

Minutes - Goshen Plan Commission
Tuesday, May 17, 2022 - 4:00 pm
Council Chambers, 111 E. Jefferson Street
Goshen, Indiana

- I. The meeting was called to order with the following members present: Josh Corwin, Richard Worsham, Tom Holtzinger, Doug Nisley, James Wellington, Hesston Lauver, Aracelia Manriquez, Rolando Ortiz, and Caleb Morris. Also present were City Planner Rhonda Yoder and Assistant City Attorney James Kolbus.
- II. Approval of Minutes of 4/19/22 – Holtzinger/Lauver 9-0
- III. The Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances and Official Staff Reports were unanimously filed into the record: Holtzinger/Morris 9-0
- IV. Postponements/Withdrawals - None
- V. **Rezoning & PUD Preliminary Site Plan Approval – (public hearings)**

22-03R – City of Goshen Department of Redevelopment, AP Development, LLC, and Jones Petrie Rafinski request a rezoning from Industrial M-1 District to Residential R-3PUD (Planned Unit Development). and PUD preliminary site plan approval, for a mixed-use development containing commercial and multi-family residential uses, permitting:

- A 10' building setback along Plymouth Avenue (where 30' is required);
- A 5' building/parking/aisle setback along 10th Street (where 25' is required);
- A 5' parking/aisle setback along Douglas Street (where 25' is required);
- A 0' patio setback for Building A;
- One four story building (where three stories are permitted);
- One building approximately 325' in length (where 200' maximum is permitted);
- Parking stall depth of 18' (where 20' is required);
- Up to 136 dwelling units with approximately 1,250 square feet of lot area per unit (where a maximum of 78 units are permitted, with a minimum of 2,000 square feet of lot area per unit);
- 174 parking spaces provided (where approximately 204 spaces are required);
- Screening along 10th Street and a portion of Plymouth Avenue (adjacent to residential land use) similar to what is shown on the PUD preliminary site plan;
- Five freestanding signs (where three are permitted); and
- Signs for the retail space.

The subject property is generally located at 620 E Douglas Street, with approximately 355' frontage on Douglas Street and Plymouth Avenue, approximately 478' frontage on 10th Street, and containing ± 3.93 acres.

Staff Report:

Ms. Yoder provided location and background information for this property, noting that land use along the corridor is a mix of industrial, commercial, and institutional uses, surrounded on both sides by residential use. The M-1 zoning along the corridor goes back to the City's first zoning map in 1961. She explained that the City acquired the property in 2008, with demolition in 2009, and environmental remediation activities occurring in 2012 and 2013. She noted an environmental restrictive covenant was recorded in January, 2019 which must be amended in order for the residential use to proceed.

She explained in 2011-2012, the 9th Street Industrial Corridor Plan, focusing on remediation and development, was developed with significant input from business owners and residents in the corridor. The plan focused on remediation and future development, with goals including mixed-use development, developing a sense of place, improving mobility and safety, and intra-community connectivity. She noted activities implemented from that plan include the 9th Street bike/pedestrian path, and the ongoing development of a railroad quiet zone.

The proposed development for mixed-use commercial and residential development would include approximately 5,150 SF of retail/commercial space and up to 136 apartments in five buildings. She went on to say that due to the close proximity to residential land uses, several variances have been granted through the years for the industrial uses in the area, and it's likely that any new uses in the corridor would require variances before development would be permitted.

Ms. Yoder gave a brief overview of the following use and developmental requirements:

- A mix of uses is permitted in a PUD.
- The proposed commercial space will be located in one building and will take up approximately 25% of one floor.
- There is no specific building height or setback in a PUD. Building and parking setbacks and building height do not require approval, but deviation from the requirements are noted for information.
- Building length in the R-3 District is limited to 200 feet, and one building is proposed at 325 feet.
- Density is proposed at approximately 1,250 SF of lot area per unit where the R-3 District requires 2,000 SF of lot area per unit. This proposed density is consistent with existing development in the 9th Street corridor.
- Because the commercial space could hold a number of uses, parking is proposed as one space per 400 SF of floor area, requiring 13 spaces for the commercial use.
- Parking for residential use is based on the number of bedrooms. The ordinance calculations require 191 spaces, but if one-bedroom units are calculated at 1 space per unit instead of 1.5 spaces per unit, the total required number of parking spaces would be 172 and 174 spaces provided.
- Two proposed access points on 10th Street will require traffic analysis through consultation with Goshen Engineering.
- Sidewalks are proposed along Plymouth Avenue and 10th Street. No sidewalk is required along Douglas Street because it no longer connects across the railroad tracks.
- Street and parking lot landscaping will meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements, and screening adjacent to one family land use is proposed as shown on the preliminary site plan, a mix of trees and shrubs.
- Based on the commercial and apartment complex use, Staff recommends the following signs be permitted:
 - One wall or monument freestanding sign per building for buildings B, C, D, & E, limited to 20 SF in area and 5' in height (if freestanding);
 - Signs for Building A
 - One sign on the short screen wall near the outdoor patio, limited to 20 SF in area
 - One monument freestanding sign, limited to 20 SF in area and 5' in height
 - Two wall signs limited to 20 SF in area
 - One ground sign limited to 8 SF in area and 3' in height for each public street driveway access
 - All signs shall be non-illuminated, and temporary and mobile signs shall be prohibited.
- The PUD final site plan, submitted as part of Technical Review, may be reviewed by Staff on behalf of the Plan Commission.

Based on the analysis, Staff recommends a favorable recommendation be forwarded to the Goshen Common Council.

Petitioner Presentation

Jon Anderson, AP Development, 214 E Main Street, Brownsburg, IN, spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He stated the development team has been meeting weekly for the past six months. He explained the building layouts have changed from what was presented to the Redevelopment Commission, the City Council, and neighborhood meetings. He explained they now propose 136 units, which is less than what was originally presented and the team is excited to continue this process.

Mr. Holtzinger asked how they plan to deal with the stormwater.

Mr. Anderson stated this has been one of the challenges and they have been working on it with the City. The plan is to deal with all of the stormwater on site. They're looking at swales, permeable pavers, and some kind of underground water retention system, and with the current state of the Goshen's sewer there is no capacity to accept stormwater off this site and the cost to extend storm sewer to this site is prohibitive. He explained this is part of the reason the City has come forward with TIF money.

Mr. Holtzinger questioned if there is enough parking for this complex.

Mr. Anderson stated they feel parking is sufficient. He pointed out that there are more studio and one-bedroom units than there are two-bedroom units. Their research has shown high demand for the studio and one-bedroom units with only 20 to 30 percent of the units being two-bedroom units.

Mr. Holtzinger asked if any of their other properties are comparable to this and if they have sufficient parking.

Mr. Anderson stated they find that generally they don't need the amount of parking required by ordinances. He pointed out that not everyone is there at the same time; some people work days, some work nights, and some are there for the commercial use. He explained they would prefer to have greenspace and plan to take advantage of being on the trail by being a bike friendly project. He went on to say with everything they've looked at, the proposed number of parking spaces is sufficient.

Mr. Morris asked for more information on the bike options and plans for onsite bike storage.

Mr. Anderson stated this is something they've been doing in all of their projects, explaining there will be bike racks in the buildings and space for a bicycle repair room.

Audience Comments

Deloris Vaughn, Greencroft, spoke to the petition. She stated her concerns are traffic, stormwater, parking, density, and neighboring properties. She stated reports she is familiar with regarding this proposal all appear to be negative, and she voiced concerns regarding the quality of life for existing residents in the neighborhood should this proposal move forward.

Hollie Rieth, 822 S 10th Street, also spoke to the petition. She stated she lives directly across the street from this site and listed parking and traffic as her main concerns.

Tom Stump, 823 S 7th Street, also spoke to the petition. He stated traffic is heavy and routinely backs up along Plymouth Avenue. He also stated this will increase the density of the neighborhood and is not in favor of this project.

Katrina Graber, 524 E Douglas, also spoke to the petition. She stated she understands that more housing is necessary, but questioned how parking would be limited. She asked if there would be assigned parking spaces or if there would be a limit on the number of cars a unit could have. She pointed out there is no public transportation near this location and even though some people will bike, that doesn't mean they won't also have a car.

Barb Hassan, 511 S 5th Street, also spoke to the petition. She stated there is an enormous need for housing in this community and feels this is a wonderful site for an apartment complex. She doesn't know if parking will be a problem, but feels that some in the community have too narrow of a vision.

Lester Eger, 914 S 10th Street, also spoke to the petition. He voiced the following concerns:

- The quiet zone has been talked about for years, and even when the quiet zone is implemented, you'll still be able to hear the engines coming.
- The railroad has stated in the past that they would like to expand the number of tracks.
- The manufacturing plant to the north needs to clean up their property and fears they will leave town instead.
- If this is such a good deal, why is City money financing this project instead of private lenders?
- Voiced concerns that once the developers can make money on this project, they will sell out and there is no guarantee that the next owner will have the same kind of track record to keep this going.
- The apartment complex looks nice, but this is not the place for it.

Dave Pinkerman, 320 E Madison, also spoke to the petition. He stated he is president of the union local, that represents the employees of Gleason Industrial Products, and that Gleason employees are concerned that the City will "bulldoze their jobs".

Ricardo Juarez, 717 S 11th St, also spoke to the petition. He stated he's concerned about the traffic and blocked streets

that are a result of trains. He understands they are trying to bring more talent and young people to the City, but questioned if there will be some sort of screening process to make sure this happens, or will units be rented to anyone that applies? He's concerned about violence and crime if there is no screening process.

Nate Osborne, 1111 S 8th St, also spoke to the petition. He stated he's impressed with the 9th Street vision plan and this development seems in line with that plan. Goshen needs additional housing and as a nearby resident, he's excited about this project.

William Malone, Gleason Manufacturing, also spoke to the petition. He stated they are a manufacturing plant with outside storage and they are constantly moving items in and out. 10th Street has blocked traffic because they are unloading steel to take into the building. On the opposite end of the building, along Reynolds Street, trucks are constantly backing in and out of the docks along there. He pointed out that Goshen Schools adds additional traffic along 10th Street. He stated that he keeps trucks off of 10th Street at certain times of the day because of school traffic. He feels this apartment complex will lower the property values of homes in the neighborhood and questioned the environmental study, asking how housing can be placed on this property. He agreed that Goshen needs more housing, but this is not the right location. He stated Gleason is a 3-shift operation and he has done his best to keep noisy operation away from the 10th Street neighbors, but there will be punch press machines running less than 150' away from people's bedrooms.

Ms. Yoder noted that she received an email from Allan Kauffman (*Exhibit 22-03R - #1*) who had to leave early because of another meeting. She provided a copy to Commission members and read highlights from his email which included the following:

- Strongly supports the rezoning request
- All kinds of new housing is necessary
- Not all workers will be able to afford the rent, but many more will. More inventory will create a domino effect, allowing those that can afford to upgrade to move from lower cost housing, making those places available for others.

Petitioner Response:

Jon Anderson, AP Development responded to neighbor concerns, noting they are aware of the issues discussed and are already being dealt with.

- Proximity to a railroad - The quiet zone is coming and there have been extensive discussions with the City. There is one crossing left and once that's taken care of, there will be no whistles coming through this area. The building is designed with the railroad in mind, noting that on the end of the building at the railroad there are no windows that open.
- Intend to be good neighbors and have no intention of invading Gleason, noting that this project has been designed with Gleason in mind.
- They are a small build and hold development company with 136 units; explained that companies that like to build and sell, like to start at the 200 unit mark.
- They have 3 apartment projects up and running. All are completely full. One has 50 units with a wait list of 30. Their intention is to hold on to, take care of, and be proud of this.
- Parking continues to be a topic, but they have done their homework and feel they have come up with an environmentally sustainable project that will meet all other needs. He stated that building 250 parking spaces for this project is not environmentally responsible. He stated they are comfortable with the number of parking spaces because not everyone is home at the same time or leaving at the same time.
- Property values in the neighborhood will not go down. Dropping \$35 million into a neighborhood will not make that happen.
- This is a Brownfield site, approved by IDEM, and has an environmental restrictive covenant to commercial standards. They are already working with the City and with IDEM to get the residential amendment before they start construction.
- The proposed rent will not plummet and a third-party management company will be utilized. Their instructions

are not to put up with a lot. They want their projects to be clean, and their people to be well-behaved. They want to be an asset, not a detriment, to the neighborhood.

- Regarding limiting parking, he explained that will come back to the third-party management. He explained there is no way to limit parking, and there will be no assigned parking. He also noted the management company does quarterly checks of the units to make sure nothing is going on inside the units. The management company will stay on top of any issues.
- Regarding screening, the property management company will perform background checks and employment verifications. If the tenants turn out to be troublesome, they will be evicted.

Staff note: There was no additional discussion relevant to the rezoning application.

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Morris, to close the public hearing. The motion passed by a vote of 8-1.

Close Public Hearing

Staff Discussion:

Mr. Nisley asked if there will be any new sidewalks along the neighborhood side of 10th Street.

Ms. Yoder replied those details will be part of the final plans, noting today's plans are preliminary and a traffic analysis hasn't been done yet. She pointed out that once the traffic analysis and final engineering is done, there may be some improvements on 10th Street.

Mr. Corwin asked if the traffic study requires a turn lane and if the setbacks have been reduced, how does that come into play?

Mr. Nisley asked about the location of the sidewalks.

Ms. Yoder replied there is right-of-way there and the sidewalks are proposed within the right-of-way.

Mr. Nisley asked if the sidewalks would have to be removed if a turn lane is required.

Ms. Yoder responded that there is 66' of right-of-way along 10th Street which is quite a bit.

Mr. Nisley voiced concerns that residents along 10th Street might lose parking spaces in front of their homes and they have nowhere else to park. He also pointed out that visitors to the apartment complex might utilize some of those parking spaces. He listed several reasons he feels this project is too big for this property.

Mr. Morris pointed out there is a massive need for housing in Goshen and the only other location for such a project is farmland, which goes against the plan set forth by the City.

Mr. Nisley pointed out there is a lot of farmland owned by developers which is waiting to be developed.

Mr. Morris agreed that there is such property, but asked if we don't want to keep that farmland.

Mr. Worsham stated he lives just outside this area and also deals with the traffic every day. He stated he sometimes has to wait on a train, but said he finds it "no big deal". He also noted that we have a lot more parking than a lot of larger cities and while he has some issues with this development, none of them are about parking. He went on to say if we're going to provide additional housing, close to downtown, parking is something that we'll have to get past. He agreed that farmland outside the City could be used, but it's not realistic to think people will bicycle from outside the City to downtown.

Mr. Morris agreed that he also bikes this path to work and finds it functional. Regarding the stormwater runoff, he feels this is something that can be addressed.

Mr. Holtzinger agreed that additional housing is necessary, but feels this proposal is too dense and parking is insufficient.

Mr. Ortiz stated he likes the concept of this, but points out people will park where it's convenient for them.

Mr. Wellington pointed out parking can be controlled by labeling the spaces on the street and inside the complex.

Action:

A motion was made and seconded, Wellington/Morris, to forward a favorable recommendation for 22-03R to the Goshen Common Council, based on Staff analysis. A rollcall vote was requested with the following outcome: Holtzinger, no; Ortiz, no; Corwin, yes; Lauver, no; Wellington, yes; Manriquez, yes; Morris, yes; Worsham, yes; Nisley, no.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-4.

VI. Audience Items
None

VII. Staff/Board Items
None

VIII. Adjournment – 5:13 pm

Respectfully Submitted:

Lori Lipscomb, Recording Secretary

Approved By:

Richard Worsham, President

Tom Holtzinger, Secretary