

**Town of Cedar Lake – Plan Commission
Work Session Minutes
September 4, 2013**

Call to Order: 7:10 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present	Jim Hunley Member	Present	Donald Oliphant Town Engineer
Present	Julie Rivera Member	Absent	Jeff Lowe Building Commissioner
Present	Greg Parker Member	Absent	Tim Kuiper Town Attorney
Absent	Robert Carnahan Member	Present	Jessica Chick Recording Secretary
Present	Tim Kubiak Member	Absent	Diane Cusack Member
Present	John Foremen Member	Present	Ian Nicolini Town Manager

Minutes:

1. Approval of August 28, 2013 Public Meeting
Deferred till the next meeting.

Old Business

1. BP-Preliminary Plat Review & Site Plan Review

Owner: Herman Fisher, 7404 E. Plank Trail, Frankfort, IL 60423 and Wayne Baringman
Petitioner: Cleon Stutler, 2155 Willowcreek, Road, Portage, IN 46368
Vicinity: 13302 Wicker Ave., Cedar Lake, IN 46303
Request: Petitioner is requesting a preliminary Plat review to establish a one (1) lot subdivision and site plan review for a gas station/convenience store and car wash.

- (1) Petitioner's Comments: not present.
- (2) Town Engineer's Comments: Many of the comments are outstanding issues that he not yet been addressed by BP. Since the title work is still missing there is not yet enough information to put together a plat document. An existing site plan and a proposed site plan have been submitted.
- (3) Building Department's Comments: The review letter had been received by the petitioner from Burke Engineering; there are still the Building Commissioner's outstanding comments that need to be corrected. It is up to BP to make the needed revisions and to include the items that are missing.
- (4) Commission's Discussion: none.

2. Monastery South Concept Plan

Owner: Monastery Woods Development, LLC, 131 Ridge Rd., Munster, IN 46321
Petitioner: McFarland Homes VI, LLC, 2300 Ramblewood Dr., Suite A, Highland, IN 46322
Vicinity: Monastery South Development

- (1) Petitioner's Comments: Richard Anderson is present to represent McFarland Homes. Monastery Woods is located at 129th and Parrish; it is an existing subdivision which was approved back in 2008 by V3 with two different zonings an RT and RM. The RM is the townhouses and the RT is the paired villas. The current subdivision consists of townhouses and villas; we would like to change to townhouses into patio homes. We have found that there is more of a desire for patio homes in this subdivision. The townhomes were seventeen hundred (1,700) square feet and the new proposed units

will be fourteen to eighteen hundred (1,400-1,800) square feet with a four hundred (400) square foot garage. They will be nice size units that will sell between one hundred and eighty-five thousand and two hundred and twenty thousand dollars (\$185,000-\$220,000). The value will be higher than the current townhomes which will bring up the average price in the subdivision while reducing the number of units from sixty six (66) to forty eight (48). We think this is the right product in this area at this time. We had met with the Town Manager and the Building Commissioner to discuss zoning categories because the town does not have a patio ordinance. RT would give us the right to construct duplexes which we do not need. We are proposing that we will go into a rezoning of R2 as the first part of the plan. The second part of the plan would be to amend the plat we would have rezoning, downzoning, down to the R2, then have a plat amendment because we will have to change the lot lines. There will still be an association to take care of everything. We will then need three (3) variances. There is a ninety (90) foot front yard ordinance for a R2 single family home, and we would need a variance because we only have fifty (50) feet. A footprint that fits most of the lots at sixty-five (65) by forty (40) which is twenty six hundred (2,600) square feet. In the footprint of every lot proposed it will fit within the ordinance. The third request in the plat amendment would be the lot coverage. We are trying to create the patio home design by using the variances, plat amendment, and by keeping the zoning at single family R2. It will be the same builder and increase the values in general while reducing the units from sixty six (66) to forty eight (48). The side yards in an R2 are eight (8) feet and they are normally five (5) feet in patio homes. Discussed previously was a want for a walking path, we are proposing providing an easement then the path would follow through to the schools property. We are here today at the work session for feedback of our model, with your feedback we can incorporate what is said for October's meeting. There are three (3) lots that are triangular, nineteen (19), thirty-three (33), and thirty-seven (37). These lots do fit the sixty-five (65) by one hundred (100) footprints.

- (2) Town Engineer's Comments: refer comments above and below.
- (3) Building Department's Comments: refer to comments above and below.
- (4) Commission's Discussion: This is the first time this company will construct patio homes. Regarding the walking path, the plan proposed is a better location then previously discussed. It is not putting a trail in between two existing units. This is giving the opportunity to improve the path as a part of the new development. So when someone purchases the home they will know what they are getting. It is believed that McFarland will sell more houses the sooner the walking path is completed because of the easy access to Strack and Van Til and the new library. The diversity in the housing stock of this subdivision allows for an esthetic benefit by reducing density as well as impacting values for the better. This seems like a much better plan then what was previously presented and in the economy it will be marketed better. The demographics are the same as a paired villa there is just no adjoining wall. The temporary sales trailer is moving out to make way for a model. Lot thirty-seven (37) has no rear yard; it would be nice to see if the houses could fit around that corner a little nicer. It appears, regarding lot thirty-three (33), that you can turn that house so it fits better around the corner. A basement can be added to the patio homes as well as the options for a front and back porch. Lot 315 is a drainage detention utility and access easement area. The paired

villas are doing well, so there is most likely not the chance of the request to convert other homes to patio style. The whole subdivision has already been platted; therefore construction of roads can begin at any time. A walkway will be shown on the design; dimensions are currently unknown on hang. It will most likely be dedicated as right of way therefore it will be public property. If it is an out lot it could possibly go to tax sale. It is a recommendation per Town Manager, Ian Nicolini, to have the walkway platted as public right of way and improved as a part of their development. It is currently considered an access easement.

Correspondence: none.

Public Comment: none.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned approximately 7:40 p.m.

Press Session: Plan Commission Public Meeting- September 18, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Hunley

Greg Parker

Diane Cusack

Robert H. Carnahan

Julie Rivera

Tim Kubiak

John Foreman

Attest: _____
Jessica Chick, Recording Secretary