

PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

The Putnam County Plan Commission met for its regular monthly meeting on August 11, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. in the Putnam County Courthouse, 1 West Washington Street, 1st Floor, Greencastle, IN 46135. Wendell Underwood called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Wendell Underwood, Randy Bee, Jay Alcorn, Eric Hayman, Kevin Scobee, and David Penturf. Rick Woodall, Jenna Nees, and Ken Heeke were not present. Also, present were Jim Ensley, attorney; and Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. Audience present see attached sign in sheet.

Mr. Underwood stated that there is a quorum, but since not all the commission members are not here, if there is a vote tonight for the project to pass all the votes must be in favor. Mr. Underwood explained that a petition could not pass on a 4 to 1 vote. Mr. Underwood asked if the petitioners still wanted to move forward. With an affirmative from the petitioners the meeting continued.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Wendell Underwood asked if there were any corrections or additions to the July 14, 2021, meeting minutes.

Mr. Underwood stated that Wendell was misspelled on the first page under "Review of Minutes".

Eric Hayman made a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Jay Alcorn seconded the motion.

The July 14, 2021, meeting minutes were approved as presented with all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS:

2021-PC-11: RYAN PLUMMER: A replat of Lot 1 in Shelby Woods to split the 79.84 acres into two (2) buildable lots containing 4.6 acres and 75.24 acres located at 6921 S CR 600 W Reelsville; Zoned A1 in Washington Township 9/13N/5W.

Greg Williams, with ASA Land Surveying, approached the board on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Williams stated that Ryan owns lot 1 of Shelby Woods subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that they are requesting to split off the existing house with 4.6 acres, leaving 75.24 acres in the back to build another residence in the woods. Mr. Williams stated that this is an existing subdivision that was originally a three-lot subdivision.

Mr. Underwood asked if this was an existing conservation subdivision.

Mr. Williams stated that it was not a conservation subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that this subdivision was approved and plat back when subdivisions were allowed in agricultural areas. Mr. Williams stated that this replat does not have to meet the 85% conservation rule. Mr. Williams explained that lot one originally is almost 80 acres.

Mr. Underwood asked if there was a location specified for the building.

Mr. Williams stated not at this time.

Mr. Underwood asked if they were just building a home.

Mr. Williams stated that was correct. Mr. Williams explained that the petitioner is requesting to leave a 50-foot strip on the west and north side of the proposed lot. Mr. Williams stated that there is an existing ingress/egress easement for the landowners to the north. Mr. Williams explained that the petitioner will install a new driveway for the new dwelling.

Mr. Underwood asked if the property was timber or tillable.

Mr. Williams stated that it was wooded.

Dave Penturf asked how the original plat got approved in the first place with no road frontage on lot 1.

Mr. Williams stated that he was not sure as the original plat was done by another surveyor in 2000.

Mr. Scobee stated that perhaps the BZA took care of it.

Mr. Williams stated that it was approved by the plan commission. Mr. Williams explained that it was a recorded subdivision, so it had approval.

Mr. Underwood asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak in favor of or in opposition of the petition. No one came forward.

Mr. Penturf asked if they had the final plat.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it was in the packet that was sent to the members.

Mr. Scobee asked where the property was located.

Mr. Williams stated north of Reelsville.

Mr. Underwood asked Mr. Ensley if there was anything the board needed to know.

Mr. Ensley indicated that everything was provided in the packets, he did not have anything additional.

Mr. Alcorn made a motion to approve the replat of Lot 1 in Shelby Woods as presented.

Mr. Hayman seconded the motion. Replat was approved with all in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

2021-PC-33: MICHAEL POOLE – CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION with five buildable lot consisting of 2.04 acres and leaving five conservation areas consisting at least 11.56 acres each; zoned A1 in Monroe Township 33/15N/4W (located on the North side of CR 200 N approximately .68 miles east of SR 231 – Parcel #67-05-33-400-009.000-013).

Greg Williams, with ASA Land Surveying, approached the board on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Williams stated that the proposal is for a conservation subdivision just south of the one that was approved called Hunter's Ridge Conservation Subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that this parcel is 70 acres. Mr. Williams stated that the request is for a five-lot conservation subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that there is enough road frontage along the front of the parcel to put two five-acre tracts that meet the county's road frontage and lot size so those are not a part of the conservation

subdivision. Mr. Williams stated that there will still be at least 350 feet of road frontage for access to the conservation subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that lot one would touch the county road the rest of the lots are to the north.

Mr. Underwood asked what the total acres was being considered for the petition.

Mr. Williams stated 70 acres.

Mr. Underwood asked when you add up the acreage for all the lots, what is that.

Mr. Williams stated that 85% of the 70 acres would put 59.5 acres in conservation, which would leave 10.2 for the building sites. Mr. Williams explained that all the building lots were 2.04 acres.

Mr. Underwood asked if lot one was 13.5 acres.

Mr. Williams stated that the conservation lot 1 was 13.5 acres.

Mr. Scobee asked about the 50-foot road on the east edge of the southwest lot.

Mr. Hayman stated that the road drops to 30 feet.

Mr. Williams stated that once the roadway bends back to the north it is reduced to 30 feet. Mr. Williams explained that that is not the road width just the easement width.

Mr. Scobee asked why the roadway is being reduced to 30 feet from 50 feet.

Mr. Williams explained that 30 feet would be tight at the bends, so it was increased to 50 feet for those areas leading up to the bends.

Mr. Penturf asked if there were road specifications for conservation subdivisions.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that in the subdivision control ordinance there is specifications for the road when dedicated to the county. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the proposed road would be a private driveway. Mrs. Zeiner explained that at this time the county does not have a driveway ordinance.

Mr. Penturf asked what happens to the driveway back to lot 5 if it falls apart.

Mr. Williams stated that the driveways are to have a lower impact on the land per the conservation subdivision. Mr. Williams explained that a maintenance agreement between the lot owners would be drafted. Mr. Williams stated that the owner is the fire chief for Roachdale fire he is concerned about fire safety.

Mr. Underwood asked if the proposed driveway was the only ingress/egress.

Mr. Williams stated that it was. Mr. Williams explained that the proposal is only preliminary and can be modified. Mr. Williams stated that if the board wanted the drive to remain at 50 feet for the entire length, that could be done.

Mr. Underwood stated he was surprised that there was only one entrance and asked if it could be on both sides.

Mr. Williams explained that the east side of the property was mostly wooded. Mr. Williams stated that it why the lots are staggered.

Mr. Alcorn asked what was being conserved.

Mr. Williams stated pasture ground and woods.

Mr. Alcorn stated that he didn't think it fits with the landscape.

Mr. Williams explained that request is to see if this 5-lot conservation subdivision could work on these 70 acres. Mr. Williams stated that he has not been to the site yet. Mr. Williams stated that once the crops are out the best building sites would be located prior to final approval.

Mr. Scobee explained that the original request for Hunter's Ridge was for a rezone as they wanted a major subdivision, until it was discovered that road would be required then they came back with the conservation subdivision.

Mr. Underwood stated that this was the first time seeing a conservation subdivision with this many buildable lots.

Mr. Williams stated that there was a conservation subdivision out on West Walnut that is all wooded with three building lots with the rest in conservation, heavily wooded along the railroad tracks.

Mr. Underwood asked if Mr. Ensley had reviewed the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Ensley stated that he was not at the tech review committee meeting, but the committee looked at the plat. Mr. Ensley explained that as long as the part that is being conserved is farm grounds or wooded area.

Mr. Scobee stated that the review board recommended approval.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it meets all the requirements of the conservation subdivision ordinance which is why the review committee recommended approval. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the only concern that was brought up is that the property is within a classified forest. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the only way the five lots could be built, those lots would have to be de-classified.

Mr. Williams stated that it does not affect dividing the property. Mr. Williams explained that it is up to the landowner to notify DNR that the property has been subdivided and then a surveyor gets involved to re-classify the property. Mr. Williams stated that a minimum of ten acres is required to classify something. Mr. Williams explained that the majority of the property would still be in a classified forest.

Mr. Scobee asked how long the property had been classified.

Mr. Williams stated it had been a while and to take it out of classified forest they would have to pay back taxes.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that there was a property owner that wanted to build a new house so that owner went through DNR to remove a portion of the property out of the classification so the dwelling could be built.

Mr. Williams explained that wildlife and forest classification has been joined together. Mr. Williams stated that before you had to classify a property as either wildlife or forest separately, but now it is all inclusive.

Mr. Underwood stated that the Plan Commission is an advisory council. Mr. Underwood explained that if the property is zoned for what the petitioner is wanting to do and it meets all the criteria for

that zoning perhaps, there is not a lot of argument. Mr. Underwood stated that anything that is done tonight, if it comes to the vote, it will go to the county commissioners.

Mr. Ensley interjected that before it goes to the county commissioners it would have to come back to the plan commission for final approval. Mr. Ensley explained that before the petitioner invests money into a final plat the conceptual design or preliminary plat is drafted for approval. Mr. Ensley stated that it would have to be advertised and come before the plan commission for final approval then regardless of approval or denial it would go before the commissioners.

Mr. Underwood open the meeting for public comment.

John Hendrich, 740 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mr. Hendrich showed on a map where he lived in conjunction to the proposed subdivision, being just west of the parcel. Mr. Hendrich explained that one of the purposes of a conservation subdivision is to preserve farm ground/agricultural ground so the way that the subdivision is drawn, it is breaking up the farm ground. Mr. Hendrich stated that another concern is the location of the proposed driveway. Mr. Hendrich explained that the way the natural drainage works in the area is that about 40 acres drains to the east. Mr. Hendrich asked if water would back up on his property if a road/driveway is installed along the property line. Mr. Hendrich asked since there is no specific language within the conservation subdivision, would then the zoning road requirements come into play.

Mr. Ensley stated that the only thing that would be needed is a driveway permit from the highway department.

Mr. Hendrich asked about the setback requirements for the road/driveway.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there is not a driveway ordinance.

Mr. Hendrich asked about changes to the A1 zoning.

Mr. Hayman stated that there were legalities about backing up water on your neighbor.

Mr. Williams stated that a culvert would have to be sized to maintain the watershed. Mr. Williams explained that once the corn is out the driveway could be relocated to make a more pleasing and less impactful.

Mr. Ensley stated you cannot back water up on someone else.

Mr. Hendrich stated that another concern was the water table. Mr. Hendrich explained that a nearby neighbor to the east of this property is on the same aquifer and they are on their third well so there are water issues out there. Mr. Hendrich explained that the report from the Health Department states that it could be suitable for septic systems. Mr. Hendrich asked how this works.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that without a soil report the health department cannot definitely say if a property can support a septic system. Mrs. Zeiner stated that per the report there is adequate room for a septic system, but they cannot say the size or type of system that would be suitable without the soil report.

Mr. Hendrich stated that there is a lot of exposed limestone on the property which impacts the flow of septic. Mr. Hendrich further stated that there is a spring on the property which is a concern with the septic.

Mr. Scobee asked how far the spring goes.

Mr. Hendrich stated it goes all the way to the creek. Mr. Hendrich explained that this request is different from the Goodin's request as that was for a family, this was just purchased a month and a half ago to flip. Mr. Hendrich stated that he did not believe that was what a conservation subdivision was about. Mr. Hendrich explained that a conservation subdivision was to accommodate farmers who maybe the kids did not want to farm the ground but still wanted to live on the ground to preserve. Mr. Hendrich stated another concern was the egress point being at the top of a hill. Mr. Hendrich explained that it is a dangerous area. Mr. Hendrich explained that there is no great ingress/egress point.

Mr. Williams explained that the proposal is all preliminary.

Mr. Underwood asked if the property was farm ground.

Mr. Williams stated that field was planted in corn.

Mr. Scobee asked about the lot in the southwest corner if the driveway could be relocated.

Various audience members started talking about the driveway.

Mr. Ensley requested that only one person speak at a time and to please state your name first.

Mr. Hendrich stated that as a resident in the area he was concerned about his property with drainage. Mr. Hendrich explained that the property was originally his grandfathers. Mr. Hendrich stated that it was a very hilly property. Mr. Hendrich explained that as the proposal is drawn, it is taking away prime farm ground.

Mr. Underwood asked if the farm ground was irrigated.

Mr. Williams stated that it was not.

Laura Tretera, 430 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mrs. Tretera stated that she lives across the road from this property. Mrs. Tretera explained concerns with traffic. Mrs. Tretera stated that the driveways coming off the road are dangerous. Mrs. Tretera explained that when vehicles come up the hill, they cannot see her driveway.

Scott Carrington, 102 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mr. Carrington stated that he lives just past the proposed conservation property. Mr. Carrington explained that his concerns was the water table and traffic with the hill. Mr. Carrington stated that when vehicles crest over the hill to the east of it, it is going to get worse. Mr. Carrington explained that the road narrows and the majority of the travel will come from 231. Mr. Carrington stated that vehicles would have to cross over the existing traffic coming from the other way, into a complete blind spot. Mr. Carrington explained that developed land could help land value, but he was concerned with the water and traffic.

Jacob Giles, 519 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mr. Giles stated that he lives at the southwest corner from this property. Mr. Giles explained that he was also concerned about the water. Mr. Giles stated that his well was drilled 14 months ago. Mr. Giles explained that the well is 7 feet deep. Mr. Giles stated that over the weekend he was letting the water run to fill a fertilizer tank and he started getting brown water within 20 seconds. Mr. Giles explained that his other concern was traffic. Mr. Giles stated that he was at the bottom of the hill on the west side. Mr. Giles explained that sometimes vehicles fly down the road. Mr. Giles stated that an additional drive would not be safe.

Mr. Hayman asked how long Mr. Giles had been at his place.

Mr. Giles stated 14 months.

Mr. Underwood asked if it was a new build or if the dwelling was already there.

Mr. Giles stated that he was in the process of building.

Tom Ostien, 97 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mr. Ostien asked what uses were approved for the land that was set aside for conservation.

Mr. Williams stated that an outbuilding could be placed on the property, but no residence. Mr. Williams explained that it could be farmed, left in wood, or have a barn on it. Mr. Williams stated that he was not sure a shop could go on the conservation area.

Mr. Underwood stated that could not put a septic in that area.

Mr. Williams stated that a barn for chickens could be placed in the conservation area.

Mr. Ostien asked about the size of structure.

Mr. Scobee stated that he did not believe a large barn could be place on it.

Mr. Williams stated that a barn could be in a conservation lot.

Mr. Scobee stated that it could still be farmed or left in timber. Mr. Scobee explained that 85% of the property must be conserved.

Mr. Williams stated that the conservation area ensures that it will not be further developed.

Mr. Ostien asked who maintains ownership of the conservation areas.

Mr. Williams stated that whoever owns lot 5 could also own conservation lot 5. Mr. Williams explained that someone could buy lot 2 and conservation lot 2, but then sell conservation lot 2. Mr. Williams stated that conservation lots could not be developed. Mr. Williams explained that a farmer could purchase all the conservation lots.

Mr. Underwood stated that another person could not purchase the conservation lots and then develop a new conservation subdivision.

Mr. Ostien asked if the lots that they are proposing were the maximum that could go on the property.

Mr. Williams stated that was correct.

Mr. Ostien asked about the easements for the driveways and if they were considered as part of the acreage for the conservation.

Mr. Williams stated that the easements were part of the conservation acres. Mr. Williams explained that the actual building lots require access incase someone else owned the conservation area, the owner of the buildable lot would be able to access that lot.

Mr. Ostien asked if there was a process to remove land from a conservation subdivision. Mr. Ostien explained his question asking if someone could take the property form a conservation subdivision and make it something else.

Mr. Scobee stated that could not be done.

Mr. Williams stated that the property is not being rezoned to place a conservation subdivision in an agriculture district.

Mr. Hendrich asked if A1 rules still applied and if the 120-foot set back applied.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that 120 feet setback is from a road, the easement is not a road; it is a private drive.

Laura Elsbrock, 196 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Ms. Elsbrock stated that her family owns property in the area. Ms. Elsbrock explained her concerns were the same as those already brought up as being septic, driveways, water, safety, wells. Ms. Elsbrock stated that safety was the biggest issue.

Mr. Williams explained that if this get approved, a soil test would still have to be done to determine if a septic would work on the property before anyone can build on the lots.

Mr. Underwood stated that each lot would have to go through that process.

Mr. Scobee stated that his biggest concern was the driveway. Mr. Scobee asked if they waited until after the crops are out to determine if more visibility for a driveway could be found. Mr. Scobee explained that when the corn is out there may be better site locations.

Mr. Williams asked if this gets approved, does the county highway department get involved.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that a driveway cut permit would be required from the highway department.

Mr. Ensley stated that the highway department will go out and look for the best location for a cut.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the highway department would also determine the size of a culvert pipe, if needed as well.

Mr. Hendrich showed locations where a driveway at the peak of the hill is dangerous. Mr. Hendrich showed the location of where the original entrance to the farm ground was located.

Mr. Underwood asked how the owner gets back into the property now.

Mr. Williams stated that they use the proposed driveway entrance.

Mr. Hendrich stated that entrance was only used in the spring and fall.

Mr. Ensley stated that an outbuilding of any size would decrease the total density of the total conservation area. Mr. Ensley explained that allowing an outbuilding in the area would not be allowed though this question has not come up. Mr. Ensley stated that on previous conservation subdivision the outbuildings were already existing.

Mr. Hendrich asked what counted toward the 85%.

Mr. Ensley stated that he was not sure that an outbuilding would be disallowed, but it would decrease the overall density of the conservation lot. Mr. Ensley explained that a recommendation could be added to the approval.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the recommendation to the commissioners could include restrictions that no building is allowed in the conservation areas.

Mr. Hendrich asked if the plan is changed if the surrounding property owners would be able to ask questions.

Mr. Underwood stated that it would still have to come back for final approval that would have to be advertised just like it was for this meeting.

Mr. Williams explained that he could snake the driveway all the way through the property. Mr. Williams stated that this is just a preliminary proposal, the driveway could move to a better location.

Mr. Scobee stated that this might be something, that if it were approved, the drive may need to be 40 feet wide and then tapered.

Someone in the audience asked if covenants would be established on what is allowed to be built there.

Mr. Williams stated that it would be up to the petitioner.

Mr. Underwood stated that this is very preliminary.

Mr. Scobee stated that a homeowner's association may be needed for the maintenance of the driveway.

Mr. Williams stated that he did not believe a homeowner's association was allowed in a conservation subdivision.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that they were allowed per the ordinance.

Someone else in the audience asked if there was a restriction on the slope for a driveway cut.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it would have to go before the highway department. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the ordinance states 15%.

Mr. Williams stated that the reason is for low impact.

Mr. Hendrich stated that he thought the ordinance said something about no slopes greater than 25%.

Mr. Scobee stated that he thought the project should be tabled until the board could get a better idea of the driveway and a road.

Mr. Williams asked if the board wanted to see shots down the center of the proposed road so that the board could see the elevations going up and down the road.

Mr. Scobee stated that he did not care about elevations. Mr. Scobee explained that he was concerned about the most visibility for a driveway.

Mr. Hayman asked if the highway department had a right to say where a driveway can go.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that the county does not have a driveway ordinance at this time. Mrs. Zeiner stated that she believes the highway department could give recommendations on where a driveway could go especially if sight distance is an issue.

Mr. Ensley stated that if there were a specific question on the road cut, it would go to the technical review committee for the final. Mr. Ensley explained that Mike Ricketts with the highway department is on that committee.

Mr. Scobee asked if anything was said about the driveway location.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that Mr. Ricketts was not at the last technical review committee as he was on vacation.

Someone in the audience stated that it would make more sense to be located at the crest of the hill for sight distance. This person explained that one of his relatives was going to purchase this property and that is where they would have put the drive.

Mr. Underwood stated that what the board has been asked to consider does not include some of the things that is being thrown out as stipulations or requirements.

Mr. Hayman stated that those issues get answered in different stages, like the septic.

Mr. Underwood stated that the petition meets all the requirements at this particular stage in the process.

Mr. Ensley stated that part of the technical committee is the health department. Mr. Ensley explained that he didn't know all the septic requirements, but the health department does.

Mr. Williams stated that if this is passed and lot 4 is sold, the health department may come back and say that there is not a good place for a septic system so then the petitioner is stuck with that lot.

Mr. Hayman asked who would have to get the approvals from the health department.

Mr. Williams explained that it would be the buyer, kind of like buyer beware.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that unless or until the subdivision control ordinance and conservation subdivision ordinance is updated that specifically requires a soil test on each buildable lot, like most other counties require.

Mr. Underwood asked if it could still be stipulated.

Mr. Scobee stated that the actual building lot location could be changed for the final.

Mr. Hayman stated that the concept needs to stay the same.

Mrs. Zeiner answered the question about the driveways. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the conservation subdivision ordinance states "To the greatest extent practicable, wetland crossings and streets traversing existing slopes over 15% shall be strongly discouraged."

Roger Tretera, 430 W CR 200 N, approached the board. Mr. Tretera stated that he lives across the street from the proposed site. Mr. Tretera explained that the road in front of his dwelling is falling apart. Mr. Tretera suggested to knock the hill down to be able to see to the east.

Mr. Ensley stated that if there are specific questions, put them in writing and send them to the planning director so that they can be addressed through the technical review committee.

Mr. Williams stated that would be helpful for recommendations.

Mr. Underwood stated that there is a petition that meets all the requirements, do we have a motion.

Mr. Hayman made a motion to approve the preliminary plan for the Poole Conservation Subdivision.

Mr. Alcorn seconded the motion. The motion carried with all in favor.

Mr. Underwood stated that motion has been passed. Mr. Underwood explained that the next step could go in any number of directions. Mr. Underwood stated that since this is just preliminary, the next step will not happen until after the crops are removed. Mr. Underwood explained that everything must be advertised again.

Mr. Williams stated that he would not be back before the board until November.

Mr. Underwood asked if there is any thing else to be discussed.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she was still working on updating the Rules of Procedures. Mrs. Zeiner explained that she hoped to have those completed for the next meeting.

Mr. Underwood stated that the points that were raised were taken into consideration and very important. Mr. Underwood explained that those were part of the recording. Mr. Underwood stated that Mr. Ensley's advise is the best, follow up with anything in writing with the plan director.

There being no other business, Mr. Scobee made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Alcorn seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 13th day of October 2021.



Wendell Underwood, President

PUTNAM COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
1 Courthouse Square
GREENCASTLE, IN 46135
(765) 301-9108

DATE: August 11, 2021

TIME: 6:30 P.M.

PLACE: 1 W. Washington St, 1st Floor, Greencastle

NEXT MEETING DATE: September 8, 2021

A G E N D A

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**
- 3. REVIEW OF MINUTES** – July 14, 2021 – Not completed at the time this agenda was drafted
- 4. OLD BUSINESS:**
 - a. **2021-PC-11: RYAN PLUMMER** - A replat of Lot 1 in Shelby Woods to split the 79.84 acres into two (2) buildable lots containing 4.6 acres and 75.24 acres located at 6921 S CR 600 W Reelsville; Zoned A1 in Washington Township 9/13N/5W
- 5. NEW BUSINESS:**
 - a. **2021-PC-33: MICHAEL POOLE** – Conservation Subdivision with five building lots consisting of 2.04 acres each and five conservation areas consisting of 11.56 acres each; Zoned A1 in Monroe Township; 33/15N/4W (located on the North side of CR 200 N approximately .68 miles east of SR 231 – Parcel #67-05-33-400-009.000-013)
- 6. REPORTS**
- 7. ADJOURNMENT**

PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION

August 11, 2020 Meeting

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
ROGER & LAURA TRETERA	430W CR 200N GREENCASTLE, IN 46135
JOHN HENDRICH	740 W Co Rd 200 N
Tom Ostiea	97 W CR 200 N
Scott Carrington	102 W CR 200 N
Derek Derek Hendrick	578 W CR 200 N
Laura Elsbrock	Rt 196 CR 200 N
Greg Williams	ASA Land Surveying
Jacob Giles	514 W. Co. Rd. 200 North