

# Morgan County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes

**Date / Time:** Thursday, November 13, 2008 @ 6:30 PM

**Location:** County Administration Building

**Attendees:** Melanie Depoy, Eleza Durnal, Kenny Hale, Mark Hensley, Brian Love, Jeff Pipkin, Paul Prather, Charlene Pugh, Jeff Quayle, Barry Stafford, John Trimpe  
EGT: Scott Burgins, Erin Shane, Cory Whitesell

Scott went thru agenda noting future meeting dates. He introduced the concept of development principles as links between the vision statement and goals/objectives. These statements are convenient for plan commissioners to use. Notes from the development principles:

- For the Manufacturing and Industrial section – add Interstates 37 and 70, railroads too
- Some committee members do not think the county needs multifamily, while others do. It was noted that apartments are important because need somewhere for young professionals to live - they don't want to live at home but not ready to buy a house
- The committee noted that they need to have nice apartments – they have a lot of rentals – but they are like duplexes, old homes and older apt complexes
- The committee agreed to add - however focus should be on quality higher end housing and multifamily towards the cities and towns
- Image – and existing residents and homes need to do more to raise the aesthetic quality

Goals – Scott noted that he did not change the major goals but revised objectives

Goal 1:

- Jeff
- Transferable rights – to get one big park instead of having a lot of little parks – can we do that locally?
- Steep slope ordinances

Goal 2

- Impact fees – have to have all these updated things (CP, CIP, a board for it etc)
- Impact fees can only be specified for 5-6 things - have to prove why we have fee – have to prove that we spent x to get the infrastructure here so you have to pay x to use it; schools is a little bit harder to determine

- How do we feel about impact fees?
- What about eminence and paragon – what are you going to do w/ these towns? Are you going to help them – and let them grow? Or let them run down more and more?; no answers tonight
- Transportation studies and financial impact statements are for developments that are larger scale; we have some of this already in the sub ord –

Goal 3 –

- Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> objective to read new biz parks – not A biz park
- There could be some development on I70 – but this is also near AG area
- Could say – support this park and others where infrastructure is available

Goal 3 –

- tough / tougher /toughest – will provide layout for design standards

Goal 4

- house study – may want to do one b/c figure out where you are – see all of the apts along 37 – if I69 comes – you can expect more of the same

Goal 5

- add express bus service to indy – after the interurban on the objective #2
- support the movement of commercial goods to and thru appropriate areas of the county – why did we get rid of this? Needs to be re-worded?
- County does have a road by road ordinance for what can be on them – but there is not a scientific methodology to it

Goal 8

- council of govts – are we talking formal – Kenny – we just need to talk more; quarterly or whatever – but HB 1001 will make us do this;
- so should we use council of govts – or another synonym – yes
- we need quarterly meeting b/t all of us –
- Kenny – it needs to be a networking – not necessarily a formal council of govts
- we can study the council of governments

- we can find case history of more informal govts – and we can offer up a description of how to do a council of governments
- we need to figure out how –
- there are some other entities that can run with this – the ED and community foundations can run this and shepard this thru
- **roundtable of governments** – you can bring in people for training, speaking – etc – better name for it. This needs to involve public participation or public comment
- 
- 
- 

#### Goal 9

- words like encourage or explore are weak – Melanie –
- counties property taxes have been reduced – tax abatements – have to be tightened up – maybe from 10 years to 8 years – give another year to the tax abatement if do a LEED building or something –so reduce the tax abatement then give back for environmental
- 

Is the flagstaff biz park area protected from residential? Can we expand this to allow for more biz?

**How do we address the existing businesses and make sure that they know that they have been evaluated and protected? How do they know that they are being protected and addressed?** We have to let them know that we are working for them.

Scott will work on language and will drop into goal 2 or 3

Cory went thru the corridor plan

Cory Working south to north – going up 37

- 1<sup>st</sup> intersection - Paragon road – grade separation – overpass or underpass – need frontage roads to get to areas around here
  - Indot only wants once interchange at paragon or liberty church – corridor plan group wants it at liberty church w/ a biz park there
- Three interchange in Martinsville

- 39 – land uses around there will stay same
- Ohio – harmon becker site will benefit from this interchange; at walmart – it is important for a pedestrian connection and high school – grade separation to connect South street w/ grand valley blvd
- 252 / 44 – new interchange b/t the two w/ new roads; high quality commercial in this area with mixed use on fringe – to comm/resid
- (Nothing on Burton – grade separation)
- North of Martinsville
  - 2 grade separations – peters and myra road? – we recommend and agree w/ this
  - We don't know how frontage roads will be developed as of yet b/c too many options w/ INDOT
- Interchange at Egbert or Henderson Ford –
  - We recommend Henderson ford – b/c can jog and run into Centennial
  - Egbert would remain a grade separation
  - Land uses would be commercial development - should not be developed until utilities are there
  - Reason for commercial? - interchange and b/c of north/south access w/ Henderson Ford
  - This has the most opportunity to go bad or good – you will need to continue to evaluate
  - Someone who develops there – b/c there is no infrastructure – would have to put a lot of \$ - so more than likely only commercial would be viable
- Harris Starlight / Stonebridge / Waverly /
- Big Bend – not on INDOT plans for interchange – it's in thoroughfare plan for an interchange
  - Otherwise it's 8 miles from 144 and Henderson ford
  - Stonebridge is lobbying for it
  - Now that Stonebridge is a plat – INDOT has to consider it in their environmental assessment
  - CP group is welcome to come to the Jan 28th corridor mtg – we will have indot there.
- Waverly – biz park – but you don't have immediate access to I69 – so have to work w/ Johnson county to make it successful
- 144 – separate set of goals for 144 – small commercial at kitchen – but most everything else will be resid – and road will be improved.

East / west connectivity – 144; how about Hadley road – the MPO plan does include Hadley road crossing river tying into smith valley; Kenny – that is in thoroughfare plan already – so landersdale and Hadley need to come together and tie in w/ smith valley. There is a **heron rookery** on the river near here – so be aware of that –

So we will have text re: policy, land uses, utilities, etc – w/ these interchanges.

Preferred agricultural – this should include floodplains – cory – this is not all of the floodplains

Jeff Quayle - b/c 37 is so important for county – we don't want to have gravel pits visible from the highway – or other commercial uses

The one new thing that is a mix b/t ag and non ag – is rural residential area – you would have to a conservation subdivision – you would have to look at different densities – less if no have utilities / more density if connect to utilities

Isn't most of the RR area already built out? Extend RR to cover some developments that are already there – cory noted on map

Paul – I see problems w/ the existing businesses – b/c they are getting cut off – we need to be prepared to address these issues at the public meeting

Land uses –

Barry - How specific we have been w/ industrial / pud / institutional - can there not be a note – that preference is given after certain distance? Jeff – it is a living/breathing document and when it depends on what the PO want to do.

Cory – this is the level of detail we need to be at – we decided at the corridor mtg we decided that we wanted to go somewhat generic and just provide text about what we wanted, not necessarily graphically.

Section b/t railroad tracks / and 69

- Last thing – Little Point – new CSA
- Jeff - Try not let development happen on south – try to have it on north
- Major problem w/ indot giving access to property in this area
- How is sewer here? Kenny – monster ones here? Kenny?
- Little point is 15 years away – head it towards distribution point long term
- Most the area is Biz and industrial
- It mostly zoned B3 now
- W

- Will check in w/ you over the holidays via email – draft in janruy