

Minutes - Goshen Plan Commission  
Tuesday, November 17, 2020 - 4:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers, 111 E. Jefferson Street  
Goshen, Indiana

**I.** The meeting was called to order with the following members present via electronic communication: Jim Wellington, Richard Worsham, Tom Holtzinger, Rolando Ortiz, Betsy Poling, and Hesston Lauver. Member Jim McKee was physically present, along with City Planner Rhonda Yoder and Assistant City Attorney James Kolbus. Absent: Aracelia Manriquez, Josh Corwin

**II.** Remote Meeting Statement

Ms. Yoder read the following emergency meeting notice: We begin this meeting during a declared public health emergency covering all of the State of Indiana. Board members Richard Worsham, Betsy Poling, Rolando Ortiz, Jim Wellington, Tom Holtzinger, and Hesston Lauver are participating in this meeting by electronic communication pursuant to Governor Holcomb's Executive Orders 20-04, 20-09, and 20-47, as well as guidance from Indiana Public Access Counsellor Luke Britt. Board member Jim McKee is physically present in City Council Chambers as we begin this meeting.

*Procedural Note:*

Ms. Yoder reminded Commission members that because some members are participating via electronic communication, all votes must be roll call votes, including those for approval of the minutes, and filing ordinances and reports into record.

**III.** Approval of minutes of 10/20/20 – A motion was made and seconded, Holtzinger/Wellington, to approve the minutes as presented with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**IV.** The Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances and Official Staff Reports were unanimously filed into record: A motion was made and seconded, Holtzinger/Wellington, to accept the Filing of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances and Official Staff Reports into record with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**V.** Postponements/Withdrawals - None.

**VI.** Rezoning (public hearing)

**20-06R** – Len & Marcia Morris and Bud Walterhouse request a rezoning from Commercial B-1 District to Residential R-1 District for a portion of the property generally located at 2604-2606-2608 S Main Street to match the existing R-1 zoning of the subject property and the adjacent property at 2614 S Main Street, all under the same ownership. Following the rezoning, all parcels will be combined into one property, with single unit residential as the primary use.

*Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder clarified this is a recommendation to City Council. She stated this is three tax parcels and includes commercial B-1 and R-1 zoning, located on the south side of Kercher Road, including a portion of the Winona Trail with an easement in place. She explained the property was annexed in 1968, and the historic zoning of the subject property has been R-1 and B-1 since at least the 1972 zoning map. She explained the property at one time had three separate residential dwellings along with several large accessory structures. She explained the property is non-conforming because of the multiple residential uses and B-1 zoning. She stated the property was purchased in 2018 by the owners of 2614 S Main Street, who intend to combine the subject property with the 2614 S Main Street property, with a primary single residential use, along with garden space, including a future greenhouse. She explained that a rezoning from B-1 to R-1 District matches the existing and adjacent R-1 zoning and will facilitate the use of the property as single unit residential with a personal garden and private greenhouse.

Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the City Council.

She noted one inquiry was received, regarding the impact on an adjacent property, zoned B-1 with grain bins. Ms. Yoder stated the rezoning will not impact the adjacent property.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

Bud Walterhouse, 55615 Riviera Drive, Elkhart, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He stated he did not have anything to share to add to Ms. Yoder's presentation.

*Audience Comments:* There was no one to speak to the petition.

*Close Public Hearing*

*Staff Discussion:* There was no discussion amongst Commission members.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Worsham, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Goshen Common Council for 20-06R. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**VII. Partial Plat Vacation** (public hearing)

**20-02V** – Jackie (“Jack”) & Jane Knies and HomeWorks Construction request a partial plat vacation to reduce a 6’ side (west) platted building setback to 0’ to allow for construction of an accessible ramp and deck expansion. The subject property is generally located at 1338 Clover Creek Lane, Lot 30 of The Villas of Clover Trails, and is zoned Residential R-3 District.

*Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder explained per Indiana Code 36-7-4-711, an application by an individual property owner for a reduction/removal of a portion of a recorded plat can only be granted by Plan Commission, through an application to vacate a portion of the plat, which is a public hearing that requires notification to all owners within the subdivision and recording of the decision. She clarified that this decision remains with Plan Commission. Ms. Yoder explained the proposed partial plat vacation would reduce the west side building setback from 6’ to 0’ to allow for installation of a ramp and deck expansion to comply with ADA regulations for accessibility, as part of an aging in place and mobility modifications project.

Staff recommends the Plan Commission approve the partial plat vacation to reduce the platted west side building setback from 6’ to 0’ for Lot 30 in The Villas of Clover Trails, based upon and with the following conditions:

1. The vacation does not defeat the original purpose of The Villas of Clover Trails, which was to create lots for detached single family dwellings.
2. The value of that part of the land in the plat not owned by the petitioner will not be diminished by the vacation, as the original proposed detached single family land use is maintained.
3. All other R-3 developmental requirements will be met.
4. And, if approved, the partial plat vacation drawing shall be recorded by the applicant, with two full-size recorded copies provided to the Planning Office.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

Nathan Kain, 1511 N Pulaski Street, South Bend, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He stated this project ensures the owner has a secondary means of egress and is made possible through the Veterans Administration. He stated the owner has permission and approval from the impacted neighbor. He explained the deck expansion is to ensure he has access to the side ramp to the property.

*Audience Comments:* There was no one to speak to the petition.

*Close Public Hearing*

*Staff Discussion:* There was no discussion amongst Commission members.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Holtzinger, to approve 20-02V, based upon the Staff Analysis and with the condition listed in the Staff Report. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**VIII. Rezoning (public hearing)**

**20-07R** – Trager Realty, LLC, and CRHH, LLC, request a rezoning from Residential R-3 District to Commercial B-2 District for subject property generally located at 401 S 3rd Street, to allow for use of the property as a professional office.

*Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder explained this is a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Yoder stated the subject property is two tax parcels located on the west side of S 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, the south side of W Madison Street, and the east side of River Race Drive. It had contained two residential dwellings, but the dwelling at 204 W Madison Street was demolished several months ago. The remaining residential dwelling at 401 S 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is proposed to be converted to a professional office use. Ms. Yoder explained the historic zoning of the subject property has been residential since the City's first zoning map in 1961. She noted the subject property is now surrounded on three sides by the B-2 district. The B-2 District permits a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to City Council in that the rezoning is consistent with the existing zoning and land use in the area as well as being consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Yoder also noted the B-2 District requirements are able to be met.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

Chris Russell, 64799 Orchard Drive, Goshen, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He stated he did not have much additional to add to Ms. Yoder's presentation but felt that the office would fit in well with the area and be well maintained.

Mr. Holtzinger asked if the historical appearance of the house will be maintained, and Mr. Russell replied that it would as well as increased landscaping. Mr. Russell also noted plans for a two-stall garage at the property.

*Audience Comments:* There was no one to speak to the petition.

*Close Public Hearing*

*Staff Discussion:* There was no discussion amongst Commission members.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Holtzinger, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Goshen Common Council for 20-07R. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**IX. Rezoning (public hearing)**

**20-08R** - Caspers Coin & Jewelry Goshen Inc requests a rezoning from Commercial B-3 District to Residential R-2 District for subject property generally located at 311 Oakland Avenue, to resolve split zoning for a single unit residential property.

*Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder clarified this is a recommendation to the City Council. She explained the subject property is one of two tax parcels that together form a residential zoning lot, located on the west side of Oakland Avenue, north of Pike Street. She further explained the two tax parcels are two separate subdivision lots, but are under one ownership, with a single family house located on the subject property and a shed and driveway located on the parcel adjacent north. The subject property is zoned Commercial B-3, and the parcel adjacent north is zoned Residential R-2. Ms. Yoder noted the residential use on this Commercial B-3 zoning makes the property non-conforming. Ms. Yoder stated the historic zoning of the subject property has been commercial since the City's first zoning map in 1961, but it appears the use has always been residential, with Assessor's records indicating the house was built in 1927.

Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the City Council. Ms. Yoder states this recommendation is based upon the rezoning request being consistent with the existing zoning and land use in the area, and the rezoning resolving a long-term non-conformity for a residential property built prior to the City's first zoning ordinance.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

David Kollar, 603 W Pike Street, Goshen, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He stated the intent is to transform this property back to a single family residence from being a rental unit.

*Audience Comments:* There was no one to speak to the petition.

*Close Public Hearing*

*Staff Discussion:* There was no discussion amongst Commission members.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Holtzinger, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Goshen Common Council for 20-08R. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**X. Rezoning (public hearing)**

**20-09R** – Ridgestone Development Group, LLC, and Abonmarche Consultants request a rezoning from Residential R-2 District to Residential R-3 District for a portion of the subject property generally located at 2609 W Wilden Avenue, to allow for multi-unit residential development. The subject property is zoned Residential R-2 and Residential R-3 Districts.

*Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder noted this is a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Yoder stated the subject property is a single tax parcel, approximately 11.51 acres with approximately 515' of frontage along Wilden Avenue and a long boundary with the Elkhart River. She stated the property is undeveloped and is zoned Residential R-2 and Residential R-3. She stated there is a mix of adjacent residential zoning, primarily with single unit residential land use, and the property across Wilden Avenue is a commercial development. Ms. Yoder explained the subject property was annexed in 1968, and the current zoning of R-2 and R-3 goes back to the 1972 zoning map. Ms. Yoder stated the proposed rezoning to Residential R-3 for the R-2 portion of the property is requested to allow multi-unit residential development. She notes only a conceptual plan is required and has been submitted at this time, not a technical site plan. With regard to access, Ms. Yoder states one street access is proposed along with an emergency fire access. She notes dedication of right of way, 40' from the centerline north, is required along Wilden Avenue to meet arterial street requirements. She states the petitioners will be responsible for the cost of any required street improvements along Wilden Avenue, as determined by the Goshen Engineering Department following a traffic impact analysis. With regard to density, Ms. Yoder noted the R-3 District requires 2,000 SF of lot area per dwelling unit, with gross density not exceeding 20 units per acre, which would allow a maximum of approximately 220 units for this area. With regard to landscaping, Ms. Yoder stated the required landscaping will include streetside trees, partial landscaping adjacent to residential land use and parking lot trees. She notes a detailed landscape plan will be required as part of the site plan review process.

Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the City Council based upon the following:

1. A portion of the property is already zoned R-3 and rezoning the remainder to R-3 will resolve the split zoning and allow the entire site to be use for multi-unit residential development.
2. The rezoning is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, including:
  - a. Neighborhoods & Housing, Goal N-7: Expand housing options and opportunities.
3. The R-3 District requirements are able to be met.

Additionally, Ms. Yoder mentioned many inquiries have been received regarding this request and all emails and letters have been provided to the Commission members and the petitioner.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

Crystal Welsh, 1009 S 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Goshen, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. She stated her intent is to address the

common themes of concerns raised regarding the request.

She stated rent for these units will range between \$800-\$1,200 per month which is not considered low-income housing. Applicants will be expected to have annual incomes of \$38,000-\$58,000.

With regard to lowering property values, Ms. Welsh stated the project is anticipated to be approximately an \$8 million-dollar investment which, per acre, would exceed the average property value for the area.

With regard to privacy, Ms. Welsh stated the property owner would be amenable to placing a fence on the property; however, the fence would work “both ways” in that the surrounding property owners would not have access to the amenities proposed for this project.

With regard to density, Ms. Welsh stated the property could have 220 units; however, the proposed number of units is 122, mostly consisting of 1-2-bedroom units with a few 3-bedroom units. She stated a reasonable estimate of the total number of residents is 183-244.

With regard to setbacks, Ms. Welsh noted that all proposed setbacks exceed requirements.

With regard to the environment, Ms. Welsh explained that the natural environment has been an important consideration in the project and will be an important marketing tool for potential residents.

She reiterated that this is not a final, technical plan, and, once the zoning issues are clarified, the next stage of the plan will proceed and will be reviewed by City staff.

Public utilities are already at the site and the site is within City limits.

With regard to the bike trail and walkability, Ms. Welsh stated the main and fire entrance will take the bike trail into consideration. There will be trails within the development as well as connecting with the City trail. Trails will be pulled back from the river bank.

She stated special precautions will be taken to maintain as much of existing tree cover, not be clear cut but cleared as needed for development to occur, and 39% of the property will remain open space.

With regard to land use of apartments, Ms. Welsh reiterated the income levels of potential residents and their choice to live in apartments.

Ms. Welsh stated the people living here would be renters of choice, not people who don't have choices.

With regard to the floodplain, Ms. Welsh stated extra efforts have been taken to ensure there is no impact to the river.

#### *Commission Questions:*

Mr. Holtzinger asked about whether the retention pond would be sufficient and whether it would meet requirements. Ms. Welsh stated the plan was developed by a civil engineer and the size of the retention pond will be appropriate.

Mr. Holtzinger asked about children on the property. Ms. Welsh stated they are focusing on 1-2-bedroom units as data has shown this is a need.

Mr. Holtzinger asked about safety concerns about the entrance to the property and whether there will be sufficient entrance for emergency personnel, particularly with regard to the bike trail. Ms. Welsh stated coming up with a good entrance design is very important for safety, sight distance, turning in and out of the development, pedestrians using the bike trail and emergency personnel. She stated these details will be reviewed by the City of Goshen's Engineering Department as a part of the technical review process.

Mr. Ortiz asked if any conceptual drawings have been completed and whether there is an idea about how the buildings will look and fit architecturally in the area. Ms. Welsh stated that has not been completed yet because architectural and engineering plans are not yet required. Ms. Welsh reported the buildings will reflect the premium rents that the residents will be paying.

Mr. McKee asked for public comments to be in addition to comments or concerns already received and reviewed by the Commission, not a repeat of what was already submitted.

#### *Audience Comments:*

Alicia Borrego, 2801 W Wilden Avenue, Goshen, stated she wanted to voice her opposition to the buildings of this size. She stated this is “too much”, “too many people”, “too many buildings” for this location. She expressed concern about the various pollutants created for both the area and the wildlife. She stated just because there will be premium rent payers does not guarantee there will be premium people. She expressed concern about the increase in traffic along Wilden Avenue. She expressed concern about the safety of the pedestrians along the bike path and the volume of traffic coming in and out of the development. She stated cutting down the trees would be of concern to her.

Nancy Keller, 2800 Woodmere Lane, Goshen, stated her home has been there for 35 years and this forest is what she sees in her backyard. She states the change in the view with buildings and lights does not seem like something that someone would want to pay money for at the time her home is listed for sale. She expressed concern for the amount of tree cutting

that needs to occur, asked why not purchase a flat lot to develop as opposed to a forest and wildlife area that needs to be cut down. Ms. Keller expressed concern for the retention pond. She stated there is flooding in her backyard and one does not have to dig deep to hit water. She stated this water would breed mosquitos. She stated the City created a gradual drainage area that has since become “8-10 feet” deep because of water washing away more of it. She expressed concern about the overhead lights, headlights and light pollution. She asked the land be respected and suggested a park or wildlife preserve. She asked the Commission deny the request.

Lonza Mullins, 1904 Russet Avenue, Goshen, stated he is opposed to the development for several reasons. He expressed concern about the water retention area and the asphalt’s impact on the environment. He stated there is housing available elsewhere in the stated price range and additional housing in Goshen would strain the traffic in downtown Goshen. He questioned the additional strain to the City water system.

Jennifer Skibbe, 2808 Woodmere Lane, Goshen, expressed concern about the impact to the environment and stated the land contains endangered species. She wonders how preserving this will be addressed by the developers. She brought up sections of Uncommonly Great Goshen and the promotion of green buildings and the preservation of ecosystems and asks how this project fits with those stated goals. She stated this land is considered an environmentally sensitive area. She stated housing of this type may be better served by duplexes. She also expressed concern for drainage and the potential for her basement to flood. She asked the request be denied.

Paul Steury, 303 Reservoir Place, Goshen, said he speaks as a “local environmental person”. He expressed concern about the location and destruction of the habitat. He notes the City’s tree canopy goal and how this project does not align with that goal. He suggests the developers look to other areas which have already been cleared. He expressed concern about stormwater runoff with the proposed parking lot area right next to the river.

Fernando Lopez, 2801 W Wilden Avenue, Goshen, noted the high-water table of the river and the various wildlife. He stated the notice of the proposal seemed to be short, and he had passed out literature to neighbors who didn’t seem to be aware of the proposed development. He questions the impact of the development on the established habitat.

Kristi Smith, 1804 Barclay Drive, Goshen, asked the Commission to look at the proposed amount of traffic as a result of the development. She expressed concern of visibility of the bike path and the traffic. She stated she appreciates the privacy the lot currently offers and the wildlife she sees.

Joe Parkhurst, 2806 Woodmere Lane, Goshen, expressed concern about the traffic spillover when waiting to cross train tracks. He stated he enjoys seeing the various wildlife in his backyard that is afforded by the current property.

Phil Miller, 21033 Rivers Edge Drive, Goshen, stated he has lived at his current property for the last 16 years. He notes the various wildlife he sees and enjoys that lives in the wooded lot. He stated he and his wife are not opposed to the idea but are being faced with no longer living in a park-like setting. He stated he does not want the trees destroyed. He noted the City’s tree canopy goal. He noted the possible height of the buildings and how the buildings would not fit with the area. He suggested there may be more neighborhood support if there was more of a buffer along the river. He asked that a larger buffer, with greater setback and more trees, be implemented. He expressed concern for the lights. He said the proposed plan does not take into consideration the value of the land. He expressed concern with the water overflow and litter/debris.

Crystal Welsh, speaking on behalf of the petitioner, stated some of the issues addressed will be addressed in the technical review process with the City. With regard to the lights, she stated there is a process to measure light pollution and bleed over and there are things that can ameliorate this bleed over that is required by the City. With regard to the retention pond, she stated a recorded maintenance agreement is required with ongoing inspections to ensure proper function. With regard to lighting, she stated the developer’s willingness to place a 6’ fence around the property to mitigate the car lights. She stated the tree line is an asset to the property, and trees that can be retained will be left on site. She stated the natural beauty is a marketing tool for this property. She reiterated that technical details are not required to be addressed at this stage. Ms. Welsh stated zoning is for use, not a site plan. She stated they would like 122 units but that may change depending on local development requirements and guidelines. She stated the parking lanes are 71’ to top of river bank, and it is not proposed to clear cut or destabilize the river bank. With regard to traffic, she stated the Engineering Department will evaluate the traffic impact and whether street improvements are needed to meet guidelines. With regard

to building height, the maximum proposed building height is three stories because that is what is allowed by R-3 zoning but those plans are not finalized.

### *Close Public Hearing*

#### *Staff Discussion:*

Mr. Holtzinger asked about whether the City's water and sewer capacity could handle the development. Rhonda Yoder assured this was addressed and there is proper capacity.

Mr. Wellington asked why R-3 was sought as opposed to R-2. Ms. Yoder stated because R-2 does not allow for multifamily. Mr. Wellington asked who owns the land now. Ms. Yoder stated it is owned by the petitioner. Mr. Wellington asked if it was acquired recently. Ms. Yoder questioned the relevancy of this detail but said the deed is from 2020. Mr. Wellington asked how old the forest is on the land and the history of the land. Ms. Yoder stated the structures have been removed from quite some time.

Mr. Worsham asked whether this proposal is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. He recognized Goal N-7: Expand housing options and opportunities. He read the goals N-1, N-3, N-6, N-7, N-9 and wonders how the proposed project fits with those goals.

Mr. Lauver asked about the history of zoning for that property. Ms. Yoder stated the current zoning has been established since 1972 zoning map, when the area was annexed and does not have a good file history.

Mr. Ortiz questions whether the proposal fits in the area. He stated he would love to see the area developed but maybe not "so much".

Mr. Holtzinger commented about the mix of residential and commercial use along Wilden Avenue and landscape and traffic changes over time from when he purchased his personal home.

Mr. Wellington noted the City's tree canopy goal.

Mr. McKee noted it is increasing difficult to find places in Goshen to develop or build on. He notes younger people don't want to purchase homes because of maintenance.

#### *Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Worsham, to forward an *unfavorable* recommendation to the Goshen Common Council for 20-09R. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, no; Holtzinger, no; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

## **XI. PUD Major Change**

**20-04MA** – Ardmore Court Enterprises No. 2, LLC, ViewRail Realty, LLC, and Abonmarche Consultants request a PUD major change for Lots 6 and 7 of Waterford Commons Business Park North, PUD Tract 2, to allow a 0' side parking/aisle setback for internal shared access and to allow combined parking to serve both lots. The subject property is generally located at 1725 (Lot 7) and 1755 (Lot 6) Ardmore Court, and is zoned Industrial M-1PUD (Planned Unit Development).

#### *Staff Report:*

Ms. Yoder clarified this is a recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Yoder explained the Waterford Commons Business Park PUD was established in January 2014 by Ordinance 4768, with a major change approved for Tract 2 by Ordinance 4871 in August 2016. Secondary approval of a ten-lot subdivision was granted by the Plan Commission in November 2016, and the plat recorded in December 2016. PUD final site plan approval was granted in December 2016 for Lot 6 and in October 2018 for Lot 7. Ms. Yoder explained the current request is to allow internal cross access with a 0' side parking/aisle setback across the shared interior side property line, and to allow combined parking to serve both lots. Ms. Yoder stated along each side of the shared interior side property line, there is a 10' drainage easement, requiring a minimum 10' setback. She stated approval of the PUD major change will be contingent on review and approval by Goshen Engineering & Stormwater, related to the potential impacts to the drainage easement.

Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the City Council, based upon the following:

1. The proposed changes have no impact on the overall Waterford Commons Business Park PUD and would be allowed without review if the two properties were under one ownership.
2. Future impacts based on ownership will be addressed through approval of the PUD major change and by the establishment of an access easement.
3. A PUD final site plan shall be submitted and approved prior to a zoning clearance form/building permit being issued.
4. Site plan approval by Goshen Engineering/Stormwater is required before a zoning clearance/building permit is issued.

There was one inquiry received about the impact to the adjacent residential property. Ms. Yoder said there is no impact to adjacent residential properties because the request is internal in between the two properties.

*Petitioner Presentation:*

Crystal Welsh, 1009 S 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Goshen, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. She stated the intent to use the buildings in tandem, not to combine them. She stated there is some benefit to remain separate development parcels. It would allow the operations of the two buildings to function better with the current use and not to impact future sale. She stated this does need to go through the technical review process.

*Audience Comments:*

Charles Taylor, 1901 Carina Circle, questioned the location of parking and impact on his property. Ms. Welsh stated this would have no impact on his property. Ms. Yoder clarified it is internal shared access.

*Close Public Hearing*

*Staff Discussion:* There was no discussion amongst Commission members.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Holtzinger, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Goshen Common Council for 20-04MA. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**XII.** Audience Items – None

**XIII.** Staff/Board Items –

- 2021 Plan Commission Calendar

Ms. Yoder explained a motion is required to approve the 2021 Plan Commission and BZA calendar.

*Action:*

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Holtzinger, to approve the 2021 Plan Commission and BZA schedule. A roll call vote was requested with the following outcome: Wellington, yes; Worsham, yes; Lauver, yes; McKee, yes; Holtzinger, yes; Poling, yes; Ortiz, yes. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

**XIV.** Adjournment – 5:40 pm

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Meaghan Bylsma

Meaghan Bylsma, Recording Secretary

Approved By:

/s/ Jim McKee

Jim McKee, President

/s/ Tom Holtzinger

Tom Holtzinger, Secretary