

**MINUTES
COLUMBUS PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
AUGUST 12, 2015 AT 4:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
123 WASHINGTON STREET
COLUMBUS, INDIANA**

Members Present: Roger Lang, Dennis Baute, Dave Fisher, David Jones, Tony London, Rodney Finke, Frank Jerome, Sondra Bolte, Beth Fizel, and Tom Finke (County Plan Commission liaison).

Members Absent: Mike Harris.

Staff Present: Jeff Bergman, Melissa Begley, Sondra Bohn, Allie Keen, Ashley Klingler, Emilie Pinkston, Charles Russell and Aaron Edwards (Deputy City Attorney).

CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes of the July 8, 2015 minutes (Approval and Signing).

Motion: Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

None

NEW BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

MP-15-06: Cornerstone Commercial West Major Subdivision 8th Replat – A request by George Dutro to create 1 new lot for a total of 2 lots totaling 5.11 acres, including (1) a request to allow an easement to serve 3 lots, 1 more than permitted, per Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.24.050(A) and (2) a modification request from Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.24.050(B) to allow parking and maneuvering within a required access easement. The property is located at 3860 West Carlos Folger Drive, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Keen presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Tim Allen with Independent Land Surveying and George Dutro, owner of the property represented the petitioners.

Mr. Dutro stated that all three lots were designed at the same time so all were taken into consideration when planning for drainage and circulation

Mr. Dutro stated for financial reasons each building has to be placed on a separate lot at this time.

Much discussion was held regarding the access easement and the maneuvering that would need to take place in that space. Mr. Dutro stated that the easement is intended to serve a

new lot to the north side of the property that would not have any street frontage or other access.

Mr. Jerome asked how many parking spaces were required for the buildings. Mr. Dutro stated the parking spaces would be regulated by the uses that were located there. Ms. Keen stated there could be different parking requirements depending on the types of tenants (offices, restaurants, etc.) in each building. Ms. Begley stated they are required 44 parking spaces and are providing 54.

Mr. Lang opened the meeting to the public

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Lang closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend approval of this request with the following modifications: (1) allowing an access easement to serve 3 lots (Lots 5B, 6B, and 7), which is 1 more than allowed by Subdivision Control Ordinance and (2) approve the modification request allowing parking and maneuvering within a required access easement. Mr. Bergman also noted that the applicant should address all the outstanding technical comments.

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve this request including the following modifications: (1) approval including allowing an access easement to serve 3 lots (Lots 5B, 6B, and 7), which is 1 more than allowed by Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.24.050(A) and (2) to allow parking and maneuvering within a required access easement and the following outstanding technical comments being addressed: (1) label the area of the floodway and the 100-year floodway fringe on the drawing [Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.12.030(M)] and 2 in the flood notation specify that Zone AE includes both the words "floodway" and "100-year floodway fringe" [Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.36.020]. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 8-1 with Mr. Baute being the nay vote.

C/AD-15-05: Ricker's/Indusites Administrative Subdivision – A request by Ricker's / Indusites for approval of an administrative subdivision that includes a request for a modification from Subdivision Control Ordinance Section 16.24.050(B) to allow maneuvering within a required access easement. The property is located at 3545 W 450 S, in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Keen presented the background information on this request.

Mr. John Stroh, Attorney and Travis Smith from Ricker's represented the petitioner.

Mr. Jerome asked if the easement across the back would ever be a road. Ms. Keen stated at this time it is not proposed as a public street.

Mr. Fisher asked what kind of business they would be trying to attract to the other two lots. Mr. Smith stated that lot #2 would probably be some kind of food services and lot #3; they are not sure, because the visibility is below grade and most businesses want to be seen next to the Interstate.

Much discussion was held regarding this access easement and the properties it would serve. Discussion included whether or not the east-west access easement at the rear of the Ricker's site should be extended to the Ricker's west property line to allow cross-access with that adjacent property.

Ms. Bolte stated it was her opinion that Ricker's should not be responsible for an access easement for a business located on State Road 58.

Mr. Jerome stated it was his opinion that this access easement would cause problems in the future.

Mr. Jones stated that if the applicant approved this layout he would vote for approval of this request.

Mr. Stroh stated in constructing a Riker's convenience store at the southwest corner of I-65 and State Road 58, this modification request needs to be approved to address the access issues in the area. He stated specifically an access easement to the other properties to the south, which currently flows through the Ricker's site. Mr. Stroh stated that Ricker's is seeking to provide that access with an easement through their parking lot. Mr. Stroh stated the only thing they are asking for is the modification. He stated they agreed to all the conditions of the staff report and would comply.

Mr. Smith stated that they expected most of the traffic at the convenience store and station would be regular vehicles and not semi-trucks. He stated this store was not designed for large trucks.

Mr. Lang opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Mark Pratt stated if Ricker's wants to grant another easement in the future to the west they can come back to the Plan Commission for approval. Mr. Jones, Mr. Fisher and Ms. Bolte agreed.

Mr. Lang closed the meeting to the public.

Much discussion was held regarding the handicap accessibility parking and where it is located in regards to the designated crosswalk that is proposed.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend approval of the request including the modification for maneuvering in the required access easement with the following conditions: (1) a note shall be added to the plat indicating the following: (a) all parking spaces located on Administrative Lot 1 to the west of the required access easement shall only be striped as pull-through spaces intended for large vehicles (b) A 5 foot wide pedestrian walkway shall be striped such that each parking space on the west side of the required access easement has direct connection to a striped pedestrian way that connects to the other site features on Administrative Lot 1 (on the opposite side of the required access easement). Where the crosswalk intersects with a sidewalk, there shall be a ramp providing full accessibility (c) The centerline shall be striped within the required access easement from the access to State Road

58 right-of-way to the south end of the parking area on Administrative Lot 1. Traffic flow arrows shall be marked for each drive lane within the required access easement. (2) A 10 foot by 10 foot sight visibility clearance triangle shall be shown on the plat at the northeast corner of the easement intersection and it shall clearly state that nothing shall be located within this sight visibility triangle including parking on the site and (3) the east-west access easement will be extended for the west line of the subdivision to allow cross-access with the adjacent property. He stated approval is contingent on all the other technical comments being addressed.

Motion: Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the request with the following conditions: (1) A note shall be added to the plat indicating the following: (a) all parking spaces located on Administrative Lot 1 to the west of the required access easement shall only be striped as pull-through spaces intended for large vehicles. (b) A 5 foot wide pedestrian walkway shall be striped such that each parking space on the west side of the required access easement has direct connection to a striped pedestrian way that connects to the other site features on Administrative Lot 1 (on the opposite side of the required access easement). Where the crosswalk intersects with a sidewalk, there shall be a ramp providing full accessibility. (c) The centerline shall be striped within the required access easement from the State Road 58 right-of-way to the south end of the parking area on Administrative Lot 1 and (d) Traffic flow arrows shall be marked for each drive lane within the required access easement. (2) A 10 foot by 10 foot sight visibility clearance triangle shall be shown on the plat at the northeast corner of the easement intersection and it shall clearly state that nothing shall be located within this sight visibility triangle including parking on the site.

The approval was contingent on all the technical comments being addressed: Please include the following statement in the Administrative Subdivision approval certificate: (1) "A modification was granted by the Columbus Plan Commission to allow maneuvering within the required access easement at the August 12, 2015 meeting." (2) Please show any existing easements that are being vacated by this subdivision (i.e. the 25 foot wide access easement on parcel #03-85-15-310-000.500-021, the 20 foot wide access easement along the west side of Administrative Lot 1 and the portion of the 50 foot access easement that is being relocated on Administrative Lot 1) and (3) Include Administrative Lot 1 in the notation regarding who will be utilizing the easement. Mr. London seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 8-1 with Mr. Baute being the nay vote.

PUD-15-09: Columbus Crossing – A request by the Columbus Plan Commission to amend the Columbus Crossing Preliminary PUD Plan to revise the sign and land use commitments. The property is generally located on the south side of Jonathan Moore Pike, between Morgan Willow Trace and I-65, in the City of Columbus.

Mr. Bergman presented the background information on this request.

Mr. Baute stated that at the July meeting they did not want to change the PUD zoning to the CR zoning.

Mr. London stated that the members wanted to have some flexibility with the signs in the Columbus Crossing PUD. He stated at this time there was none.

Mr. Bergman stated that if this Columbus Crossing Preliminary PUD Plan Amendment was passed concerning signs and land uses it would give the applicants some flexibility to present to the Plan Commission when proposing signage. It would be decided on case-by-case basis.

Mr. London asked if this were passed would it prohibit Chevrolet from asking for an Interstate sign. Mr. Bergman stated that as proposed it would still prohibit interstate-oriented signs. Mr. London stated it was his opinion this prohibition should be struck from the amendment.

Ms. Bolte stated it was her opinion that prohibiting the interstate-oriented signs would allow some continuity. She stated that the Plan Commission discretion should not be created as proposed and that there would have to be some criteria developed that says which sign is approved. Ms. Bolte stated for the two years the Preliminary PUD was debated it was mostly about the signage and not wanting to clutter up the front door to the City of Columbus.

Mr. Jones stated there is an inconsistency between what is allowed in the adjacent CR zoning and compare with the PUD for signs across the State Road 46 that is already in place and if the PUD is amended this would allow some flexibility where before there was none. It also sets a guide that maintains the integrity of the PUD.

Mr. Bergman stated at the last Plan Commission meeting some members wanted to have some discretion over signs and others said that they wanted to prohibit interstate signs. He stated the decision needs to be made if interstate signs would be allowed in the Columbus Crossing PUD.

Mr. London stated that it was important that the height of the sign could be seen from the interstate and perhaps the visibility should be one of the criteria for a sign.

Mr. Jones asked if he could install a LED digital sign at this PUD. Mr. Bergman stated there are provisions within the CR zoning for how much digital area is allowed. The CR Zoning only allows a changeable copy sign as an alternative as part of a wall sign or a freestanding sign, but not for an interstate oriented.

Mr. Jerome suggested a picture be made with 10 or 12 more interstate oriented signs present at the site and see what this would look like.

Mr. Jones stated it was his opinion that more signs would draw people off the interstate to shop. Mr. Jerome stated he was guided by the information signs on the highway.

Much discussion was held regarding interstate signs.

Mr. Fisher stated he would like to prohibit all 90-foot signs. He stated they are unattractive, they clutter the visibility and stated it would be much more attractive if none of them existed. He stated a lot of work had gone into this PUD and that was what they were trying to prevent was the clutter of signs.

Mr. London stated that from when this PUD was put in, place businesses have changed the way they operate and it is difficult to compete in the business world today.

Mr. Lang opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Jerry Strickland, White River Dental spoke in favor of amending the PUD sign ordinance.

Mr. Lang closed the meeting to the public.

Motion: Mr. London made a motion to forward the proposed Columbus Crossing Preliminary PUD sign standard and land, use amendments to the City Council with no restrictions on interstate-oriented signs with a favorable recommendation. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 7-2 with Mr. Baute and Ms. Bolte being the nay votes. Ms. Bolte expressed concerns about the lack of specific standards and Mr. Baute expressed concern about the possibility that large interstate signs could be allowed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Bergman stated this month he had sent out in the packets a cost of construction comparison between Columbus Crossing and buildings on the adjacent CR lots. The Planning Department was able to collect construction cost information for new commercial structure near the I-65/SR/46 interchange.

Mr. Bergman introduced Charles Russell as the new Planning Associate who has joined the Planning Department staff.

Mr. Bergman stated that a map was included in the packets that also display all the watersheds that drain into the Columbus area. He stated this speaks to the root cause of flooding concerns in the community.

LIAISON REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT: 6:45 p.m.


Roger Lang, President


Dave Fisher, Secretary