

Minutes - Goshen Plan Commission
Tuesday, February 15, 2022 - 4:00 pm
Council Chambers, 111 E. Jefferson Street
Goshen, Indiana

I. The meeting was called to order with the following members present: Rolando Ortiz, Richard Worsham, Josh Corwin, Tom Holtzinger, Hesston Lauver, Doug Nisley, Caleb Morris, Aracelia Manriquez, and James Wellington. Also present were City Planner Rhonda Yoder and Assistant City Attorney James Kolbus.

II. Election of 2022 President

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Holtzinger/Wellington, to appoint Richard Worsham as Plan Commission president. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 9-0.

III. Approval of Minutes of 1/18/22 – Holtzinger/Lauver 9-0

IV. The Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances and Official Staff Reports were unanimously filed into the record: Holtzinger/Wellington 9-0

V. Postponements/Withdrawals - None

VI. PUD Major Change (public hearing) - Tabled from 1/18/22 Meeting

22-01MA – Pilgrim Partners, LLC, City of Goshen, and Abonmarche request a PUD major change for Plymouth Avenue Professional Park PUD to allow a 6' vinyl privacy fence in lieu of landscaping screening along a portion of the east property line and to remove the requirement for a sidewalk along the east side of Lighthouse Lane. The subject property is Plymouth Avenue Professional Park PUD, zoned Commercial B-3PUD (Planned Unit Development), and generally located south of Plymouth Avenue, east of Greene Road.

Mr. Worsham requested a motion to remove 22-01MA from the table.

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Nisley/Holtzinger, to remove 22-01MA from the table. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 9-0.

Staff Report:

Ms. Yoder explained she has included an updated report in the packet because there have been changes to the request since the last meeting. She announced that the petitioner has submitted a letter asking that the fence portion of the request be withdrawn and stated that screening requirements of Ordinance 4371 will be met. She noted a copy of the letter is enclosed and Plan Commission action is required to accept the withdrawal.

Ms. Yoder explained the packet contains two updated layouts that were submitted by the petitioner. The primary plan for Plymouth Avenue Professional Park Second Addition has a pedestrian easement added in the front setback in the proposed Lot 3. This pedestrian easement would allow an optional, private sidewalk. Also included is a project map showing the preliminary location of a sidewalk crossing on Lighthouse Lane to the south, in The Crossing Subdivision.

She summarized that following the withdrawal of the fence request, the current request is only to remove the requirement for a sidewalk along the east side of Lighthouse Lane and this is the only thing being discussed today. She reminded Commission members that last month's meeting discussed the street design and the installed design prevents the sidewalk from being placed in the right-of-way along the east side as required. To meet that requirement, the entire roadway would need to be reconstructed, which would not be feasible. The alternative is to provide an option for a private sidewalk in the proposed Lot 3 and because the secondary subdivision reviewed by the Plan Commission last month required revisions, now is the time to add a pedestrian easement in the front yard setback to the plat. Doing so will allow the future owner to install a sidewalk if they choose to do so.

Also discussed last month was that Lighthouse Lane will eventually be connected with The Crossing Subdivision to the south and there is a plan for a sidewalk crossing that will take the sidewalk along the west side of Lighthouse Lane.

Based on this analysis, Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the Council. Ms. Yoder noted the next step will be for the Plan Commission to accept the withdrawal of the fence.

Mr. Worsham requested a motion to accept the withdrawal of the fence portion of the request.

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Nisley/Holtzinger, to accept the withdrawal of the fence request. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 9-0.

Petitioner Presentation

Crystal Welsh, 303 River Race Drive, Unit 206, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. She confirmed Staff's overview of the request regarding the sidewalk. She feels they have reached a good compromise that takes the physical constraints of the property into account. She also verified a plan that would allow the ability for the sidewalk on the south to connect to the west side of Lighthouse Lane.

Mr. Holtzinger questioned if the optional sidewalk for Lot 3 will be installed or if it's up to a future property owner. He also questioned if the sidewalk connection from the south to the west side is also optional.

Ms. Welsh stated that Lot 3 allows for connectivity but does not mandate it. She went on to say that the plan for the sidewalk from the south to the west side of Lighthouse Lane will be designed as part of The Crossing Subdivision and is not optional.

Mr. Wellington asked if the City or the subdivision will be responsible for installing the crosswalk across Lighthouse Lane.

Ms. Yoder responded that it's required by both the subdivision and the PUD process and that the crossing will need to be designed to meet Engineering requirements. She advised that the drawing being discussed today is only preliminary.

Mr. Wellington asked what the rear setback is for Lot 3.

Mr. Yoder replied the setback for a primary building is 25' and noted that because of the 20' easement, any accessory structure can be no closer than 20' from the rear property line.

Mr. Nisley asked if Lot 3 connects to Plymouth Avenue.

Ms. Yoder referred to the site aerial in the packets, noting that Tract A, which contains a retention pond, is located between Plymouth Avenue and Lot 3.

Mr. Lauver stated if the sidewalk along Lot 3 is optional, he sees no reason the future owner would want to install one.

Dustin Sailor, Director of Public Works, stated no direct connection between the sidewalk on the east side and the pedestrian path to the north is possible, pointing out the retention area does not allow enough room for a sidewalk.

Audience Comments

David Daugherty, 1101 Park Meadows Drive, spoke to the petition. He asked if there will be a public hearing prior to any construction on the property. He stated the neighborhood has concerns regarding the building height, lighting, landscaping, etc.

Ms. Yoder responded that there will be a PUD final site plan review which can be done by the Plan Commission, but is normally done by Staff on behalf of the Plan Commission and is not a public hearing. She explained when reviewed by Staff, they look at the PUD and make sure all requirements are met.

Mr. Nisley asked Ms. Yoder if those issues would be addressed by the PUD.

Ms. Yoder replied the concerns will be addressed as part of the PUD and the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Close Public Hearing

Staff Discussion:

There was no further discussion amongst board members related to the sidewalk request.

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Nisley/Holtzinger, to forward a favorable recommendation for 22-01MA to the Goshen Common Council. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 9-0.

VII. Audience Items
None

VIII. Staff/Board Items
None

IX. Adjournment – 4:42 pm

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Lori Lipscomb
Lori Lipscomb, Recording Secretary

Approved By:

/s/ Richard Worsham
Richard Worsham, President

/s/ Tom Holtzinger
Tom Holtzinger, Secretary