CLARK COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION
October 14, 2026

The Clark County Plan Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, October 14, 2026 starting at 5:00 p.m. in the Clark County Government Center, 300 Corporate Drive, Room 103, Jeffersonville Indiana 47130.

The following Board members were present: Chris Fox, David Ruckman, Brad Spencer, Brad Weddington, Bryan Glover and Mark Cassady.

The following Board members were absent: Larry Brison, Guy Guernsey and one vacancy.

The following staff were present: Chris King, Stacy Gettings, and Eric Wise

The following appeared on the Plan Commission Agenda:

1. **Call to order**- Mr. Glover called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. **Announcement of Meeting Rules**- Mr. King read the meeting rules.

3. **Public Hearing Items**- Mr. Glover indicated the applicant for PC26-26 requested the item be tabled to permit additional modification to the proposal requested by staff. Mr. Fox then motioned to table the request until the October 14, 2026 meeting which was seconded by Mr. Ruckman and unanimously passed.

   a. REQUEST TO TABLE- PC26-26: Preliminary Subdivision Plat for property located on the west side of Old SR 60 between Ashby Ln and Sweet Amy Way. (Parcel # 10-09-08-800-095.000-030). Applicant/Owner: Chase Murphy Enterprises, INC

Mr. Fox Motioned to table the request which was seconded by Mr. Ruckman and unanimously passed.

Mr. Glover informed the audience that PC26-26 will be considered at the November 10, 2026 meeting at 5:00pm in the same meeting room.

b. PC26-28: Subdivision Plat Amendment- vacate a platted easement- on Lot#230 of Hardy Falls Subdivision Section 2. (208 Pebble Brook Dr. Charlestown IN) (Parcel 10-03-11-900-258.000-003). Applicant/Owner: Thomas A. Menendez

Mr. Menendez, 208 Pebble Brook Dr. Charlestown IN presented the request indicating that he wished to remove a utility easement from the property so that he may sell the property and an existing garage is located within the easement. He further indicated that other easements exist for drainage and utilities.

Mr. Harold Hart, Hart surveying, 958 Water St. Charlestown IN, explained further that utility companies have no objection to the vacation.

Mr. Wise indicated that the Drainage Board requested action be delayed until the Board considers the request at their next meeting and suggested that if the Commission decides to approve the request that approval be subject to a favorable action by the Drainage Board.

Mr. Hart then distributed an elevation drawing of the property showing that the easement is not necessary for drainage.

The floor was then opened for public comments- none were heard.

Mr. Cassady informed the Board that he lives near the property and would like to vote on the item if there are no objections.

Mr. King confirmed that Mr. Cassidy did not have a financial interest in the property and no objections were heard regarding Mr. Cassidy's continued participation.

Mr. Spencer then motioned to adopt the findings of fact prepared by staff for approval with the condition that the vacation is approved by the Clark County Drainage Board which was seconded by Mr. Ruckman and unanimously passed.

> **c. PC26-31: Change of Zone** from AG (General Agriculture) to R2(Medium Density Residential) for property located on the south side of Henryville Otisco Rd between CR160 and Snow Rd. (Parcel# 10-06-25-600-013.000-027) Applicant/Owner: Christopher L & Yvonne K. Guthrie

Mr. Chris Guthrie, 1120 Leon Prall Rd. Otisco IN, and Trenton Guthrie, 816 Castetter Rd, Henryville IN, presented the request indicating two duplexes are planned for the property and septic has been approved for the property. Trenton also indicated that there is interest in rental units in the area.

Mr. Spencer inquired about available utilities in the area.

Trenton indicated public water was available.

The floor was then opened for public comments.

Mr. Wise read the adjoiners list with no response.

Mr. Michael Bednarczyk, 6120 Henryville Otisco Rd, Henryville IN, spoke in opposition indicating that the septic approval is for a single-family home and asked to table until proof of septic can be provided.

Romie Ramsey, 648 Dieterlen Rd, Henryville IN, spoke in opposition referencing steep slopes on the property and concern for septic leaching offsite.

Patricia Houtchens, 6320 Henryville Otisco Rd, Henryville, IN spoke in opposition referencing Surrounding farmstead uses, blind curve, septic and steep slopes.

Mr. Jacob Horton 6001Zollman Rd, Henryville IN, spoke in opposition referencing steep slopes, septic, and increased runoff.

There being no further comments the hearing was closed for comments.

Mr. Wise informed the Board that the approved septic was designed for a 4-bedroom home and that a revised septic system would be required for a duplex. He also indicated that if the zoning is changed, actual development on the site will be dictated by the type of septic system that may be possible on the site which may be single family.

Mr. King reminded the audience that the Commission will be making a r recommendation and the Board of Commissioners will make the final decision.

Mr. Weddington confirmed that prior to permit the septic, setbacks and drive permit will need to be met.

Mr. Spencer motioned to send a favorable recommendation subject to all utilities and permit requirements being met.

Mr. Wise indicated that such requirements would be addressed when building permits are requested and the current consideration should be whether the proposed zoning and all possible uses are appropriate in the area.

The motioned died for lack of a second.

Mr. Weddington then motioned to forward with a favorable recommendation which died for lack of a second.

Mr. Spencer then motioned to table until more information is provided regarding septic and utilities which was seconded by Mr. Fox which failed on a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Weddington then motioned to send with a favorable recommendation which was seconded by Mr. Spencer which passed on a vote of 6-0.

d. PC26-32: Change of Zone from R2 (Medium Density Residential) to M1(Light Industrial) for property located on the west side of SR 3 between Sunset Trail and 5th St. (2805 SR 3 Charlestown IN) (Parcel# 10-03-15-600-042.000-003) Applicant/Owner: KGF Building LLC

Austen Dockens, 954 Market St. Charlestown IN, presented the request indicating they intended to develop a flexible commercial space for start-up businesses without outdoor storage. He also indicated access would be limited to SR 3.

Mr. Spencer inquired if regular retail would be included.

Mr. Docken indicated it would be more of a service use type facility.

Mr. Weddington questioned the light industrial zoning for commercial use.

Mr. docken indicated the planning staff indicated light industrial was required.

Mr. Wise indicated the original use description was for a warehouse and construction office.

Mr. Ruckman asked if a PUD would be appropriate.

Mr. Wise indicated if there were concerns about potential used a written commitment may be more appropriate.

Mr. Dockens then mentioned existing M2 to the north and the planned mixed-use corridor in the comprehensive plan.

The floor was then opened for public comments.

Jeremy Karen, 2719 SR 3, Charlestown IN, spoke in opposition referencing traffic and use being more suited to an industrial park.

Kenneth Lemmons, 2718 SR 3, Charlestown IN spoke in opposition referencing failure to receive notice, Industrial zoning allows commercial development in residential area, traffic hazards, spot zoning and health concerns for granddaughter. He then distributed a letter expressing his concerns.

Clayton Bliss, 81110 Palermo Trail, Sellersburg IN, spoke in opposition referencing residential nature of the area and offsite impacts.

There being no further comments the floor was closed.

Mr. Weddington inquired about tabling to allow the applicant to consider restricting the use of the property.

Mr. Wise indicated that the item could be tabled to allow the applicant to submit a written commitment for the request.

Mr. Fox questioned if this would be the highest and best use of the property.

Mr. Spencer expressed his concern that an intense industrial use would occur that would create offsite impacts in a residential area.

Mr. Glover expressed concern about entrances off two roads.

Mr. Fox then motioned to forwarded with an unfavorable recommendation which was seconded by Mr. Ruckman and unanimously passed on a vote of 6-0

e. PC26-33: Amendment of the Clark County Unified Development Ordinance Amendments will be considered which will amend Chapter 3 SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS Section 3. DRIVEWAY STANDARDS by reducing commercial/industrial driveway construction standards, changing method of measuring driveway separations from intersections and reduce driveway separation standards within platted subdivisions; The Clark County Plan Commission initiated this item.

Mr. Wise presented the request by describing the proposed amendments and indicating that the changes have received approval by the County Engineer.

There being no questions the floor was opened for public comments- none were heard.

Mr. Ruckman then motioned to forward the item with a favorable recommendation which was seconded by Mr. Fox and unanimously passed on a vote of 6-0.

d. PC26-34: Clark County Unified Development Ordinance Audit in regards to housing regulation: as directed by HEA 1001 the Clark County Plan Commission will conduct a public hearing to review its Unified Development Ordinance and any zoning regulations and land development rules, with the goal of increasing housing development. Factors to be considered include but are not limited to: (1) Providing for higher density development of duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes in areas designated for single family homes; (2) Constructing other housing types including accessory dwelling units and manufactured and modular housing; (3) Adaptive reuse of commercial buildings for residential use; (4) Increasing the allowable floor area ratio in multifamily districts; (5) Streamlining or shortening the permitting processes; and (6) Waiving or eliminating regulations such as requirements for garage size and placement, minimum lot size and square footage, greater setbacks, off-street parking, design standards that restrict or prohibit the use of code compliant products or property height limitations. The geographic area subject to regulation under the UDO includes all land within the unincorporated area of Clark County in addition to all land within the incorporated Town of Borden.
The Clark County Plan Commission initiated this item.

Mr. Wise introduced the item and provided a brief comparison of the UDO and the considerations for increasing housing development as follows:
1. Increased density is single family zones- The UDO includes one single family district, R1, and the current options for increased density include a special exception for an accessory dwelling or use variance. To date requests for accessory dwellings have been supported by the Board of Zoning Appeals and since no such request has been denied it may appropriate to consider making such uses permitted with conditions which make it easier to develop this type of use and avoid 1–2-month delay required for a hearing.

2. Consider allowing other housing types- Currently the UDO classifies manufactured and modular construction in the same manner as site-built homes and there would appear to be no need for amendments.

3. Adaptive reuse of commercial buildings for residential use- Currently the B1 zone permits multi-family and it may not be a major change to consider expanding this use to the B2 and B3 zones which would allow existing commercial buildings to be repurposed for multifamily or second story multi-family use.

4. Increased floor area ratio for multi-family districts- Currently the UDO does not use floor area rations. With the R4 multi-family zone district setbacks and lot size permit just over 19 units per acre. In comparison the B1 zone density is dictated by setbacks and parking requirements and in one example 20 units per-acre were permitted. Should the Commission wish to increase destiny in these zones it is likely that parking stall dimensions and/or number of parking spaces required.

5. Streamlining or shortening the permitting process. Currently multi-family developments are required to obtain development plan approval which h can extend the process one-two months. Given the type of review the development plan requirement could be removed and all review occur during building permit review.

6. Waiving or eliminating regulations such as for garage size and placement, minimum lot and square footage, greater setbacks, off street parking, design standards that restrict or prohibit the use of code compliant products, and property height limitations. Currently the Minium lots size for development on septic is 40,000 sq.ft. and between 4,400 and 6,000 sq.ft. when sewers are available. Lot size could be reduced when septics are involved but it will take guidance from the health department but the current size appears to be adequate to permit a home, accessory building and septic. Though it would be possible to allow the Health Department to approve smaller lots it is always better to have some extra room in case of a failure and it would not be something I would recommend tonight.

Mr. Weddington expressed his opposition to reducing the size of lots using septic due to difficulties on an acre lot with home and driveway placement and accessory building.

Mr. Wise indicated that increasing density on sewers is possible however the current minimum side setbacks are five (5) feet and the fire department are not supportive of

reducing this distance and when if the distance is reduced the building code requires fire separation construction which may actually increase the cost of housing.

7. Review impact fee zones with zone advisory committee for improvements- Mr. Wise informed the Commission that the County does not utilize impact fees and therefore not considerations can be made.

8. Use of property tax abatements to enable higher density and mixed income communities- Mr. Wise indicated the County does not offer abatements for residential type development.

9. Donating land for affordable housing development- Such activity would be under the prevue of the Board of Commissioners but if desired the topic could be researched and inquiry made with the Commissioners.

Finally, Mr. Wise indicated that if the Board wished to make changes after the public hearing, we can schedule a work session or discuss changes at the next meeting.

Mr. glover then opened the floor for public comments.

Jacob Horton, 601 Zollman Rd Otisco IN, expressed his opinion that rural areas should remain rural and new development of homes should be in more developed areas. He also expressed the strain on fire and emergency services associated with urban development in rural areas.

There being no further comments the hearing was closed.

4. **Reports, Resolutions, and Communications**:

None were provided.

5. **Approval of the prior minutes from the September 9, 2026 regular meeting**- Mr. Weddington motioned to adopt the minutes as written which was seconded by Mr. Spencer and unanimously passed.

Mr. Weddington then made a motion to adjourn at 6:16 pm which was seconded by Mr. Spencer and unanimously passed.

MINUTES ADOPTED THIS 10 DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

~~Larry Brison, President~~
Bryan Glover
Vice President

Eric Wise Director