

MINUTES
COLUMBIA CITY PLAN COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING

September 8, 2020

7:00 p.m.

Whitley County Government Center
Meeting Room A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT

Larry Weiss, President
Patrick Zickgraf, Vice Pres.
Doug Graft
Don Langeloh
Dennis Warnick
Dan Weigold

MEMBERS ABSENT

Walt Crowder
Chip Hill
Jon Kissinger

STAFF

Nathan Bilger

ATTORNEY

(absent)

AUDIENCE MEMBERS

Two visitors registered their attendance at the meeting. The signed guest list is kept on record/attached to these minutes. There was no audience on the webcast.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Weiss called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Bilger read the roll call with members present and absent listed above.

CONSIDERATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Bilger explained that the previous meeting minutes had not yet been completed and would need to be considered at a later meeting.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The oath was not administered since the agenda items would be discussed as

OLD BUSINESS

20-C-ZOA-1, Amendment to the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Access and Connectivity

20-C-ZOA-2, Amendment to the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Updates and Modifications

Mr. Weiss opened discussion of both of these items. Mr. Bilger stated that these would require formal action to continue the public hearings, but that could occur after discussion.

Mr. Bilger proceeded to highlight changes suggested by the City Engineer that had been discussed in the past month by the ad hoc review committee, with the following being the principal topics discussed in depth by the Commission.

The purpose of Section 4.11, Fencing, was questioned. Mr. Bilger suggested that the requirements were not clear and possibly conflicted with existing zoning code fence regulations. Mr. Graft was concerned that removal of the section would allow any type of fence in a subdivision, which led to a discussion of what this section was supposed to regulate. Mr. Bilger suggested that trimming the section to allow the Commission the authority to require fencing as needed may be all that would be required. The final provision that fencing would not be placed in easements without Board of Works would also be retained.

The purpose and requirements for temporary cul-de-sacs were also discussed at length. It was suggested that gravel temporary cul-de-sacs may be used only for a period of up to three years, unless extended by the Commission, with a paved temporary cul-de-sac, specifications to be determined, installed after that. This would be similar to what was agreed to in the recent Ravenwood II subdivision. Further discussion about applicability and specifications will need to occur.

Whether including street standards for roundabouts was discussed, with a consensus that there are too many variables to appropriately design a roundabout by standard and specification. A statement that roundabouts would be designed on a case-by-case basis may be inserted to show that they were contemplated in the code.

Finally, Mr. Bilger outlined the purpose of standard 14 on Chapter 4, Page 47, as providing for a wider, but not deeper, street pavement specification for through local streets. He drew attention to the undefined term “high-density subdivision” as being subjective. After discussion about how the zoning code regulates density by means of lot area and dimensions, and how density may be misleading, Mr. Graft suggested replacing the term with some ratio of number of lots to the number of access points. Further consideration would be given to the number of lots in future connected developments.

Switching to the staff’s proposed changes for access and connectivity, Mr. Bilger asked for any comments. Mr. Weiss offered that the Commission should be able to hold a developer accountable for when the maximum number of lots allowed on one entrance would be met. For example, it is not the intention to allow subdivisions to use one entrance only up to the final section when another entrance would be added. Mr. Bilger suggested that adding a requirement to submit a proposed sectionalization plan at the primary plat stage would aid in assuring that the right number of entrance points would be planned for. This would set expectations for the developer and be an opportunity to discuss any need for waivers. Mr. Michel suggested that knowing at least proposed sections at the beginning could also help in appropriately designing infrastructure.

Brooks Langeloh asked about why 40 lots could be on one entrance, but 41 to infinity lots could be on just two. This was discussed. Mr. Bilger suggested that the 40 number would allow a convenient number of lots in the first section or two of a typical subdivision, but it was not an absolute number. He also stated that the purpose of the number was to have a threshold at which subdivisions would be required to have at least two paths of egress for the majority of lots. Additional thresholds may be desirable for larger subdivisions, either based on lot count or area.

There being no additional discussion on the amendments, Mr. Langeloh made a motion to continue both 20-C-ZOA-1 and 20-C-ZOA-2 to the next meeting. Mr. Zickgraf seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business, Mr. Weiss declared the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.