

## **PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES**

The Putnam County Plan Commission met for its regular monthly meeting on July 14, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. in the Putnam County Courthouse, 1 West Washington Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Greencastle, IN 46135. Wendell Underwood called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Wendell Underwood, Ken Heeke, Randy Bee, Jenna Nees, Jay Alcorn, Eric Hayman, and David Penturf. Kevin Scobee, and Rick Woodall were not present. Also, present were Jim Ensley, attorney; and Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. Audience present see attached sign in sheet.

### **REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Wendell Underwood asked if there were any corrections or additions to the June 9, 2021, meeting minutes.

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

Ken Heeke made a motion to approve the minutes contingent on the correction of Wendall to Wendell.

Mr. Penturf seconded the motion.

The June 9, 2021, meeting minutes were approved contingent on the corrections being made with all in favor.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

**2021-PC-11: RYAN PLUMMER:** A replat of Lot 1 in Shelby Woods to split the 79384 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 requested the petition to be continued until the August meeting. Mr. Williams explained that all the title issues have been straighten out.

Continuance was granted by the Board.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**2021-PC-30: JON HUTCHESON** – CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION with one buildable lot consisting of 2.50 acres leaving 14.84 acres in conservation; Zoned A-2 in Marion Township 34/14N/3W (6410 E CR 300 S Greencastle).

Greg Williams, with ASA Land Surveying, approached the board on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Williams stated that the Mr. Hutcheson’s mother owns the property and lives in the dwelling. Mr. Williams explained that they wanted to sell the house and keep the remaining property. Mr. Williams stated that there is access off CR 675 E and CR 300 S, but the main entrance for the dwelling will be off CR 300 S. Mr. Williams explained that the easement would be included in the conservation part of the subdivision. Mr. Williams stated that the sister wants to purchase the dwelling and Mr. Hutcheson wants the rest of the ground. Mr. Williams explained that there is not enough road frontage to just divide the house off unless a petition to the BZA for a variance was granted.

Mr. Underwood asked if a conservation subdivision that freezes the property.

Jim Ensley stated that as long as the percentage of the conservation is met per ordinance. Mr. Ensley explained that if they wanted to add another buildable lot, they could if the overall percentage of the property was in conservation.

Mr. Underwood asked if there was enough in conservation if another building lot.

Mr. Williams stated that 85% of the total acreage is 14.74 acres. Mr. Williams explained that 14.84 acres is the conservation area, so there only one buildable lot would be allowed on this parcel.

Mr. Underwood asked about combining the parcel that Mr. Hutcheson already owns with the conservation portion of the subdivision if that would make it all conservation.

Mr. Ensley stated that if Mr. Hutcheson petitioned to make it would parcel, that is another issue. Mr. Ensley explained that it would be purchased as a separate parcel.

Mr. Williams stated that the conservation area would have its own parcel number.

Mr. Heeke asked if a conservation subdivision means that you cannot do anything else with the parcel, so if it is a field that can be farmed does that mean you cannot farm it.

Mr. Williams stated that it would stay as tillable, wooded, pasture, etc. it cannot be developed.

Mr. Ensley stated that if it is wooded it can be logged, not development of the property. Mr. Ensley explained that conservation subdivisions are a way to get around road frontage requirements.

Mr. Williams stated that it is not a federal or state program, just county terminology.

Dave Penturf asked if a classified forest could be put in the conservation.

Mr. Williams stated that they could. Mr. Williams explained that a barn could be on the conservation area, just not living quarters. Mr. Williams stated that the structure would also have to stay out of the 100-foot buffer area.

Mr. Heeke asked if the conservation subdivision was being done to get the 2.50 acres sold off.

Mr. Williams stated that was correct. Mr. Williams explained that if they had enough road frontage the minimum is 3 acres and 200 feet of frontage for a homestead variance. Mr. Williams stated that there isn't enough road frontage for that.

Mr. Penturf asked if there was a southern limit to the egress/ingress easement.

Mr. Williams stated that the property has not been surveyed yet. Mr. Williams explained that the drive comes into the house at that location, so the easement was stopped south of the drive.

Mr. Bee asked if the easement was the only way to get to the house.

Mr. Williams stated that was correct. Mr. Williams explained that it follows the existing driveway.

Eric Hayman made a motion to approve the Hutcheson Conservation Subdivision.

Jenna Nees seconded the motion. Hutcheson Conservation Subdivision was approved with all in favor.

**2021-PC-31: TYLER COX** – CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION with two buildable lots consisting of 4.9 acres (lot 1) and 7.00 acres (lot 2) leaving 74.2 acres in conservation; Zoned A1 in Marion Township; 16/14N/3W (5718 E CR 50 S Fillmore)

Greg Williams, with ASA Land Surveying, approached the board on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Williams stated that lot 1 has an existing dwelling and the parents will give lot 2 for a new house. Mr. Williams stated that 86.1 acres total in the deed so 85% would be 73.19 in conservation. Mr. Williams explained that there is 74.2 acres in conservation as designed. Mr. Williams stated that the egress/ingress easement is an existing driveway. Mr. Williams stated that the access to lot 2 would come off of the existing driveway somewhere around the east side of the pond.

Mr. Underwood asked if the pond itself was considered land.

Mr. Williams stated that it was part of the acreage. Mr. Williams showed on the plat where the proposed drive to lot 2 would be located. Mr. Williams explained that there are two power companies that service this area, Duke and REMC. Mr. Williams stated that REMC services the house and the barn is serviced off the house. Mr. Williams explained that if they wanted to put separate meter on the barn or get service to lot 2 that is in Duke's range. Mr. Williams stated that the petitioner is working with Duke on power. Mr. Williams explained that lot 2 will be moved north of the pond if they cannot get power to lot 2 as proposed.

Mr. Bee asked if there was any response from the neighbors.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that one person came into the office, but once we explained what was proposed he stated he did not have a problem with it. Mrs. Zeiner explained that no other phone calls or letters were received.

Mr. Bee asked if moving lot 2 would present a problem with the drive or septic.

Mr. Williams stated that there should be plenty of room.

Mr. Bee made a motion to approve the Cox Conservation Subdivision as presented.

Mr. Hayman seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

### **RULES OF PROCEDURES**

Mr. Underwood stated that the current rule of procedures is outdated. Mr. Underwood explained that he was not sure that the rules are being followed. Mr. Underwood stated that it was time for them to be updated.

Mr. Bee stated that he did not understand the technical advisory committee, under Article XIII on page 7 of 9 and when it kicks in.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that anytime that a petition is applied for the Plan Commission, the technical advisory committee reviews the plans. Mrs. Zeiner explained that Sara Campfield with Soil and Water, Mike Rickets, with the Highway Department, Robbie Cudnik, with the Plat Office, a representative from the Health Department, David Penturf, from the Surveyor's Office, Jim Ensley, and me are all members of the committee. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the petition is reviewed to make sure that it meets all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the Subdivision Control Ordinance, and make sure all steps are completed before it comes before the Plan Commission.

Mr. Bee asked if the recommendation letter on the individual proposals come from that committee.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct. Mr. Zeiner explained that the health department looks at the petition to make sure there is adequate room for two septic systems, Mike Ricketts looks at it to make sure proposed driveway locations do not cause a site distance issue.

Mr. Ensley stated that prior to 2013, there was a technical review committee. Mr. Ensley explained that when Lisa began, she found that a committee was required per the ordinance.

Mr. Underwood asked if a petition could be denied based on the letter.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the committee could recommend denial if the petition does not meet the ordinance. Mrs. Zeiner explained that only the Plan Commission can deny the petition. Mrs. Zeiner stated that if the petitioner fixed the issues that the committee found that did not meet the ordinances prior to coming before the board, the board could then approve it. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the committee only recommend approval or denial. Mrs. Zeiner stated that one of the items that was added was to include the Towns of Bainbridge, Roachdale, and Cloverdale as advisory members of the plan commission. Mrs. Zeiner explained that when there is a petition within the two-mile fringe of these Towns' it would be beneficial to have them give a recommendation on the project to make sure it meets with their standards so that are compatible with their ordinances. Mrs. Zeiner stated that utility companies, schools, and fire departments will get notification of a major subdivision in their jurisdiction to review the proposed plat for input. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the committee is trying to make sure all players have input on major projects.

Mr. Penturf stated that under Article II Section 10 says "the commission shall hire or retain an engineering firm..." Mr. Heeke asked if it should be may instead.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it can be changed to what the board wants.

Mr. Underwood asked if this decision would be recommended from the technical review committee.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that it would. Mrs. Zeiner explained that review for storm water, Rule 5 IDEM, would be helpful to have an engineer review plans.

Mr. Underwood asked if the cost for the engineer would be passed on to the petitioner.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that who pays for the engineer was not detailed. Mrs. explained that bids would be required.

Mr. Underwood asked who would cover the cost.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that an ordinance would need to be drafted because the fee schedule does not cover engineering fees. Mrs. Zeiner explained it could be covered under the Drainage Board, once that is established.

Mr. Underwood stated that fees need to be covered if placed in the rules of procedures.

Mr. Zeiner stated that it could be that the county surveyor reviews all those items.

Mr. Ensley stated that it does say that the plan commission solicit services from a minimum of two engineering firms. Mr. Ensley explained that the wording of section ten could be the same as section eight. Mr. Ensley stated that it would not be required to be bid out, but it is recommended. Mr. Ensley explained that it could be put into the budget as a reverting fund.

Mr. Bee asked if section 11 could be added to say that the engineering fees are to be paid for by the petitioner.

Mr. Underwood stated that if a section 11 was added then the permit fees to cover the cost would need to be removed.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that in Hendricks County has in their fees for their subdivisions, they have an application, plus recording fees, and engineering fees; they also have fees for inspections. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the Hendricks County Planning Department goes out and inspections the subdivisions as they are being developed to make sure they are constructed as approved.

Mr. Heeke asked if there is an engineering fee in every design.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that she was not sure if it was every design or if the fee is waived if the engineering review is not required. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the wording could be changed to say "the commission may hire or retain an engineering firm to review development plans, subdivision plat, and planned unit developments on an as needed basis and fees to cover the cost of review from the engineering firm shall be paid by the petitioner.

Mr. Williams stated that in Hendricks County when a surveyor does a one lot subdivision it has to come with a set of development plans. Mr. Williams explained that an engineer is already involved. Mr. Williams stated that they should come in with the development plans. Mr. Williams explained that if they are doing a major subdivision, they should have already hired an engineer.

Mr. Ensley stated that section nine could be changed to include and/or engineering services.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that section ten could be removed or stay any subdivision or plan unit development required a development plan by a certified engineer.

Mr. Underwood suggested adding including an engineering firm to section nine. Mr. Underwood suggested looking at the rule of procedures more closely.

Mr. Bee asked if on page 7 section 5 meant Wendell since he is president would automatically be on the committee

Mrs. Zeiner stated that not necessarily.

Mr. Bee stated that a plan commission member was not named as one of the committee members.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that a plan commission member would be named if the planning administrator could not attend the meeting for some reason.

Mr. Underwood stated that since Dave Penturf is on the committee section 5 is covered.

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

Mr. Heeke seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 13 day of October 2021.

Wendell Underwood  
Wendell Underwood, President

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

**DATE:** July 14, 2021

**TIME:** 6:30 P.M.

**PLACE:** 1 W. Washington St, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Greencastle

**NEXT MEETING DATE:** August 11, 2021

**A G E N D A**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

**3. REVIEW OF MINUTES – June 9, 2021**

**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

*- Continue To  
August Meeting*

**5. NEW BUSINESS:**

- a. **2021-PC-30: JON HUTCHESON** – Conservation Subdivision with one building lots consisting of 2.50 acres leaving 14.84 acres as conservation; Zoned A2 in Marion Township; 34/14N/3W (6410 E CR 300 S Greencastle)
- b. **2021-PC-31: TYLER COX** – Conservation Subdivision with two building lots consisting of 4.9 acres (lot 1) and 7.00 acres (lot 2) leaving 74.2 acres in conservation; Zoned A1 in Marion Township; 16/14N/3W & 21/14N/3W (5718 E CR 50 S Fillmore)

- c. **RULES OF PROCEDURES** —

**6. REPORTS**

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION

July 14, 2020 Meeting

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
Greg Williams	ASA Land Surveying