Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:00 p.m.

Richard J. Pasco Council Chambers, City Hall

10 S. State St, Greenfield, IN 46140

Plan Commission President, Becky Riley, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Secretary, Monica Evans, took Roll Call with the following members present:

Becky Riley, President

Chris Cooper

Mike Terry

Laurene Lonnemann

Paulette Richardson

Thomas Moore

Dave Spencer

Glen Morrow

Rick Roberts

Non-member staff present:

Monica Evans, Secretary

Gregg Morelock, Attorney

Evan Beaty, Planner

 At 7pm Plan Commission President B. Riley called the meeting to order.

At this time, a motion was made to approve the minutes for the May 29, 2025, special meeting. The motion was made by R. Roberts with 1 correction to a name misspelling and seconded by D. Spencer. Motion carried.

A motion was then made to approve the June 2025 meeting minutes by T. Moore and seconded by M. Terry. Motion carried.

E. Beaty gave the administrator’s report. He stated the summary had been provided to members and there were no questions.

**DEV25-03: 2055 Barrett Drive Home Depot Development Plan**

 E. Beaty gave the staff report. He said the site was previously approved in 2002 and a second plan approved in 2003. He said the site has remained in compliance since that time. Temporary use permits have been issued on occasion but have not been obtained regularly. He stated the Petitioner and the City have come to an agreement to formalize the expansion of the outdoor storage and a screened area in the back on the lot.

The rear will be a 20-foot screened storage area that was previously containers. In the front there will be Mulch and a drive-through area for customers. To the North side of the property, storage of mowers and fence panels is being requested. They are also requesting to line the entire building with other various display areas.

E. Beaty stated the fenced area in the back will be like the current garden area that is on the south side of the building. Staff feel this is appropriate and sufficient for keeping the area screened with an 8-foot black chain link fence with opaque wind cloth as previously approved in 2002 and 2003. The northern area, staff feels is considered offsite storage and is inappropriate for the site and not conducive with surrounding retail sites. This is a new proposal that staff are not supportive of.

The front facade sales and storage area being requested is approximately 9769 square feet of outside sales and storage. This was previously denied under the original development plan. This amount would be 8 times the amount the UDO currently allows for outdoor sales, which is 1 percent. This is not supportable by staff.

The Tech Review Committee had minimal comments other than the Fire Department stated there are specific requirements for fencing for lumber storage and staff have not seen any information regarding that yet.

For access to the rear of the property, previously it was filled with storage containers and shipment drop-offs and now would be confined to the 20-foot fenced area. With that staff finds that would resolve the restrictions on truck access.

For parking, there is no way to bring the parking lot into compliance with 1 spot per 200 square foot of retail space. However, the parking lot has rarely if ever been full and would not impact the capacity.

E. Beaty read all 5 conditions in their entirety. There are 2 staff recommendations for denial for the north parking lot area and the sales display along the entire front of the building. With the conditions of approval, there are modifications to conditions 3 & 4. The screening of the seasonal sales will need to be brought into compliance within 6 months.

R. Roberts asked if seasonal sales have been defined. E. Beaty advised it is March 1-August 1. L. Lonneman asked if the meaning of perpetual on the mulch area meant forever or what. E. Beaty stated that they are only wanting the sales to be what is listed in the staff report and that would prevent needing a permit every year.

T. Moore stated that he feels the company needs to be able to grow due to the growth of the community. E. Beaty said the Petitioner would need to decide where they want to display their goods. L. Lonneman stated that the outdoor displays don’t sound the same as the hanging basket area that T. Moore is speaking of. D. Spencer asked for clarification. He asked about where they would store things in the parking lot and walk around it. E. Beaty stated that it was the north area. He said he was thinking about storage in the middle of the parking lot like another store does.

P. Richardson asked about the contractor’s entrance area. E. Beaty showed a picture and stated it was also out of compliance. She also asked if the need for the storage on the back drive is due to deliveries or management not processing well.

M. Terry asked about the storage area in the rear and the fencing needed. E. Beaty stated it was due to the lumber being stored there and the flammability of the materials.

T. Moore asked if staff felt that they would not be able to help Home Depot would they look for another location. He also asked about theft. E. Beaty stated he cannot answer about them moving. E. Beaty also said they cannot in good conscience, support a proposal that could lead to crime or detriment to the community.

P. Richardson asked about complaints. E. Beaty stated that Bomgaar's has asked why they cannot do outdoor displays while they are allowing Home Depot to have it.

Jeremiah Pollock, Kimley Horn came forward for the petitioner. He stated that he was given a statement from the petitioner and read it. One statement said they would like to close off the entire back side of the property. They are unaware of any shared access agreements with the other property owners. E. Beaty stated his concern is that trucks would not be able to access the other stores from the south and the Fire Department would not have access.

The Petitioner was confused as to the fence height in the rear as well. E. Beaty explained that it would be the same as the current garden area fence.

The Petitioner is willing to drop the north parking lot area of the outdoor storage. They, however, do not want to get rid of the storage along the store front. They would like to continue doing what they are doing.

T. Moore stated that he looked at several other Home Depot stores and they are all the same as far as outdoor storage.

E. Beaty asked if what is proposed is sufficient and Mr. Pollock stated what they requested is what is needed, but E. Beaty stated that he has been saying permanent storage. He said what they are asking for is a variance and that they would potentially need to go to the BZA for approval.

G. Morelock asked about the square footage requested being ideal and would like the exact amount of outdoor storage required.

E. Beaty asked if the petition should be continued since the Petitioner does not know what the amount of outdoor storage needed is. Discussion was had about whether the Petitioner could make a phone call and get information or to continue the petition.

R. Roberts asked the Petitioner to ask their team if this is the model they are going to continue using and call it permanent storage.

A motion was made for approval of amendments 1 & 2 of the Development plan with conditions listed in the staff report made by P. Richardson with a second made by R. Roberts. Motion carried 9-0.

A motion was made for Amendment #3 to be withdrawn, which was made by P. Richardson and seconded by M. Terry. Motion carried 9-0.

A motion to continue amendment #4 until the August Plan Commission meeting was made to continue till August was made by P. Richardson and seconded by L. Lonneman. Motion carried 9-0.

**VA25-01, PUD25-02 & REZ25-01 Annexation of Shafer Farms**

E. Beaty gave the staff report. He stated the Petitioner is wanting to annex this property on the west side of the city. He showed the property and how it would be split. The northern portion of the property is being sold to Lark Farms and zoned BP and would remain undeveloped as of now. The southern portion which would be split by the new McClarnon Road installation will be the housing subdivision. The southwest area will be the commercial node.

Density will be approximately 3.45 units per acre, which is close to the RM zoning district. Lot sizes for homes will be 72, 52 and 42 feet wide.

There have been development standard increases such as exterior lighting on the garages on 42-foot lots but staff is concerned there is no mention of decorative or cohesive treatments of the garages and staff recommend that language to be included in the PUD statement and add them to all garages, not just on the narrower lots.

The PUD proposes to meet the UDO with a few exceptions. A minimum of 1 window per side per story is required on all sides except the front. Staff would like to strike that restriction for the 42-foot lots. Staff would like to include a window on all front doors. Staff would also like to add that only homes on 42-foot-wide lots will have a garage that is more than 60% of the front façade.

Staff are concerned that an expansion of allowance of the garages into the larger lots, would make the other areas less presentable. There is a lot of pedestrian access with trails and sidewalks around the development. Staff would like to see more usable space within the subdivision. Currently, there is no access to any of the ponds or green spaces. Staff would like to see connectors within the cul-de-sacs.

Staff is generally supportive of the PUD statement commitments. Exceptions are commitments #4 and #7 of the staff report. Number 4 is to add windows to all front doors. Along with exterior lighting fixtures on garages. Number 7 is asking the Petitioner to show access to at least half of all open spaces.

These issues do not need to be resolved prior to annexation but prior to and during the DUD portion of the application. Staff are supportive of the mixed zoning of the site with the commitments in the PUD statement and conditions listed in the staff report with 4b and 4d being removed. A traffic study is also being requested by staff.

L. Lonnemann asked if there are sidewalks along the retail spaces and E. Beaty responded that there is.

P. Richardson asked about acell and DeCell lanes for the subdivision. E. Beaty said they are not currently proposed but can be added to the PUD statement or during the DUD petition. P. Richardson asked why 4B was removed when it limits the number of rentals. G. Morelock advised they cannot do that any longer.

R. Roberts does not want any land donated to the Parks Department. L. Lonnemann asked about the McClarnon extension. She said the portion at the current dead end becomes a parking lot when there are games at the school. Her concern is the impact between the two locations and parking along the road.

T. Moore asked if 42-foot lots are needed in Greenfield. E. Beaty said it is not ideal but has worked with the Petitioner to make them better.

Cheyenne Hoffa, Forestar Group, came forward and was sworn in. She gave a quick presentation on the Forestar Group. She explained they are a developer and not a builder. She also stated the community will more than likely being a multi builder community.

Ms. Hoffa stated they are ok will the seven commitments recommended by staff. Number 7 adds additional amenities. They will add a path to one of the cul-de-sacs and open an area closer to the commercial node. They will also remove a few of the 42-foot-wide lots to create a dog park. Ms. Hoffa also feels that with Lark Farms expanding that could be considered part of the amenities. She also asked if the traffic study can be left to the Engineers and P. Richardson said it does not happen. P. Richardson is also asking for a passing blister and acel/decel lanes to be added to the PUD statement.

When asking how tall the commercial building will be, Ms. Hoffa stated it shouldn’t be any taller than 3 stories. P. Richardson stated that that would not be compatible with the area.

G. Morrow asked about the County legal drain. Ms. Hoffa said they will be petitioning the county for the legal drain to route it around the subdivision through the City right of way or run it through the storm system. She said they have been able to route through the storm system in a couple other subdivisions in the county. Forestar meets with the County Drainage Board in August.

Staff feel that more areas are needed for activation and J. Wertman feels that ponds are not amenities. More trails and other areas are needed.

Adam Lark came forward and was sworn in. He said that they will keep their main entrance on Meridian Road. He said down the road that may change depending on need. He says this is a chance for a little bit of a buffer between the subdivision and the Farm and will make the area nicer.

At this time resident, Lavonne Sorensen came forward and was sworn in. She stated that she is not opposed to the housing but the size of the lots and the shopping center is not desirable and is not downtown Indy. She feels it detracts and cheapens the area.

P. Richardson asked what is expected to be in the commercial area. Ms. Hoffa said they will follow the use table in the UDO. It would be places like barber shops, small grocery stores and things of that nature.

G. Morrow asked about office space in the buildings. E. Beaty listed the uses within the RM zone code as that is the underlying zoning of the PUD.

J. Wertman said that if the Plan Commission wants certain things to be allowed in the commercial area, they need to be added to the PUD statement. The language will need to be clarified to add office space or residential uses for permitted uses.

The first motion will be a recommendation for annexation with no zoning. A motion was made for a favorable recommendation by Thomas Moore and seconded by R. Roberts. Motion carried 9-0.

A motion was made to continue the PUD & BP zoning by L. Lonnemann and seconded by P. Richardson. Motion carried 5-4 to continue.

**DEV25-05: 1993 N. State Street, Thomas English Real Estate**

E. Beaty gave the staff report. He stated this location is where the old O'Charley’s building is located, at the corner of State Street and New Road. It is in the CN zoning district. They are planning to have a drive-through for the bank with an ATM and a lane with a tube system.

The bank and drive-through are appropriate for the area. For parking, they will be losing 18 parking spaces, but it is still within range of the UDO requirements. Access to the property is also adequate. The building will be split into 2 storefronts, one for a bank and an unknown user for the other storefront.

There will be a one way on the east side of the property and the Petitioner has submitted an extensive landscaping plan. The dumpster location will also be on the east side of the property and will be screened.

Jake Wilson, Petitioner came forward and was sworn in. He said they were looking for a single restaurant but the market wasn't there for a single restaurant. They approached 5/3 Bank and they were interested in the building but only half of it. They believe a Mattress store will be another storefront but it’s not finalized at this time.

Terry asked if they would be retaining ownership of the building and J. Wilson stated they would continue to own the building and would be leasing the areas to the bank and whoever else.

A motion was made to approve by M. Terry and seconded by R. Roberts. Motion carried 9-0.

A motion to adjourn was made by P. Richardson and seconded by M. Terry. Motion carried.