

PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF DECATUR
MINUTES

September 15, 2015

A meeting of the Decatur Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Engle at 4:50 pm on Tuesday, September 15, 2015 at City Hall, 172 N 2nd St, Decatur IN 46733.

Present at the meeting were: Barbara Engle, Tyler Fullenkamp, Steve Hakes, Larry Isch, Bill Karbach, Greg Kitson, Jack Macklin, Nate Rumschlag - City Engineer, and Dennis Scheumann. Also in attendance were Tim Baker - City Attorney, Roger Gage – Superintendent, and Sharon Braun - Assistant.

Upon motion by Isch, seconded by Rumschlag, the minutes of the July 21, 2015 meeting were approved as presented. Motion carried, 8-0.

Upon motion by Macklin, seconded by Karbach, the proof of publication for the September 15, 2015 meeting was approved as presented. Motion carried, 8-0.

Upon motion by Hakes, seconded by Isch, the Affidavit of Notice to Adjoining Property Owners for Gilpin's petition was made a matter of record. Motion carried, 8-0.

The first applicant before the Plan Commission was Gilpin Inc, 1819 Patterson, Decatur IN 46733, requesting site plan review for an 80x126 cold storage warehouse at their facility. Gilpin was represented by Brett Miller, MLS Engineering, 221 Tower Dr, Monroe IN 46772.

Miller explained Gilpin's proposal --

- 80x125 warehouse to be built directly south of their existing building
- pole barn type construction with overhead doors
- will be used for cold storage of steel items
- no storm water runoff plan is required
- will extend gravel drive for access to new building

Questions from the board were as follows --

- height of walls, 16 feet
- this is an accessory structure, will not modify the existing facilities
- electric only, no plumbing
- industrial zoning allows for flexibility, no light shading or landscape screening is required
- no security exterior lighting is required, just light at building entrance

Chairperson Engle asked for any comments from the audience, in favor or opposed, with no response.

Plan Commission members also stated they had no further questions.

Upon motion by Macklin, seconded by Hakes, the Plan Commission granted final site plan approval as submitted for the proposed project at 1819 Patterson St, Decatur IN 46733, for Gilpin Inc. Motion carried, 8-0.

The next item on the agenda was Nate Rumschlag's presentation of the 2015 Decatur Land Use Ordinance. Board members were provided with an outline detailing the steps for development of subdivisions and the permitting process. Following the slide presentation, board members were asked to review the material for further discussion.

Following explanation, Baker presented a petition to the Plan Commission members for their recommendation to City Council to adopt the amendment of the Decatur IN zoning map to be consistent with the text of the Decatur Code of Ordinances of 2015.

Upon motion by Macklin, seconded by Hakes, the Plan Commission made request for a petition to adopt the language for the zoning map to be consistent with the Decatur Code of Ordinances of 2015. Motion carried, 8-0.

Upon motion by Rumschlag, seconded by Karbach, the Plan Commission approved the petition for recommendation to City Council to adopt the amendment of the Decatur IN zoning map. Motion carried, 8-0.

(Copy attached)

Chairman Engle called for old business, with no response.

Chairman Engle called for new business.

Gage explained a situation of on-going complaints received about a business being operated in a residential zoning at 839 N 10th Street. The building (being used for the business) was originally built for the owner's personal use. As the owner aged, his son began to work on his personal vehicles in the building, then friends' vehicles, and then grew into a business, which is the owner's livelihood.

Baker explained the problem now is that the business doesn't conform to the definition of a home occupation, and to rezone would be contrary to the city's land use ordinance which discourages spot zoning. The home occupation would require a variance and special exception but would allow the board more discretion in placing restrictions on the use, while rezoning would open multiple future uses.

Baker cautioned the board that no discussion could take place because the case was pending, but asked for their opinion as to which direction to take. The board briefly discussed what enforcement policies are in place. Baker responded that currently the city's only option would be litigation, which takes time and money.

There being no further business to come before the board, upon motion by Karbach, seconded by Isch, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15pm. Motion carried, 8-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Braun
Recording Secretary