

**PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

The Putnam County Plan Commission met for its regular monthly meeting on June 8, 2022, 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 6:30 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Wendell Underwood, Jenna Nees, Kevin Scobee, Ken Heeke, Randy Bee, Eric Hayman, and Jay Alcorn. David Penturf and Rick Woodall were not present. Also, present was Jim Ensley, County Attorney; and Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. Audience present see attached sign in sheet.

**REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Wendell Underwood asked if the board had any corrections, additions, or other changes to the May 11, 2022, meeting minutes.

Lisa Zeiner stated that on page three, last paragraph, first sentence should be “BZA was stuck on a precedent...” not “president”.

Jenna Nees stated that her name was wrong on pages seven and nine.

Ken Heeke stated that on page three first paragraph should be “flagpole lots cannot be seen from...” instead of “send on”.

Mr. Underwood stated that on page four second to last paragraph last sentence should be “...does not cause irreversible damage” instead of “re-reversible”.

Kevin Scobee made a motion to approve the May 11, 2022, minutes contingent on corrections being made.

Randy Bee seconded the motion.

The May 11, 2022, minutes were approved contingent on corrections with all in favor.

**OLD BUSINESS:** - None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE** – Amend the Putnam County Zoning Ordinance for A1 to allow a 2-acre parcel with two hundred feet of road frontage; Amend the Putnam County Zoning Ordinance for A2 to allow for a 1-acre parcel with 200 feet of road frontage; Amend the Putnam County Subdivision Control Ordinance to remove Homestead Variance Exemption from 154.050 definition.

Mr. Underwood asked what the best way to begin this discuss would be.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that this is a public hearing; therefore, the board could discuss what the proposed changes are and then open the public hearing or just open the public hearing.

Mr. Underwood stated that we revisit the motion that was approved then open it up for discussion.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the motion that was made at the last meeting was to proceed with updating the zoning ordinance for the development standards in an A1 and A2 district which would also remove the exemption for a homestead variance. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the homestead variance would allow for a dwelling to be split off from the parent parcel with three-acres and two hundred feet of road frontage without going before the Plan Commission or BZA. Mrs. Zeiner stated that this provision would be

eliminated because the proposed development standards are less than the three-acres but would still require the two hundred feet of road frontage.

Jim Ensley stated that this is a substantial change, and the county is currently undergoing the process to change the Comprehensive Plan and how that fits with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Ensley expressed concerns that if a change like this is made prior to going into the process there will be people of the public and steering committee that will say “they have already made up their minds, why are we going through this process?”. Mr. Ensley cautioned the board on proceeding.

Mr. Underwood stated that was a valid point. Mr. Underwood explained that this is only a temporary fix. Mr. Underwood stated that this issue has plagued the county for a long time. Mr. Underwood questioned if two-acres was the right number or if the road frontage is not enough, could it be modified.

Mr. Ensley stated that the proposal is what was suggested from the last meeting. Mr. Ensley explained that it has been advertised and could be modified at this meeting.

Jay Alcorn stated that the issue is do we really need to do this right now. Mr. Alcorn asked for the advice of the steering committee and consultant.

Mr. Underwood stated that there were some on the board that was undecided last month but changed their mind in the end. Mr. Underwood explained that he believes that it would be temporary and that they are doing what needs to be done with the time on which we must work. Mr. Underwood stated that this simplifies the ordinance. Mr. Underwood explained that any motion that the board makes, the final decision would be with the commissioners.

Mr. Heeke stated that he felt that the zoning board was being burden as well as the property owners.

Mr. Underwood stated that what we have currently does not work, but we could modify it to the point that makes it usable.

Randy Bee asked if the comment about people may feel that we are spinning our wheels, is that coming from the property owners or the consultant

Mr. Ensley stated that the consultant brought it up. Mr. Ensley explained that there were items that the consultant stated needed to be done, but this was not one of them. Mr. Ensley stated that making a drastic change, sends a sign to the steering committee and the public. Mr. Ensley explained that he understands the frustration. Mr. Ensley stated that a variance from the current development standards could be obtained by the BZA.

Mr. Underwood asked if there was anything harmful with making this change.

Mr. Ensley stated that if in 18 months and the new ordinance comes out and it is different, there will be a lot of people that it could affect, such as title companies, surveyors, etc.

Mr. Underwood asked what the difference is between the variance work around or updating the ordinance now.

Mr. Ensley explained that when the current zoning ordinance was put into place it was based on the Comprehensive Plan; this ordinance does not have a supporting document. Mr. Ensley stated that the acreages for the proposed changes was based on surrounding counties who have a comprehensive plan in place to support their zoning ordinance and the development standards in their ordinances. Mr. Ensley stated that those counties did not look at Putnam County’s Plans to produce the standards.

Mr. Underwood asked if this was the rule of the advisory board? Mr. Underwood explained that he understood both sides of the debate.

Mr. Bee asked when the new comp plan and ordinance take effect, would the current zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan be voided.

Mr. Ensley stated that the new plans would replace the existing plans.

Mr. Scobee stated that this has been an ongoing issue for a long time and the board should proceed with the changes.

Mr. Alcorn stated that this could be a good opportunity to know if this meets the mark or not, it is a chance to try it as opposed to waiting.

Mr. Underwood asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments.

Bill Mentgen, owner of property within Putnam County, approached the board. Mr. Mentgen stated that he came to the county ten years ago to make Putnam County his home. Mr. Mentgen explained that he has ran across many people who would love to live in this area, but there is not a piece of land that is available. Mr. Mentgen stated that farmers have areas of ground that is not suitable for farming, but it does not meet the current standards. Mr. Mentgen explained that he owns thirty-acres that is not tillable ground. Mr. Mentgen explained that he would like to make one or two acre lots for someone else to build on. Mr. Mentgen stated that there is a need.

Bill Lawter, owner of property within Putnam County, approached the board. Mr. Lawter asked what the consultant recommendations were.

Mr. Ensley stated that the recommendations were for site plan review, clean up solar ordinance, and flood hazard ordinance are the items that need to be addressed now.

John Bossnack, owner of property within Putnam County, approached the board. Mr. Bossnack stated that he has outgrown his dwelling and is looking for land to build a house and grow his business. Mr. Bossnack explained that he was interested in any potential to make it easier to buy land to develop.

Greg Williams, ASA Land Surveying, approached the board. Mr. Williams stated that what is being discussed tonight is a small part that will be addressed in the comprehensive plan. Mr. Williams explained that doing this change does not throw the entire comprehensive plan out the window. Mr. Williams stated that this needs to move forward as this has been an issue for five years.

Lora Scott, property owner, BZA Board Member, and member of comprehensive plan steering committee, approached the board. Mrs. Scott stated that the BZA is not overburden. Mrs. Scott explained that the BZA was not hearing many requests for variances. Mrs. Scott stated that decisions should be made after listening to the citizens of county about this via the comprehensive plan update. Mrs. Scott explained that she is opposed to the adoption of the ordinance for the following reasons: 1). Population density is not being considered with the plan that is proposed, this amendment only addresses making it easier to convert property for residential housing demand. Mrs. Scott asked does the residence of Putnam County want helter-skelter housing growth over the entire county or do they want population growth and housing concentrated in certain areas of the county to preserve open space. Mrs. Scott stated that we do not know because it has been fourteen years since the public has been involved in the planning process. Mrs. Scott asked would planning for population growth and adopting appropriate ordinances to influence that growth help the commissioners, school officials, and county engineer plan for costly infrastructure needs. Mrs. Scott explained if you know where the growth is going to occur, zoning can be a tool for effective planning. 2). The ordinance would apply to an area that is too broad. Mrs. Scott explained that

A1 and A2 is most of the county. Mrs. Scott stated that the outcome would be that there is no influence on population growth and where it will occur. Mrs. Scott explained that the possible result is a conversion of value road frontage and prime agricultural ground will be accelerated. Mrs. Scott stated that the adoption of this ordinance sets up limitations for the updated comprehensive plan. Mrs. Scott explained that the county has agreed to invest two hundred thousand dollars for updating the Putnam County comprehensive plan for land use and that may be impeded by the adoption of this ordinance. Mrs. Scott asked why the plan commission board members would, at the start of the process of updating the comprehensive plan, want to compromise the new plan and the zoning ordinance by passing this ordinance. Mrs. Scott stated that she supports reducing both requirements for acreage and road frontage requirements, but not as written in the proposed ordinance. Mrs. Scott explained that the county leaders need to consider more specific zones besides just A1 and A2 as well as tools to influence population density and where housing growth occurs. 3). Zones which value, not just farmland, but also rich timber resources. Mrs. Scott explained that the residence within Putnam County enjoy the open spaces, the quietness, clean air, low population density, and low crime rate. Mrs. Scott suggested working together to plan to future land uses, but not rush to amend our zoning ordinances just because this has been a prolong topic of discussion. Mrs. Scott urged the board to embrace the current planning process and not approve this amendment.

Mr. Underwood stated that the board has heard people's opinion tonight and are as important as anyone else, there is support. Mr. Underwood explained that taking something that is quite simple and project disaster coming, is a stretch. Mr. Underwood stated that this is more about a readiness for tomorrow. Mr. Underwood explained that he does not see the doom and gloom coming from making this simple change. Mr. Underwood stated that he respected everything that was said, but he did not think it applied.

Mrs. Scott stated that what she anticipates from the process of the comprehensive plan, is that hundreds, hopefully thousands of people expressing what they value about Putnam County and living here and what we want to preserve. Mrs. Scott explained that there is no question that an increase in demand for property has been seen. Mrs. Scott stated that the ordinance does not go far enough. Mrs. Scott explained that planning tools should be looked at to control population density in areas where farmland or forest land is to be preserved, zones are created that reduce density. Mrs. Scott stated that if someone wants to have one acre and build back a quarter of a mile off the road, ordinances need to address that. Mrs. Scott explained that now is not the time to amend the ordinance.

Mr. Underwood stated that those were valid points.

Mr. Hayman stated that he agreed that he hopes that something comes out of the comprehensive plan that allows for something off the road frontage.

Mrs. Scott stated that it is where you do it.

Mr. Williams stated that Putnam County is broad, you cannot say you can do it in this part of the county and not this part of the county.

Holly Cook, Roachdale Town Council, approached the board. Mrs. Cook stated that during the steering committee it was discussed about creating subzones with clearly defining the acreage. Mrs. Cook stated that when this ordinance is passed and the comprehensive plan comes out along with the supporting ordinance that define subzones, then this ordinance is out the window in eighteen months.

Mr. Underwood stated that this ordinance came about because the process has been very frustrating for people to try to figure out what to do in a situation where the way it is set up does not work. Mr. Underwood explained that there are alternative routes, but not everyone has the patience. Mr. Underwood stated that we are talking about making a changed that has been changed previously, it went from ten acres then five acres.

Mr. Hayman asked if there was a three acre and three hundred fifty feet rule.

Randy Bee stated that the original proposal was for twenty acres, but final was for ten acres.

Mr. Hayman explained that when he went through the subdivision control ordinance back in 1993, he cut out two lots from his property along Burma Road at three acres and three hundred fifty feet and that did not have to come before any boards.

Mrs. Scott stated that there were decisions that were made that were not correct.

Mrs. Cook stated that this proposed ordinance would not cause harm as the ordinance would change with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Hayman stated that as far as preserving farm ground, what we currently have does not work. Mr. Hayman explained that he was on board with making the proposed changes.

Stephanie Campbell, property owner in Putnam County approached the board. Mrs. Campbell stated that she agreed with one acre, the "flagpole" lots, all of that being incorporated into the comprehensive plan. Mrs. Campbell explained that the comprehensive plan would be moving forward regardless. Mrs. Campbell stated that her parents are wanting to give her ground to build on, but it cannot be done the way the ordinance is now. Mrs. Campbell explained that Mrs. Zeiner has helped to get what they need done, and it is conservation subdivisions. Mrs. Campbell stated that there are several people that Mrs. Zeiner has helped with alternate ways to get what they want done.

Mr. Scobee asked if Hendricks County had a comprehensive plan.

Lisa Zeiner stated that Hendricks County has a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Scobee asked how many zones Hendricks County has.

Mrs. Zeiner stated ten, fifteen. Mrs. Zeiner explained that Hendricks County had three agricultural zoned districts.

Mr. Scobee asked what the minimum lot size the Hendricks County. Mr. Scobee explained that there is not any other county that has a five acre and three hundred and fifty feet of road frontage.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that Hendricks County has three agricultural districts. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the Ag Intensive has a minimum ten acres with one hundred feet of road frontage with a fifty foot minimum for road frontage, Ag Business and Ag Rural have a minimum of one acre, unless there are municipal sewers which allows smaller lots, the road frontage is still one hundred feet of road frontage with a fifty foot minimum.

Mr. Scobee stated that the five acres is out of line of what all other counties are.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that we are not the other counties.

Mr. Underwood stated that there is nothing wrong with comparing.

Mr. Williams stated that we have to go east for a comparison because west there is no zoning.

Mr. Underwood stated that two acres may be too much.

Mr. Bee stated that with it being so close to the comprehensive plan, he would have a problem with anything less than two acres. Mr. Bee explained that when the original comprehensive plan was drafted there were thousands of people that came out. Mr. Bee stated that he is frustrated with the current zoning,

but it has been a frustration for the last fifteen years. Mr. Bee explained that he would have a problem with not waiting another eighteen months to see how everything fits together verses one spot.

Mr. Williams stated that Farm Bureau has come up with a recommendation from its members. Mr. Williams explained that affordable housing is an issue.

Jay Alcorn asked about the one hundred feet and fifty feet road frontage, does that mean anyone can have the fifty feet.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that Hendricks County would prefer the one hundred feet, but they do allow a fifty-foot strip. Mrs. Zeiner explained that Greencastle's Zoning Ordinance also allows for a fifty-foot road frontage in an Ag Rural area.

Mr. Williams clarified that it also depends on the road classification as some road required a seventy-five-foot road frontage.

Mr. Bee stated that he was not dismissing the ordinance. Mr. Bee explained that he is not disagreeing with any of it, but he would be more comfortable with having it all combined.

Mr. Williams asked who makes the final call on the decisions.

Mr. Bee stated the Commissioners would after the board gives a recommendation.

Mr. Hayman stated it could be longer than eighteen months for the comprehensive plan to be passed.

Mrs. Scott stated that there are four members of the plan commission on the steering committee.

Mr. Alcorn stated that there are some very large property owners in the county that could sell five acres with three hundred fifty feet of road frontage and not affect their operation, but they are not going to give up road frontage. Mr. Alcorn explained that the farms are going to look the same no matter what the zoning is, a significant change to the negative is not going to be seen. Mr. Alcorn stated that this would be in isolated areas where this fits well.

Mrs. Scott stated that the biggest issue is the timing of the ordinance. Mrs. Scott explained that there is a better way to do this.

Mr. Alcorn asked if a precedent is being set when the BZA board denies a petition so other do not come before the board for that reason.

Mrs. Scott stated that there is not a lot of crossovers of impact.

Mr. Williams stated that being in the business you hear it daily.

Mr. Scobee stated that there is overwhelming support from farm bureau membership to move forward with this.

Mr. Ensley stated that there will be surveys and a table at the fair for input.

Mr. Campbell stated that only the people who have issues come to the meetings.

Mr. Underwood closed the public hearing portion of the meeting for this case. Mr. Underwood asked the board for a motion.

Mr. Scobee asked if there was any discussion on changes the acreage and road frontage.

Mr. Hayman asked if that was allowed.

Mr. Underwood stated that it was allowed.

Jenna Nees stated that she was content with the proposed changes, but not with going smaller at this time.

Mr. Hayman stated that he agreed with Mrs. Nees.

Mr. Alcorn stated that he would like to move forward with the ordinance.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve the **AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO CHANGE A1 FROM 5 ACRE TO 2 ACRES AND 250 FEET OF ROAD FRONTAGE TO TWO HUNDRED FEET OF ROAD FRONTAGE AND A2 FROM THREE ACRES TO ONE ACRE WITH TWO HUNDRED FEET OF ROAD FRONTAGE.**

Mr. Hayman seconded the motion.

The zoning amendment passed with all in favor.

**AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE:** Amend the Wind and Solar Ordinance to be more in line with Senate Enrolled Act 411 that was recently passed.

Mrs. Zeiner handed out updated ordinances. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the ordinance was passed last year however, errors were found that caused the need for an updated. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the Senate had passed a bill that becomes law on July first, so the revisions are more in line with the new law. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the changes start on page nine under 155.135 Development Standards for Solar Energy Commercial Item B – all references to development plan review has been removed since the commissioners did not pass that ordinance and changed the wording to read “Prior to construction, erection, placement, modification, or alteration of any Solar Energy System-Commercial (SES-C) a building permit is required. A detailed site plan is required as part of the permit application process. No building permit will be issued unless all applicable fees have been paid and the site plan is reviewed for compliance with this ordinance”. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the site plan would be reviewed in the building office. Mrs. Zeiner stated that on page 9 under Screening Item B was revised to read “The landscape buffer must be constructed from such materials as set forth in a plan submitted to the Putnam County BZA during the permitting and approval process.” Mrs. Zeiner explained that buffers or screening is required the BZA would review the plan as part of the approval process. Mrs. Zeiner stated on page twelve under Signage the original large paragraph was just broken down in to points to flow better, same with Items F and H. Mrs. Zeiner explained that one page nineteen under 155.137 Design and Construction WESC and SES was added to the section, on page twenty 155.138 Special Exception heading was changed to cover both systems. Mrs. Zeiner stated that Section 155.139 was changed to say, “Plan Director and/or Building Commissioners.” Mrs. Zeiner explained that the last sentence under 155.142 (A) 1 was changed to read “The landowner, if different than the applicant, shall also sign the application or a notarized affidavit of consent from all involved property owners must be submitted. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the affidavit would be for when there are several property owners that need to give consent to an application in lieu of each one signing the application. Mrs. Zeiner stated that on page twenty-two Item C states “In addition, commercial uses of WECS or SES must submit all the information required to obtain a building permit.” Mrs. Zeiner explained that there would be a special building permit application for wind and solar projects that her office is working on. Mrs. Zeiner stated that Jarrod Pitts with Tenaska would like to address the board.

Mr. Underwood asked if the board had any questions. There being no additional discussion, Mr. Underwood open the public hearing for this proposal.

Jarrold Pitts, director of development with Tenaska. Mr. Pitts stated that Tenaska is one of the largest solar companies in the US that has been developing power projects for over thirty years. Mr. Pitts explained that he is working with an investment partner Avenon on a large-scale solar project in Putnam County. Mr. Pitts stated that Tenaska has been developing solar projects in Indiana for the last two to three years and have been on several projects where they were the first solar project within the county. Mr. Pitts explained that spending the time on getting the ordinance right on the front end makes the approval process go better. Mr. Pitts stated that one of the key things is what does the approval process look like, there would be approval from the BZA with a public hearing and then before the planning department for a building permit.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct and all the items that are in the ordinance would need to be address prior to obtaining the building permit and several items would be required.

Mr. Hayman asked if the project would come before the BZA or the Plan Commission.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that the special exception approval would go to the BZA. Mrs. Zeiner stated that since the commissioners tabled the development plan review ordinance until their July 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, it would not be heard by the plan commission.

Mr. Hayman asked about how this would work with the comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the current comprehensive plan does not address wind and solar. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the updated comprehensive plan would address wind and solar and detail where they should or could be located and the new ordinance would be in more detailed on landscaping and other items that it does not currently address.

Mr. Underwood asked if the ordinance was complete.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the one that was presented at the beginning is complete.

Mr. Hayman stated that this was not under the plan commission's authority.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that while the approval of a project falls under the BZA, ordinance amendments fall under the plan commission to give a recommendation to the commissioners.

Mr. Pitts stated that on the landscape buffer. Mr. Pitts asked what the expectation for landscape buffer for his project is.

Mr. Underwood asked if he was asking about material, size, width, etc.

Mr. Pitts stated that typically they see more prescriptive requirements on screening. Mr. Pitts explained that he was fine with it being place as proposed in Item E.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that screening is not needed along the road, it is only needed if Item E has not been met.

Mr. Pitts asked if the subdivision control ordinance was not removed under Item D.

Mrs. Scott stated that the BZA could make a motion on the specific of the landscaping and screening during the special exception hearing.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that page 10 Item D could be deleted and combined with Item B so that it reads "The landscape buffer and screening must be constructed from such materials as set forth in plan submitted to the Putnam County BZA during the permitting and approval process."



Mr. Underwood asked what we needed to do with this ordinance.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the ordinance was up for review, discussion, and approval.

Mr. Pitts asked for application requirements for the special exception and the building permit.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that she had emailed the special expectation packet. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the building permit application and submittal requirements would need to be drafted once the ordinance is passed.

Mr. Pitts stated that on page twenty-two details special exceptions requirements and several of those items are more appropriate for building permit not for special exception.

Mr. Zeiner stated that it does cover both.

Mr. Pitts explained that there are several things that would not be available until closer to construction.

Mr. Underwood asked if the ordinance was too vague.

Mr. Pitts stated that the special exception requirements needed to be split out for building permit requirements and separate requirements for the special exception process.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that items 5, 8, and 10 are building permit items.

Mr. Underwood stated that it would be better to vote on once the ordinance is finalized. Mr. Underwood asked if the ordinance was for Putnam County or this project.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the ordinance is for the County.

Mr. Pitts stated that there are certain things that he wants for his project and provisions that are consistent with other counties.

Mr. Underwood stated that we are not other counties.

Mr. Scobee asked if HWC could review the ordinance prior to coming back to the board.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the ordinance as written is from the Senate Bill and specific to Putnam County.

Mr. Williams asked if Mr. Pitts is recommending these changes because it happens in other counties, and you don't like the way it happens, or this is the way it happens in all the counties.

Mr. Pitts stated that the process that is proposed fits the development cycle that other communities have embraced. Mr. Pitts explained that he was seeking clarity.

Mike Summitt, property owner in Putnam County, asked how this would benefit Putnam County.

Mr. Pitts stated that it would be an investment of over two hundred million dollars, which would bring in roughly forty million in property tax revenue over the project life, it will create over three hundred construction jobs, it would create fifteen long term operating jobs, there would be significant economic benefits with this project.

Mr. Underwood stated that alternative power sources is happening and if there is not any ordinances to deal with it the county has no say so on the control.

Mr. Hayman asked what the project life was.

Mr. Pitts stated it was a thirty-five-project life. Mr. Pitts explained that there would be a decommissioning agreement and a bond drafted. Mr. Pitts stated that the ground would be restored to pre-solar conditions.

Mr. Underwood asked who decommissioned the project.

Mr. Pitts stated that the intent is to decommission it at the end of the project life. Mr. Pitts explained that this is a newer industry, there will be contractual obligations for decommissioning.

Kristin Clary, executive director of the Putnam County Development Center, approached the board. Mrs. Clary stated that her rule is to be an advocate for business. Mrs. Clary thanked Mrs. Zeiner for her work on the ordinance. Mrs. Clary explained that alternative sources of energy are coming, and we need to do something about it. Mrs. Clary stated that Sullivan County is being striped of their coal mines and Terre Haute has some negative impacts. Mrs. Clary explained that we needed a fine balance on stipulations. Mrs. Clary stated that they would be asking for tax abatement and economic development would be presented.

Mrs. Nees asked if Jim Ensley has reviewed the ordinance. Mrs. Nees stated that Indiana needed to be corrected on page twenty-three.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she was not sure if Mr. Ensley has reviewed the document.

Mr. Underwood suggested having a third party look at the ordinance.

Mrs. Scott suggested HWC could review it.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she would send it to them.

Mr. Hayman made a motion to table the solar ordinance.

Mr. Bee seconded the motion.

The **AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE** to amend the Wind and Solar Ordinance was tabled with all in favor.

Mr. Underwood stated that he forgot to close the public hearing. Mr. Underwood closed the public hearing for the wind and solar ordinance.

Mr. Williams asked for signatures on a conservation subdivision that was approved. Mr. Williams presented the Rowling Conservation Subdivision.

Mr. Underwood asked if everything was good with this project.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that this was approved at the August plan commission meeting in 2020.

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

Mrs. Nees seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 13<sup>th</sup> day of July 2022.

Randy Bee  
~~Wendell Underwood, President~~  
Randy Bee, Vice-President

**PUTNAM COUNTY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION  
AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY JUNE 8, 2022  
6:30 P.M.**

Commissioner's Meeting Room -Putnam County Courthouse  
1 W Washington Street - Greencastle, IN 46135  
(765) 301-9108

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Wendell Underwood  Eric Hayman  Kevin Scobee  Randy Bee  Ken Heeke  
 Jenna Nees  Jay Alcorn  Rick Woodall  David Penturf  Jim Ensley, Attorney  Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director

**2. REVIEW OF MINUTES – May 11, 2022**

- 3. PUBLIC HEARINGS** - Public hearing items have been advertised according to law. For items involving a piece of land, courtesy notices have been sent to some property owners. Testimony for and against each proposal will be taken and a decision by the plan Commission made. The Commission may continue an item to another date for hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

❖ **OLD BUSINESS: None**

❖ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE:** Amend the Putnam County Zoning Ordinance for A1 to allow for a 2-acre parcel with 200 feet of road frontage; Amend the Putnam County Zoning Ordinance for A2 to allow for a 1-acre parcel with 200 feet of road frontage; Amend the Putnam County Subdivision Control Ordinance to remove Homestead Exemption from 154.050 definitions

**AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE:** Amend the Wind and Solar Ordinance to be more in line with Senate Enrolled Act 411 that was recently past

- 4. BUSINESS SESSION** - In its business session, the Plan Commission meets in open session to discuss each item and make a decision. By law, a business session agenda is posted at least 48 hours prior to this meeting. This is not a public hearing. No testimony is taken unless the Plan Commission requests it. The Plan Commission may continue an item to another date for the hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS**

**6. WISHES TO BE HEARD**

Information pertaining to these cases is available to the public weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Department of Planning & Building, Putnam County Courthouse 1 W Washington St, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Room 46 Greencastle, Indiana 46135. There are times during routine application processing when files may not be immediately available. Written objections to any item on the agenda may be filed with the secretary of the Plan Commission before the hearing. At the hearing, oral comments concerning each Public Hearing proposed will be heard. The jurisdiction of the Plan Commission is all of Putnam County except the City of Greencastle, and the Towns of Bainbridge, Cloverdale, and Roachdale. For more information call (765) 301-9108.

FOR SPECIAL ACCOMODATIONS A NEEDED FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS PLANNING TO ATTEND THIS HEARING. PLEASE CALL, THE PLANNING SECRETARY AT (765) 301-9108 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION

June 8, 2022

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
David Ternoyan	Banner-Graphic
Stephanie Ampsen	TAXPAYER
Mike Summit	TAXPAYER
John Bossnach	712 Highridge Ave Greencastle
Bill MENTGEN	2009 S CIR 400 W GREENCASTLE, IN
Jarrod Pitts	300 E John Caprante Dallas, TX,
Lora Scott	Roachdale
Bell-Lantz	3038 W VS 36 Bainbridge