

**MINUTES**  
**ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**  
**HELD ON THE 9<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL 2015 AT 9:00 A.M.**  
**MEETING ROOM – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING**  
**4230 ELKHART ROAD, GOSHEN, INDIANA**

1. The regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission was called to order by the Chairperson, Steve Warner, with the following members present: Tony Campanello, Lori Snyder, Steve Warner, Roger Miller, and Tom Stump. Steven Edwards, Jeff Burbrink, Blake Doriot, and Frank Lucchese were absent. Staff members present were: Chris Godlewski, Plan Director; Jason Auvil, Planning Manager; Mark Kanney, Planner; Liz Gunden, Planner; Kathy Wilson, Administrative Manager; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.

2. A motion was made and seconded (*Stump/Campanello*) that the minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2015 be approved as submitted and the motion was carried unanimously.

3. A motion was made and seconded (*Stump/Campanello*) that the Elkhart County Zoning Ordinance and Elkhart County Subdivision Control Ordinance be accepted as evidence for today's hearings. With a unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

4. The application for Primary approval of a two-lot minor subdivision to be known as **CRYSTAL HEIGHTS - HAMPTON INN MINOR SUBDIVISION**, for Amish Hospitality, LLC, represented by Lang, Feeney & Associates, Inc., on property located on the south side and east side of Crystal Heights Boulevard, 270 ft. east of Main Street (SR 13), 750 ft. south of US 20, common address of 105 Crystal Heights Boulevard in Middlebury Township, zoned M-1, was presented at this time.

Mr. Kanney presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #105CRYSTAL HEIGHTS BLVD-150227-1*, adding that the subject area is the site of a Hampton Inn and that the petitioner wants to plat some available space in front as lot 2.

Terry Lang, Lang, Feeney & Associates, Inc., 715 S. Michigan St., South Bend, was present on behalf of the petitioner and said that original site plan approval was for two buildings. One was the hotel now present, and the other was a small strip center in the southwest corner of the subject property. The petitioner, he said, would like to sell proposed lot 1, which features the hotel, and retain proposed lot 2 for future development.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Lori Snyder, that this request for Primary approval of a two-lot minor subdivision to be known as **CRYSTAL HEIGHTS - HAMPTON INN MINOR SUBDIVISION** be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

5. The application for Primary approval of a two-lot minor subdivision to be known as **FARABAUGH MINOR SUBDIVISION**, for Nano Farabaugh represented by Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., on property located on the north side of CR 6, 2,400 ft. east of Ash Road, common address of 30595 CR 6 in Cleveland Township, zoned A-1, was presented at this time.

Ms. Gunden presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #30595CR 6-150227-1*.

Peter Schnaars, Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., 4703 Chester Dr., Elkhart, was present on behalf of the petitioner, owner of the 28-acre subject piece, which features two residences. The petitioner wants to split the piece into two large parcels so that she can secure financing on one, he said.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Roger Miller, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that this request for Primary approval of a two-lot minor subdivision to be known as *FARABAUGH MINOR SUBDIVISION* be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

6. The application for the vacation of a county right-of-way known as County Road 10, for *Karen S. Smaka & Jeffrey K. Smaka* represented by Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., on property that runs east-west direction between CR 23 and SR 15, in Washington Township, zoned A-1, was presented at this time.

Ms. Gunden presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #CR 10-150227-1*.

Mr. Miller asked whether there are any requirements that govern road abandonment and whether the petitioners will have to tear the road up, and Ms. Gunden responded that as far as she knew the road had already been barricaded.

Peter Schnaars, Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., 4703 Chester Dr., Elkhart, who was present on behalf of the petitioners, stated that the SR 15 entrance to CR 10 has been removed and that the subject portion of CR 10 can no longer be used as a through street. Mr. Miller asked whether any problems involving drivers finding a way to use the subject portion of CR 10 could arise, and Mr. Schnaars responded that any such use will soon constitute trespass and that the Smakas will prevent such use using their tractors. Mr. Campanello said that remaining area access to CR 23 from SR 15 is via CR 14, and Mr. Schnaars added that the newly platted Industrial Drive, intended to replace the subject portion of CR 10, will also provide access to CR 23.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Kolbus to comment, and Mr. Kolbus commented only that the petitioners must be aware of any utility easements, which will remain, and must follow the statute. Mr. Campanello asked whether Industrial Drive is built and usable now, and Mr. Kanney responded yes.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tom Stump, **Seconded by** Tony Campanello, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Bristol Town Board that this request for the vacation of a county right-of-way known as County Road 10 for *Karen S. Smaka & Jeffrey K. Smaka* be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

7. The application for a zone map change from M-1 PUD to M-1, for *Grand Design* represented by Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., on property located on the north side of CR 2, 600 ft. west of SR 13, common address of 11333 CR 2 in York Township, was presented at this time.

Mr. Kanney presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #11333CR 2-150227-1*.

Ken Jones, Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., 4703 Chester Dr., Elkhart, who was present on behalf of the petitioner, first clarified for Mr. Campanello that ordinance 95-36 was the original PUD rezoning ordinance. Mr. Campanello then asked what zoning ordinance changes have caused the PUD's current nonconformity, and Mr. Kanney answered that GPUDs and DPUDs did not exist at the time of initial rezoning and that approval of the current petition will remove limitations placed in 1996, which dealt primarily with CR 2 enlargement and reconfiguration. Those have been done, he said. Mr. Kanney and Mr. Jones then indicated areas south and southeast of the subject property not affected by the petition.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tony Campanello, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request for a zone map change from M-1 PUD to M-1 for *Grand Design* be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

\* See items 12 through 14 below for the applications for *D & N Properties, LLC; Millersburg Lumber Co., Inc.; and ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV and REPLAT OF LOT 15A OF ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV*.

#### 8. *Jason Auvil*

Mr. Godlewski at this time introduced Jason Auvil, new Planning Manager and Zoning Administrator and replacement for Mr. Mabry. Mr. Auvil has background working with county plan commissions and boards of zoning appeals, Mr. Godlewski said.

#### 9. *Application Filing Deadline Adherence*

Mr. Godlewski began by noting that in the past the planning department has tried to accommodate petitioners, whether first-time petitioners or regulars, while advertising filing deadline dates as well as possible. The department has also been accepting one or two applications per month after their deadlines. Customer-friendly acts on the front end, however, have caused complications on the back end, which have included an increase of the number of people handling applications.

Applicants filing before a deadline will be heard on the appropriate dates, and applicants filing after a deadline will now no longer be treated as though they filed before a deadline, Mr. Godlewski said. The office is busy, the economy is doing well, and there is no time to route late petitions as though they were timely. While the public might view the change as unfriendly, acceptance of late petitions does the public more of a disservice and creates chaos in the office. Mr. Godlewski also promised a memo to the Plan Commission, BZA, and regular petitioners that will inform them of the change.

Mr. Miller said that petitioners should be provided a schedule showing what is expected of them and when. Mr. Godlewski's response was that the department already does that and can work on it and do it better, agreeing that the more applicants know in advance, the easier the process is for them and the planning staff.

Mr. Godlewski then assured the Board that the staff will continue to help applicants and accept all applications, assigning the appropriate hearing dates to all applications.

Elkhart County should stay one step ahead of other counties as developers decide where to build by being the most business friendly county, said Mr. Campanello, who would hate to turn away developers who might also be considering St. Joseph County, for example. In response, Mr. Godlewski emphasized that while some applicants might experience a delay having missed a deadline, no one will be turned away. He said also that acceptance of a late application requires, in effect, that a whole new process and schedule be set up for the routing of that one application. He asked what message simultaneous schedule adherence and schedule nonadherence sends to the public, and thought that applicants knowing how the process works in Elkhart County, getting in line, getting in order, and thus getting work done was better.

The department will continue to look at its processes to learn how to make them more efficient, he concluded, as this helps the department and eliminates unnecessary work.

#### 10. *Funneling*

Mr. Warner raised the matter of funneling at this time, saying that Mr. Auvil would begin working on it, and Mr. Godlewski said he contacted the plan director of another county that has a funneling ordinance to gain perspective on the issue. Ms. Gunden is modernizing and otherwise updating Subdivision Control Ordinance formatting at this time, he added, and the industrial subdivision and administrative subdivision materials might receive attention as well. He said also that the staff wants to have funneling language written by late spring or early summer 2015.

#### 11. *Illuminated Signs*

Mr. Miller raised the matter of light emitted by electronic signs, which he said should be looked at more as more such signs are installed. Mr. Godlewski responded that illuminated signs are more restricted by the zoning ordinance than nonilluminated ones and asked Mr. Miller whether he thought the restrictions go far enough. Mr. Miller said only that he did not know how other counties and states restrict illuminated signs and noted the popularity of electronic billboards. Mr. Godlewski then mentioned that signs on federal or state roads are regulated by the state and thus require two permits—a local one and a state one. He offered also that the local restrictions on illuminated signs can be reviewed.

12. The application for a zone map change from A-1 to M-1, for *D & N Properties, LLC*, on property located on the east side of CR 29, 1,500 ft. northwest of CR 146, and west side of CR 127, 1,200 ft. north of CR 146, in Jackson Township, was presented at this time.

Ms. Gunden presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #00000CR 29-150302-1*.

Mr. Miller asked whether “we’re classifying warehousing as agricultural now,” and Ms. Gunden replied by summarizing the content of paragraph 2 near the top of Staff Report page 5b. Ms. Snyder asked whether the petitioner will construct a building for inside storage of everything, and Ms. Gunden said that that is the staff’s recommendation. Mr. Stump asked whether a special use was available for the proposed use if the zone remained A-1, and Ms. Gunden and Mr. Kolbus agreed that it was not. A use variance is available, added Mr. Kolbus. Mr. Stump asked whether the special use and the use variance were basically the same thing, and Mr. Kolbus replied that the use variance’s standard is more difficult to meet than that of the special use and that the use variance is requested in cases where the desired use is not allowed in a subject property’s zoning district. Mr. Miller asked whether use variances have time limits, and Mr. Kolbus said that they do when such limits are imposed by the Board of Zoning Appeals. He also confirmed for Mr. Stump that use variances are heard by the BZA, not the Plan Commission.

Rob Martin, Barr Design Group, 502 S. Main St., Goshen, was present on behalf of the petitioner, which owns the subject property. The current location of VBD, Inc., the company that will operate the proposed storage facility, is at the intersection of CR 29 and SR 15 on property zoned “B-3 PUD,” he said, and among use restrictions at that location is one on height of product stored outside.

The business has grown despite poor economic conditions, Mr. Martin continued, and the height restriction is now causing a need for more space. The subject property is close to the current location and offers alleviation of the restriction. The proposed building will house product, but outside storage of product is also needed, the reason for the rezoning request. Though no outside storage is intended within six months to one year of building construction, outside storage is desired in the long term, as the company continues to grow, he said.

The company is willing to mitigate the impact of outside storage by surrounding the outside storage area with the same privacy fence used at its current location. The fence will serve to screen and to secure product, Mr. Martin said.

Mr. Martin then mentioned that while the proposed use at this time is just warehousing, there is potential for product modification onsite, which might involve use of a router line.

Returning to the subject of the privacy fence, Mr. Martin said that the fence can be up to seven ft. tall, if necessary, and that the company prefers not to store product three bundles high. Product stored that high can be seen above the top of a seven-foot fence, but product stored two bundles high cannot. “That would be our concession to allow the outdoor storage—would be that privacy fence totally surrounding it,” he said.

Mr. Campanello stated that semi drivers can enter the subject property from CR 29, which is narrow, and exit onto CR 127. Mr. Martin then assured the Board that the petitioners intend the continued delivery of large bundles of product to the existing facility and that at this time product arriving at the proposed building will be delivered “on their own personal transportation,” not by large semis. Trucks might be used in the future, however, and this is the intent of the drive-through,

Mr. Martin added.

Mr. Miller expressed concern over approval of the petition with a limitation on semi traffic on CR 29 followed by the appearance of unapproved semi traffic. Mr. Campanello said that semi drivers do occasionally use CR 29 as a shortcut to Syracuse. Thus semi drivers use CR 29 “any way you look at it,” he said.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Mr. Stump indicated discomfort over the placement of a manufacturing zone amid a residential and agricultural area, despite CR 29 traffic volume, and surprise over the absence of neighboring property owners from the public hearing, commenting that New Paris Speedway is the area use closest to an industrial use. Mr. Campanello said that the problem is created by the new zoning ordinance and that the old ordinance permitted the proposed use in the A-1 zone. But the proposed use still required a special use in the A-1 zone under the old ordinance, clarified Mr. Kolbus. Ms. Snyder then noted the conflict between staff-recommended commitment 2 and the petitioner’s future desire for outside storage. Mr. Miller also expressed concern over the use conflict at hand and commented that petitioners who have wanted only to place shops on parcels adjacent to those of their existing work locations have had difficulty receiving approval. He warned that the proposed manufacturing zone “will develop into more” and that semi drivers making deliveries will appear later.

Mr. Stump then said that the petition would not bother him as much if the proposed site were closer to the petitioner’s existing location or an existing heavy-use area. Mr. Campanello and Ms. Snyder then received confirmation from Mrs. Wilson of proper public notice. Ms. Snyder asked how far the subject site is from the petitioner’s existing site, and Mr. Campanello and Mr. Miller agreed it is less than five miles away. Ms. Snyder then affirmed the petitioner’s desire to locate the new site on property it already owns but asked whether any appropriately zoned property that lies closer to the existing site was available. Mr. Martin answered that no such property exists and that owners of nearby farmland have declined petitioner offers. The subject parcel, bought at auction, is only a couple of miles down the road from the existing site, said Mr. Martin.

Mr. Miller asked what the use of the property at the northwest corner of the subject property is, and Mr. Martin described it as a home workshop/business for fencing operated by an Amish or Mennonite man. Among activities there is outdoor storage of piles of fence posts, he said.

A native of the subject area, Mr. Martin said he was not surprised by the absence of remonstrators, as the proposed use fits into the area. He offered also that the site has been farmed for a number of years and that the unused portion of it will continue to be farmed.

Mr. Campanello also observed the conflict between staff-recommended commitment 2 and the petitioner’s desire for outside storage, and Mr. Martin’s response was that outdoor storage is among the main reasons for the petition. Outdoor storage is requested at the subject location to enable the petitioner to continue to be a good neighbor and honor commitments at its current location, he explained.

Mr. Warner asked Mr. Martin to comment on traffic expectations, and Mr. Martin said there would be very little traffic. No employee will be onsite initially, he said, and perhaps one or two employees will be onsite after one or two years. He described the subject property as a staging area with no customer pickup and emphasized that the manufacture and modification is at the existing

CR 29 location.

Mr. Warner then likened the proposed use to a large farm shop with little traffic. Mr. Martin expressed willingness to commit to limitations on traffic and employee numbers and offered that privacy fencing is easy for the petitioner to install. He also confirmed for Mr. Campanello that the property will feature a gate on CR 29 and one on CR 127.

Mr. Miller reminded Mr. Martin that M-1 is a manufacturing zone. Mr. Martin agreed and said that discussion between planning staff and him resulted in a determination that a request to rezone to M-1 was appropriate. Mr. Campanello received confirmation from the rest of the Board of the effect of staff-recommended commitment 1.

Mr. Warner asked whether the proposed use has the potential to grow into something like A & R Machine Shop. Mr. Miller said it does, but Ms. Snyder and Mr. Campanello said it does not, because of staff-recommended commitment 1.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tony Campanello, **Seconded by** Steve Warner, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that this request for a zone map change from A-1 to M-1 for *D & N Properties, LLC*, be approved with the following commitments:

1. Permitted uses are limited to warehousing and storage.
2. Outside storage is permitted and shall be screened by a solid vinyl fence, seven feet tall, completely surrounding the outside storage area.

**Vote:** Motion failed (**summary:** Yes = 2, No = 3, Abstain = 0).

**Yes:** Steve Warner, Tony Campanello.

**No:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Tom Stump.

*\* It is noted that after the above motion and second but before the above vote, Mr. Stump stated preference for tabling to the next meeting of the Plan Commission, when more members would be present to hear the petition.*

**Motion: Action:** Table, **Moved by** Tony Campanello, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission table this request for a zone map change from A-1 to M-1 for *D & N Properties, LLC*, to the May 14, 2015, meeting of the Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

13. The application for a zone map change from B-3/A-1 to B-3, for *Millersburg Lumber Co., Inc.*, represented by AR Engineering, LLC, on property located on the west side of Jackson Street (SR 13), 500 ft. south of CR 42, common address of 215 S. Jackson Street in Benton Township, was presented at this time.

Ms. Gunden presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #215SJacksonSt-150302-1*.

Andrew Rosell, AR Engineering, 24554 44th Ave., Mattawan, Michigan, indicated he was present on behalf of Millersburg Lumber Co. and Millersburg Partners. Mr. Miller stated that “that property” has been vacant as long as he could remember, and Mr. Rosell responded that the company is situated at the rear of the parcel and that the cell tower is situated at center, confirming

that the portion of the site near SR 13 has been vacant.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

Ms. Snyder observed the adjacency of the portion of the parcel zoned A-1 and the portion zoned B-3, commenting that rezoning makes sense.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tom Stump, **Seconded by** Tony Campanello, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Millersburg Town Council that this request for a zone map change from B-3/A-1 to B-3 for *Millersburg Lumber Co., Inc.*, be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

14. The applications for a major amendment to an existing Detailed Planned Unit Development E-3 to be known as *ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV* and for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development E-3 known as *REPLAT OF LOT 15A OF ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV*, for Ludwig Investments, Inc., represented by Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., on property located on the southwest corner of CR 6 and CR 17, in Osolo Township, zoned DPUD E-3, were presented at this time.

Mr. Kanney presented the Staff Reports/Staff Analyses, which are attached for review as *Case #00000ELKHART EAST BLVD.-150227-1* and *Case #00000ELKHART EAST BLVD.-150227-2*.

Mr. Kolbus asked whether Mr. Kanney had copies of ordinance section 3.5.2 available for the Board members, who should see what they are being asked to waive. Mr. Kanney did not, but responded that the petition is an attempt to streamline a process. An application for a DPUD, in the past, had to be submitted for each site on the subject property before building permit issuance. Approval of the current petition would allow the planning staff to authorize a project based on PUD and zoning ordinance standards with no public hearing requirement. He described the process until now as a stumbling block for the developer. Mr. Kolbus asked Mr. Kanney whether the staff is comfortable with the change to the process, and Mr. Kanney said yes.

Addressing Secondary approval, Mr. Kanney said that the petitioner would like to begin work on a significant building on lot 15, which has frontage on the cul-de-sac at the intersection of Challenger Dr. and Discovery Dr. and will be a buildable tract following Plan Commission approval. The building will constitute an expansion for a company already present at the subject area. Building and site plans have been submitted, which include landscaping and building height details, and the project appears to be in order, he said. Elkhart East's own requirements, which have been adopted as part of the PUD, are quite stringent, he added, and project compliance review is performed by the planning staff and Elkhart East.

Mr. Kanney mentioned also that the development is on city sewer and that new signalized entrances will be built on CR 6 and CR 17.

Ken Jones, Jones Petrie Rafinski Corp., 4703 Chester Dr., Elkhart, who was present on behalf of the petitioner, agreed that permission to omit detailed site plans "in this particular activity" made sense and that the requirements of the PUD ordinance have been cumbersome. Such



permission has been given before, he said, for Parkway at 17 and Elkhart East Area 'B.' The change allows the project review process to begin with the staff, whom he commended and who he said will provide quality review.

Mr. Warner asked whether Endeavor Dr. will require a new CR 17 curb cut, and Mr. Jones replied that new approaches from CR 17 and CR 6 are planned, but "that isn't new." "Those have been planned since . . . 2001 in the original approval," he said, and the details for them are now being brought forward.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Stump*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said requests and after due consideration and deliberation:

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tony Campanello, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the request for a major amendment to an existing Detailed Planned Unit Development E-3 to be known as ***ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV*** be approved in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

**Motion: Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Tony Campanello, **Seconded by** Tom Stump, that the Advisory Plan Commission approve the request for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development E-3 known as ***REPLAT OF LOT 15A OF ELKHART EAST AREA 'D' - PHASE IV*** in accordance with the Staff Analysis.

**Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (**summary:** Yes = 5).

**Yes:** Lori Snyder, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Tom Stump, Tony Campanello.

Following voting, Mr. Kolbus commented that other jurisdictions use staff-only review similar to that approved today for building projects on lots in industrial subdivisions. The process works very well, as long as the staff has access to applicable standards.

Rob Letherman, Northland Corporation, PO Box 1322, Elkhart, then came forward and stated that in 2001 Elkhart East agreed to Plan Commission approval of the first three or four buildings, which was to set the tone for project approval. But a 2009 change led to a requirement for Plan Commission approval of all building projects. The change added a delay of 30 to 60 days, he said. Mr. Godlewski reminded him that project observation of DPUD standards will still be required, though the change made today sets the tone of the review process subsequently.

## 15. *Planning Calendar*

Mr. Warner at this time asked Mr. Godlewski to say why a new planning calendar was issued. Mr. Godlewski summarized that the new calendar contains the correct date of Good Friday, April 3, 2015, and, as the result of an update, the correct day of each month of the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission, the first Thursday, beginning May 2015.

16. The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Warner at 10:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Daniel Dean, Recording Secretary

---

Steve Warner, Chairman