

**DELAWARE-MUNCIE METROPOLITAN PLAN COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 2025 REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
AGENDA**

DATE: February 6, 2025

PLACE: Commissioners' Court Room
3rd Floor, Delaware County
Building

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

Stephen Brand	Chris Smith	
Nate Carroll	Jerry Dishman	Michelle Owen
Dustin Clark	Teresa Hensley*	Rickie Sipe
	Jesse Landess	

Advisory Members

Tom Borchers	Justin Curley	Adam Leach
--------------	---------------	------------

MINUTES: Consideration of the January 2025 regular meeting minutes.

OLD BUSINESS:

MPC 03-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Mary Phillips, Calvin Carroll, and Amy Spangler**, 2524 South Macedonia Avenue., Muncie, Indiana, 47302, requesting a change in zone from the BV Variety Business Zone to the R-3 Residence Zone on premises located at 2524 South Macedonia Avenue, Muncie Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

NEW BUSINESS:

MPC 04-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Michael Lunsford**, 2701 West Jackson Street, requesting a change in zone from the R-4 Residence Zone to the BV Variety Business Zone on premises located at 2810 West Ethel Avenue, Muncie, IN 47304, as more accurately described in the application.

MPC 05-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Drake Properties I LLC-Donna Drake**, P.O. Box 96, Eaton, IN, 47338, requesting a change in zone from the R-3 Residence Zone to the BC Community Business Zone on premises located at the 3700 Blk E Centennial Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

MPC 01-25A Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of a Resolution of Approval for the 2024 Zone Map Changes to the Official Zone Maps for Muncie, Indiana.

MPC 02-25A Jurisdiction: County Commissioners

Being a consideration of a Resolution of Approval for the 2024 Zone Map Changes to the Official Zone Maps for Delaware County, Indiana.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

DIRECTOR’S REPORT:

ADJOURNMENT:

**DELAWARE-MUNCIE METROPOLITAN PLAN COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 2025 REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING
MINUTES**

The Delaware-Muncie Metropolitan Plan Commission held its regular monthly meeting on Thursday February 6, 2025 at 6:00 P.M., in the Commissioners Court Room of the Delaware County Building, Muncie, Indiana. President Chris Smith called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

Ms. Swackhamer called roll and the following members were present: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Absent: Mr. Borchers, Mr. Curley, Ms. Hensley, and Mr. Leach. Also present: Mr. Wright, attorney for the Board.

MINUTES:

Ms. Owen made a motion to approve the January 2025 regular meeting minutes. Mr. Brand seconded the motion, with a correction on page 9, that he commented 1-foot candle, not 1/10 foot candle. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, and Ms. Smith. Voting against: None. Abstaining: Ms. Sipe. Motion carried, January 2025 minutes approved with amendments.

OLD BUSINESS:

MPC 03-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Mary Phillips, Calvin Carroll, and Amy Spangler**, 2524 South Macedonia Avenue., Muncie, Indiana, 47302, requesting a change in zone from the BV Variety Business Zone to the R-3 Residence Zone on premises located at 2524 South Macedonia Avenue, Muncie Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Randy Phillips, 3901 S. Meeker St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared to represent his wife, Mary Phillips. He stated that they had a first time buyer lined up to purchase this property, but the FHA loan would not allow the loan since the property was in a commercial zone. He stated that they wanted to rezone to residential so that the loan can go through for them to purchase the property.

Ms. Sipe stated that as a realtor, this was standard procedure, and they would need to rezone to residential to obtain a loan.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that some type of verification had been needed to show that Mary and Randy Phillips were authorized to sign for the Sunset Property Management LLC, and that had been received.

Mr. Smith stated that Ms. Phillips name was listed on the application, but no where else in the paperwork, and this clarified that issue.

Mr. Dishman asked what type of business had been here previously.

Mr. Phillips stated that Bob Marshall had owned the property, and it had been a business for many years.

Mr. Dishman made a motion for a favorable recommendation for MPC 03-25Z requesting a change in zone from the BV Variety Business Zone to the R-3 Residence Zone. Mr. Brand seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Voting against: None. Motion carried, a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for their meeting on March 3, 2025.

NEW BUSINESS:

MPC 04-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Michael Lunsford**, 2701 West Jackson Street, requesting a change in zone from the R-4 Residence Zone to the BV Variety Business Zone on premises located at 2810 West Ethel Avenue, Muncie, IN 47304, as more accurately described in the application.

David Carnes, attorney with Dennis, Wegner, and Abrell, 324 W. Jackson St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared to represent the applicant. He stated that this building was constructed around 1966 and was originally a commercial building with medical offices. He stated that Mr. Lunsford and his wife had purchased the property in 1999, and it contained 9 different retail and office spaces. He stated that Mr. Lunsford was selling the property to an investor and it would remain the similar type of commercial uses, and they would like to change the zoning.

Mr. Brand asked if rezoned, would the new owner be requesting any variances.

Mr. Carnes stated no. He did not believe they would be changing the current uses, and that they had just replaced the roof.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Brand made a motion for a favorable recommendation for MPC 04-25Z requesting a change in zoning from the R-4 Residence Zone to the BV Variety Business Zone. Mr. Carroll seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Voting against: None. Motion carried, a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for introduction at their March 3, 2025 meeting.

MPC 05-25Z Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of an appeal filed by **Drake Properties I LLC-Donna Drake**, P.O. Box 96, Eaton, IN, 47338, requesting a change in zone from the R-3 Residence Zone to the BC Community Business Zone on premises located at the 3700 Blk E Centennial Avenue, Muncie, Indiana, as more accurately described in the application.

Kathy Vannice, Ashton Land Surveyor, 325 W. Washington St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared to represent the applicant. She stated that the application requested a change to the BV Variety Business Zone, not the Community Business Zone as read.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that was an error on the agenda, and that the application did state BV Variety Business Zone as the request.

Ms. Vannice stated that the purpose of the rezoning would be for the owner to store building materials on this site, which was allowed under the Variety Business Zone. She stated that Drake Properties purchased neglected properties and rehab and remodel them so that they could be livable again. She stated that she had provided pictures of homes all within Delaware County that Drake Properties had remodeled, and that the assessed value of all of those homes was just under \$5,000,000 for 2024. She stated that on this site, the house had been remodeled and before it was sold, the barn did not go with the property containing the home. She stated that the barn was in poor condition before that time, and that Drake Properties had remodeled it, and would like to use it as a storage location for her materials between remodel jobs. She stated that they would need to ask for variances if the rezoning was granted. She stated that a corridor requirement was for a building to be at 20' of the right of way, and the barn was back 200' from the right of way. She stated that the east adjoining parcel was zoned Variety Business Zone, so this would not be considered spot zoning. She stated that since the previous request they had added a fence around the property along the residential sides, and they had intentions of placing landscaping with some trees along the fence as well.

Mr. Brand stated for clarification, the original request in October received a 0-7 unfavorable recommendation, and was forwarded to City Council. He stated that he had attended the City Council meeting and asked Mr. Dishman to remind the Board of the concerns that were brought about hazardous materials, and maybe trucks driving over a neighbors' septic lines.

Mr. Dishman stated that at City Council he had asked about the possible tankers.

Mr. Brand asked if there was any hazardous material.

Mr. Dishman stated so far no.

Mr. Clark stated that he believed there had been discussion of contractors or maybe pest control cutting the corner and driving in the neighbor's yard causing some ruts in the yard.

Ms. Vannice stated that there had been a pest control company that cut through the yard not realizing they had crossed the property line, and they had since adding the rocks for the driveway and the fence to make it very clear how to get to the barn without driving on the neighboring property.

Mr. Dishman stated that the request had been tabled at City Council.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that the request had first been heard in October, was forwarded to City Council for their November meeting, and had come back to Plan Commission in January to request a rehearing of the request. She stated that the Board had granted the rehearing, and that was the point in the process where we were today. She stated that the packet the Board had been provided

for the current request included all of the emails from the first request, minutes from City Council's meeting, and a follow up email from the neighbor. She stated that the topic of the tankers and oil concerns were in regards to the property to the east which was owned by a someone else, and was already zoned Variety Business.

Mr. Clark asked if the owner had reached out to the neighbors.

Zach Crouch, 105 W. Church St., Hartford City, Indiana, appeared. He stated that he was here to speak as a proxy for Ms. Drake who was unable to attend. He stated that he had talked to the neighbor to make sure that things were going well, and that the last time they spoke was in October, and that the neighbor had not reported any complaints at that time. He stated that they had tried to do everything within their power to make things right moving forward, and correct any issues.

Ms. Sipe asked if they had corrected all of the neighbors' concerns.

Mr. Crouch stated yes, to his knowledge they had.

Ms. Sipe asked what those items were.

Mr. Crouch stated that one concerns had been people turning around in the neighbor's driveway. He stated that they had installed a new driveway that leads to the barn, and that the drive was marked with reflectors. He stated that they had also installed privacy fencing along both sides of the driveway that goes back towards the barn. He stated that depending on how the request for rezoning came out, they would be adding landscaping later in the spring. He stated that there was an outside light on the southside of the barn that had been a concern, and that had been addressed, and was no longer functional.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that the last email that she had received for Anthony Reiger, the neighbor, was dated November 21st and 22nd and that the Board had copies of those emails with pictures.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification that the sale purpose of the request was in order to store the business materials, and asked if there was any other option other than rezoning the property.

Ms. Vannice stated that since the property was in the R-4 Residence and there was no dwelling, it would need to be rezoned. She stated that they could not ask for a lower level of zoning since the only zone that allowed for this type of business storage was the BV Variety Business Zone.

Mr. Daniel stated that the ordinance did proved for a variance request in a case such as this, where the owner's plans did not fit the current zoning. He stated that with a variance of use, if approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), the applicant would be granted the right to that specific use and that the BZA can make conditions. He stated that those conditions can be for improvements, limiting hours, lighting, or landscaping, and ensures that there are limits to the use as opposed to a rezoning which would allow for any use allowed under that new zone.

Mr. Smith stated that an applicant could apply for the use of the property for storage, and if sold, the property would go back to the original use.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that the zoning would not change with the variance, just the use.

Ms. Vannice stated that was all true, however R-4 Residence Zone did not allow for an accessory dwelling without a dwelling.

Mr. Daniel stated that was correct, but there was currently a variance for the barn to exist without a dwelling in a residence zone which was granted last year prior to the creation of the Nannie Haven Subdivision where the property was split.

Mr. Clark asked if this request was referred to the BZA for a variance request, and if that was denied, would the applicant then have the option to come back and request the rezoning at that time.

Mr. Wright stated that they could rehear the request again, but that they would need to vote to go through the process.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification, if denied from the BZA, it would not exclude them from coming back to this Board.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that the rules of procedure did state that new evidence would need to be presented for a request to be reheard by the Board.

Ms. Vannice stated that in this case, the new evidence was the fence, the gravel driveway, and removing the light in order to try and resolve some of the concerns. She stated that if denied by BZA, they would have no new evidence to come back.

Ms. Owen stated that based on the email from the neighbor, the fence may not be complete.

Ms. Vannice stated that in November it was not complete, but it was now complete.

Drew Hall, attorney with McKinney and Company Law, 201 N. High St., Muncie, Indiana, appeared. He stated that he handled the corporate side of things for Drake Properties. He stated that one of the factors that the Board should take into consideration was for the most desirable use of the property and other factors of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Together DM Comprehensive Plan, page 47 shared a future intended use map and this was included in that area. He stated that Mr. Drake would be using this property to invest in other properties, and that the simplest way to take care of this would be to rezone at this time. He stated that he had talked with the neighbor and that unfortunately most of his concerns would exist regardless of what the zone was. He stated that people could still drive to the wrong property, still drive through yards, and still have flood lights on barns.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Hall to restate the document and page number again for the Board.

Mr. Hall stated it was page 47 from the Together DM Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Dishman stated that the first time the request had been heard, there were some concerns about hazardous waste from the tanker trucks. He stated that he had asked if the property would be sold to that company for their expansion, and that they were assured that the property would not be sold to them. He stated that if the property was not sold to that neighboring property, he would have no problems with the request.

Mr. Hall stated that when the request was first filed, selling the property was a thought but that was no longer the plan, so there would be no expansion to that existing business.

Anthony Reiger, 4008 E. Centennial Ave., Muncie, Indiana, appeared in opposition. He stated that he was the neighbor with concerns, and that some of those issues had been addressed. He stated that there was a fence in the back and a shorter one along the side, and people were no longer driving in his yard. He stated that he and his wife purchased their home in March of 2024 from Drake Properties. He stated that they lived there for 6 months before all of this began, and that they had been dealing with this for the past 4-5 months. He stated that while some things had improved, they still had concerns about the effect on their property value if they ever chose to sell. He stated that they purchased their home knowing there was a landscaping business across the road and the trucking company to the east. He stated that they purchased the property because they wanted to live in an area that was not over crowded with business and not suffer from a lot of light pollution. He stated that he did not have a problem with Drake Properties storing their materials here, but if rezoned and sold, he would have no control over that. He stated that he had concerns with the traffic, noise, lighting, and safety for his kids that a business could bring to the area in the future. He stated that if he wanted to sell the house, all of those issue would create extra hurdles in that process, and that he would not have purchased the house if he knew it would be surrounded by businesses. He stated that he had talked to Mr. Crouch, and he was the only one from Drake Properties that had talked to him, and that he was a nice person and been very helpful. He stated that he was just very frustrated because they did not buy the house to have a business 60' from their home. He stated that it would be nice if they had the flood lights on a motion sensor or a timer so that when he gets up at night to check on his baby, he did not have the light shining through the windows. He stated that this was their first home they had purchased and it came down to safety for his family, the value of his home, and the quality of enjoyment of that home all being impacted by this request.

Mr. Smith asked when they had purchased the home.

Mr. Reiger stated March of 2024.

Mr. Landess asked if Mr. Reiger had asked any questions about the surrounding property at that time, or if anything was mentioned to him by the seller.

Mr. Reiger stated that the realtors had stated that if the owner decided to also sell the parcel with the barn, that he would be given the opportunity to purchase it as well. He stated that made him believe that it was intended to remain residential.

Mr. Smith asked if he had been given the chance to purchase the property and just had not.

Mr. Reiger stated yes, financially it was not an option at that time.

Mr. Brand asked if there would be any condition in which he would not be opposed to the rezoning.

Mr. Reiger stated no, he could not think of anything that would fix the concerns he had. He stated that he could not control who the owner might sell to in the future, but the ideal situation would be for that parcel to remain residential and maybe at some point they could afford to purchase it or another family purchased it to build a home.

Mr. Brand stated that he had seen deals written that would allow for a first right of refusal, and asked if Drake Properties offered him the first chance to purchase the property, would that make a difference.

Mr. Reiger stated it would not hurt to have that option.

Ms. Owen congratulated him on his new baby and asked if a variance to allow the storage of materials would be more appealing than rezoning the property.

Mr. Reiger stated thank you. He stated that if it was just storage he did not have a problem with that because there was just an occasional truck going to the barn, and that did not bother his family. He stated that he did have concerns about the rezoning and just wanted to voice those concerns.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Crouch why Drake Properties did not rezone both parcels prior to Mr. Reiger purchasing the smaller lot with the home.

Mr. Crouch stated that he would refer that question to Ms. Vannice.

Ms. Vannice stated that she had been working with Ms. Drake at that time, and that the whole parcel had been on the market for a long time with no interested buyers. She stated that Ms. Drake then tried to divide the home and barn on a parcel and keep the almost 5 acre vacant land to the north. She stated that option also produced no interested buyer. She stated that she found out that people were having a hard time trying to secure a loan with the poor condition of the barn at that time. She stated that Ms. Drake then decided to split the home from the barn on 2 separate parcels, and since the home had been remodeled she might find a buyer. She stated that was when they platted the parcel to become Nannie Haven Subdivision lots 1 & 2, and then she began the remodel of the barn.

Mr. Smith asked if Ms. Drake would be open to applying for variance or if she was not at all interested in that as an option.

Mr. Crouch stated that at this time, they would not be interested in that option. He stated that it was difficult to be on an agenda and they would like to be finished with the request. He stated that he was certain that if they decided to sell the property in the future, they would make an agreement with Mr. Reiger to have first right. He stated that the security light could be addressed because he had a 3 ½ year old, and he understood how important family time was.

Ms. Vannice stated that they had checked with the former City Building Commissioner to make sure that the light was within the allowable lumens and it was. She stated that she did understand it was bright, but it was not on the high end of being too bright.

Ms. Sipe made a motion for a favorable recommendation for MPC 05-25Z requesting a change in zoning from the R-3 Residence Zone to the BV Variety Business Zone. Ms. Owen seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Voting against: Mr. Landess. Motion carried, a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for introduction at their March 3, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Brand stated that he was voting yes based on Mr. Crouch's testimony stating that he would work with the property owner to mute the light, he would recommend a switch rather than a motion sensor which would allow the light to be turned off, and that the owner would offer them the first right of refusal option.

MPC 01-25A Jurisdiction: City Council

Being a consideration of a Resolution of Approval for the 2024 Zone Map Changes to the Official Zone Maps for Muncie, Indiana.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that this was a compilation of all of the rezonings that took place during 2024 that had been adopted. She stated that this was done annually to create the new zoning maps for 2025. She stated that the list of all 6 city rezonings had been provided.

Mr. Brand asked for clarification if these requests had been to the Plan Commission for a recommendation and then forwarded to City Council for approval, and this was the annual report for Plan Commission.

Ms. Swackhamer stated yes, this was the official approval for the zoning maps to be updated.

Mr. Brand asked if this was the normal favorable or unfavorable recommendation or if this was an approval or denial.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that it would be for a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to City Council for final action.

Mr. Carroll made a motion for a favorable recommendation for MPC 01-25A, approval of the 2024 Official Zone Map changes. Ms. Sipe seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Voting against: None. Motion carried, a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to City Council for introduction at their March 3, 2025 meeting.

MPC 02-25A Jurisdiction: County Commissioners

Being a consideration of a Resolution of Approval for the 2024 Zone Map Changes to the Official Zone Maps for Delaware County, Indiana.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that was the report for the rezonings in the county during 2024 and that they were approved requests.

Mr. Brand made a motion for a favorable recommendation for MPC 02-25A, approval of the 2024 Official Zone Map changes. Mr. Clark seconded the motion. Voting in favor: Mr. Brand, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dishman, Mr. Landess, Ms. Owen, Ms. Sipe, and Mr. Smith. Voting against: None. Motion carried, a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to the County Commissioner's for introduction at their February 18, 2025 meeting.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

Ms. Swackhamer reported that MPC 01-25Z the rezoning request by Surmukh Singh had been introduced at City Council at their February 3, 2025 meeting and was rejected. She stated that as she understands it, this would not be heard the second time at City Council.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she had provided her regular report of permits, inspections, variances, rezonings, and plats (see attached report for details). She stated that on the MPO side of the office we had a new employee, Zach Wicliffe, who was a 2024 Ball State graduate and was a great addition to the team. She stated that he had been working on the Coast Allocation Plan for fiscal year 2026, which was a required document by INDOT. She stated that staff was also working on the Unified Planning Work Program and the DMTIP which were other INDOT required documents. She stated that the SS4A grant was moving quickly and that the kick off meeting was recently held with the consulting firm American Structurepoint and Mathew Nichols, the Program Manager for that grant, who was here tonight. She stated that Ms. Hensley had been reappointed to the MPC Board and that there was still one BZA vacancy, but there had been some interest.

Mr. Brand stated that they had 3 interested people, and that they did live in the unincorporated area, so that was good news.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she had received a call from possible a fourth candidate. She stated that the County Commissioner's had reappointed her to the ECRIPD Board. She stated that Ms. Ingermann had been representing the office at the County Handbook meetings, and that Commissioner Brand was also on that committee possibly leading that committee.

Mr. Brand stated that he was leading that committee.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that she had also provided the Board with information for the IDEA Conference which was coming up on Saturday March 8, from 9AM to 3:30PM at the Ball State Student Center. She stated that there would be many local community leaders who are there to learn from each other. She stated that this was a free conference and that she had attached an agenda for the members. She stated that Mr. Fouch, the County Building Commissioner was on one of the panels discussing code enforcement. She stated that INDOT had a public meeting regarding a few roundabouts in Muncie, and that she had provided the members a little information and would be happy to email more if they had questions. She stated that Mr. Carroll and Mr. Brand were both at that meeting so they were able to hear a little about the projects. She stated that the roundabouts were proposed, along with other options, at State Road 32 and Madison Avenue and also State Road 32 and Hackley Street. She stated that the solar moratorium that was set to end on March 1, 2025, and that the County Commissioners had been researching and discussing this, and that she would keep the Board updated on that topic.

Mr. Landess asked how many of the grants and funds were from the federal government.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that some of the annual allocations come from the federal government, and that the SS4A grant was the only one that was sought out and applied for which was federal dollars.

Mr. Landess asked if it was small percentage of the whole that was from the federal grants.

Ms. Swackhamer stated she would not say a small percentage since the annual allocations from INDOT come from federal dollars. She stated that those were grants, but that they were not grants that had been applied for and awarded. She stated that that since we are an MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) those funds were available.

Mr. Landess stated that he was just not very optimistic about that at this time.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that staff was trying to stay informed, and if anything happens with the grants it would only be moving forward and not affect anything already in place.

Mr. Landess asked if any on the salaries were from federal funds.

Ms. Swackhamer stated no, those funds were from county funds, but that there were reimbursements available for some of those salaries.

Mr. Brand stated that in addition to the roundabouts Ms. Swackhamer mentioned, he had attended a meeting with INDOT one week ago regarding a roundabout at State Road 3 North at the Eaton Albany Pike intersection. He stated that there was a gas station, a Dollar Store, and the Green Diamond Junction along with an existing traffic light at that intersection, where a roundabout would be installed. He stated that there was also a study in place for a possible roundabout at the intersection of Fuson Road and Cowan Road where CanPack and Magna are located.

Mr. Smith stated that since becoming President of this Board, he had talked with Ms. Swackhamer many times. He stated that one item that had been mentioned was that for some time now, there had been no December meeting for this Board. He stated that he would like to open that discussion for the Board to consider having a December meeting and that it be decided sooner than later.

Mr. Brand stated that he would be in favor of that. He stated that it had been mentioned by Mr. Crouch earlier that it was difficult to be on an agenda, and if an item was sent back, there may be a 2 to 2 1/2 month wait after a City Council meeting. He stated that this meeting was early in the month, so there would be no conflict with the holiday, and was in favor of adding it to the schedule.

Ms. Owen stated that historically meetings would be cancelled if there was no business to discuss, so if there was no need for the meeting, that would still be the case.

Ms. Swackhamer stated that it came up primarily due to the Drake Properties request being moved and delayed with no December meeting. She stated that it was believed that the Board used to have a dinner instead of a December meeting, but the Plan Commission was early enough in the month and this would be more convenient for the applicants. She stated that there was a deadline and that if an applicant turned in all of the required documents for the application before that deadline, they would be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Brand stated that he believed Mr. Crouch was referring to the delays, not that he was not allowed on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chris Smith, President

Kylene Swackhamer, Secretary