

**WHITLEY COUNTY ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

19-W-REZ-5 ZONE MAP AMENDMENT

Micropulse, Inc.
Area northwest of SR 14/CR 600E, 5865 E SR 14

APRIL 17, 2019

AGENDA ITEM: 2

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Current zoning: AG, Agricultural; GC, General Commercial
Proposed zoning: IPM, Industrial Park/Manufacturing
Property area: 8.86± acres

The petitioner, owner of the subject property area, is requesting a zone map amendment for an area located northwest of the intersection of State Road 14 and CR 600 East, and east of the existing factory at 5865 East State Road 14. The requested zoning for the subject property is IPM, Industrial Park/Manufacturing.

Note on the map of the requested rezoning area that it does not abut the west (rear) property lines of the residences along 600E, but would retain a 270'± strip of AG-zoned land. The request does abut the south line of the southernmost residence.

Existing zoning classifications and land uses

Currently, the subject area is zoned AG, Agricultural, and GC, General Commercial, and is used for crop cultivation. There is a fire protection wellhead on the northern part of the property.

The following table lists current surrounding zoning classifications and land uses:

	<i>Current zoning</i>	<i>Current land use</i>
<i>North</i>	AG	Agricultural (field), residences (Rolling Meadows sub.)
<i>East</i>	AG	[CR 600 East], agricultural (field)
<i>South</i>	AG, GC	Residences, business, [SR 14], residences and fields
<i>West</i>	IPM, AG	Industrial, agricultural (field)

Proposed land use

The petitioner is requesting the zoning amendment to allow for proposed and future expansions of the Micropulse facility. No specific plans for an addition have been submitted, but the petitioner has indicated that an expansion could commence yet in 2019. The remaining acreage of the rezoned property would stay in cultivation until needed for future additions, parking, drainage, etc.

Additions to commercial or industrial buildings require Development Plan review prior to issuance of an Improvement Location Permit. At such time, the required buffering, building placement, drainage, parking, lighting, and other development standards would be evaluated.

REVIEW CRITERIA

Indiana Code §36-7-4-603 and Section 12.2(F) of the zoning ordinance state the criteria listed below to which the Commission must pay “reasonable regard” when considering amendments to the zoning ordinance. Staff’s comments are under each criterion.

1. The most recently adopted Comprehensive Plan;

The Land Classification Map of the 2011 Comprehensive Plan “depicts the County’s land use and development form goals (land classification) in a conceptual manner. It should not be construed

representing precise location of land classifications, but used as a foundation for support and influence with land use and development form decisions and zoning map changes.”

That caveat being understood, the Map shows a classification of “Industrial” and “General Commercial” in the area of the subject property. In its text, the Comprehensive Plan suggests that the Industrial and General Commercial classifications are “best fit” adjacent to each other. Both classifications have similar location recommendations, such as being on major highways. So the Commission may find it possible to support either commercial or industrial uses (or both) in the vicinity of the request.

The Map does depict the area around the subject property as being “Agricultural.” While the current request to industrial zoning is contained within the Industrial or Commercial classifications, the Commission should give due consideration as to whether this request could lead to additional industrial rezoning requests in the area that could, at some eventual extent, degrade the recommended agricultural land usage.

2. The current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;

Generally speaking, the overall character of the current structures and uses in the mile or so surrounding the subject property is agricultural interspersed with residential parcels. However, in the vicinity immediately surrounding the subject property are the petitioner’s factory, an adjacent business, agricultural field, and residences.

The requested rezoning would complement the factory usage, and would likely have negligible effect on the existing commercial business. Two residences are associated with the petitioner and would also likely not be impacted by a rezoning.

If the request is granted, the residences along 600E could be roughly 300’ from an industrial building, after expansions have occurred, and potentially closer to parking lots or accessory uses. This may be of concern, but the 300’ distance is a relatively large buffer for an enclosed industrial use.

3. The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted;

Given the location of the property near existing industrial and commercial uses, and its proximity near SR 14, the proposed industrial usage is desirable. Buffering is required by the zoning code to aid in mitigation of potential effects on the nearby residences.

4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction;

Rezoning the requested area could affect the property values of the nearby residences, especially immediately following construction of any building expansions. However, considering values throughout the jurisdiction, property values will likely not be adversely impacted.

5. Responsible development and growth;

What is proposed would effectively create an “in-fill” situation between existing industrial and commercial districts. If already located in a desirable location, as discussed in #3 above, such in-fill expansion or concentration of similar uses is generally considered to be responsible development and growth.

6. The public health, safety and welfare.

Generally the IPM district is designed to have few public health or safety effects, even where there may be nearby residential uses. In this case, the existing Micropulse factory has operated for a

number of years without significant detrimental effects on health or safety. The public welfare is a less objective criterion, so the Commission should give regard to how this request could affect public well-being, equitable implementation of plans and codes, and other factors.

Date report completed: 4/4/2019

PLAN COMMISSION ACTION

Motion By:

Second By:

<i>Vote:</i>	Deckard	Hodges	Johnson	Mynhier	Western	J. Wolf	B. Wolfe	Woodmansee	Wright
<i>Yes</i>									
<i>No</i>									
<i>Abstain</i>									