</i>	<i>Tom Clover</i>
<i>Diane Crim</i>	<i>Mark Heirbrandt</i>	
<i>Frank Habig, III</i>	<i>Steve Schwartz</i>	<i>Linda Burdett, Secretary</i>