

REGULAR MEETING OF THE MISHAWAKA COMMON COUNCIL

April 8, 2024

Be it remembered that the Common Council of the City of Mishawaka, Indiana met in the Council Chambers of the New Mishawaka City Hall and via telephone on Monday, April 8, 2024, at 6:00PM. The meeting was called to order by Council President Gregg Hixenbaugh. All were asked to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a moment of silence in memory of former Mishawaka Fire Chief and Board of Public Works member Dale Freeman as well as former Mishawaka Police Officer and County Councilman Bob McCahill. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated their condolences go out to the families of both gentlemen.

Members attending virtually do so by WebEx. Public that attends can participate by WebEx or observe meetings by YouTube or Facebook live. The Council meetings are also streamed live on Michiana Access on Comcast/AT&T U-verse Channel 99.

Clerk Block called the roll.

Present: Mrs. Hazen (P), Mrs. Voelker (P), Mr. Carroll (P), Mr. Banicki (P), Mr. Emmons (P), Ms. Hahn (P), Mr. Mammolenti (P), Mr. Violi (P), Mr. Hixenbaugh (P)
P: Present E: Electronically Participating A: Absent

Minutes for the Regular Meeting on March 18, 2024, were approved as received from the Clerk's Office.

Clerk Block read the following appeals and petitions by title.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Appeal No. 2024-05 | Use Variance to allow a Food Truck in the Parking Lot of Pilo's Body Shop – 1017 E. Jefferson Blvd. |
| Appeal No. 2024-07 | Use Variance to allow Duplex in R-1 Single Family Residential – 311 Taylor St. |
| Appeal No. 2024-08 | Use Variance to allow for a Restaurant with Drive-Thru (Jimmy Johns) in C-1 General Commercial District – 415 Bittersweet Rd. |
| Petition No. 2024-05 | Rezone from C-1 general Commercial to C-10 Filling Station Commercial for proposed Casey's Convenience Store & Gas Station – SE corner of Douglas & Fir Rd. |
| Petition No. 2024-06 | Rezone from R-1 Single Family Residential to C-1 General Commercial for a Restaurant with Drive-Thru (Jimmy Johns) – 415 Bittersweet Rd. |

Presentment of Redevelopment Commission Activities Report for 2023 – No Action Required

Mr. Hixenbaugh stated the record would reflect that the Council received the report.

Clerk Block read the following resolution by title and opened the public hearing.

RESOLUTION R2024-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MISHAWAKA, INDIANA, APPROVING A REPORT OF COMPLIANCE WITH STATEMENT OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS Tax Abatement Compliance Report 2024

Clerk Block read the list of the property owners involved in **RESOLUTION R2024-03**:

- **Lippert Components Manufacturing Inc. (Building Expansion)**
- **Lippert Components Manufacturing Inc. (New Racking/Logistics Distribution Equipment)**
- **Front Street LLC (The Avalon – Mixed Use Building)**
- **Helios Hydraulics Americas LLC (Building Expansion)**
- **Helios Hydraulics Americas LLC (New Manufacturing Equipment)**

Derek Spier, City Planner for City of Mishawaka, spoke in favor of **RESOLUTION R2024-03**. Mr. Spier stated this was the annual tax abatement compliance reports for 2024 and also a request to withdraw the previously approved abatement for the Barak Group LLC. Mr. Spier stated the property owners who had applied for and been granted a tax abatement for real or personal property must file a report with the Council and the St. Joseph County Auditor's Office reporting the extent of compliance with the goals set forth when they received their abatement. Mr. Spier stated there were currently 4 projects with 6 active abatements in the city, with 5 requiring reporting for 2024 and one of the active abatements that did not require reporting was for Steelhead Apartments as they were requesting the abatement be withdrawn. Mr. Spier stated all 3 of the projects with 5 active abatements did require reporting and were being worked toward their expectations of their compliance. Mr. Spier stated since 2023, they had one abatement that had expired, that one being WellPet. Mr. Spier stated the compliance forms for real and personal property were due to the County Auditor's Office on May 15th of each year and the first abatement was for Lippert Components that required reporting for expansion and new equipment. Mr. Spier stated they received both real and personal property in 2017 for renovation improvement of the former AM General warehousing facility. Mr. Spier stated the proposed real estate improvements included in this abatement were originally estimated at \$7.4 million and had all been completed. Mr. Spier stated actual real estate investment that was filed on the CF1 was over \$13 million and personal property improvements included in this abatement were estimated at \$1.6 million and actual property investment through the CF1 was over \$9.5 million. Mr. Spier

stated since the abatement was approved for 10 years, annual reporting would be required through 2028. Mr. Spier stated when the abatement was filed, they 247 employees with an additional 200 to be added and at present, there were 423 employees and total payroll was listed at nearly \$19 million which was more than the \$10.3 million when the abatement was approved but slightly less than the near \$22 million listed in 2023. Mr. Spier stated the next abatement was for Front Street LLC, which was the Avalon project. Mr. Spier stated this was for real property improvement and was approved in October of 2022 for a mixed-use building with construction beginning in November of 2022 and was still ongoing. Mr. Spier stated construction was anticipated to be complete at the end of April of the current year. Mr. Spier stated the final abatement was for Helios Hydraulics Americas LLC and it was for real and personal property improvements, and it was improved in October of 2022 and included a building expansion and new manufacturing equipment. Mr. Spier stated the real property improvements included \$4.8 million with a building addition, expanded parking areas and other improvements. Mr. Spier stated construction began in December of 2022 and was ongoing and was expected to be complete in 2026. Mr. Spier stated actual real estate investment at the end of 2023 was \$3.7 million with construction progress equaling another \$5.5 million. Mr. Spier stated personal property improvements included \$11.5 million for new equipment and actual personal property investment by the end of 20234 was \$14 million with construction progress being another \$300,000. Mr. Spier stated when the abatement was filed, the total existing employment was listed at 139 with an additional 73 jobs to be added over the life of the project and by the end of 2023, the company added an additional 58 employees. Mr. Spier stated total payroll was listed at \$11 million, more than the \$10.2 million listed when they got the abatement. Mr. Spier stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Hixenbaugh thanked Mr. Spier for the work that went into putting the report together.

Question was called for at 6:11PM for **RESOLUTION R2024-03 Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 9).**

Yes: Mrs. Hazen, Mrs. Voelker, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Banicki, Mr. Emmons, Ms. Hahn, Mr. Mammolenti, Mr. Violi, Mr. Hixenbaugh. The resolution passed 9-0.

Clerk Block read the following proposed ordinances by title and opened the public hearing.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-04

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 137 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF MISHAWAKA, INDIANA, AS FROM TIME TO TIME AMENDED, COMMONLY KNOWN AS “THE ZONING ORDINANCE” OF THE CITY OF MISHAWAKA, INDIANA

PUD amendment for reduced building & parking setbacks for interior lot lines – Lot 1 & 2 of the Enclave at Grandview Minor Subdivision

Mr. Mammolenti reported the Committee of Land Use Planning recommended this proposed ordinance should be adopted. Upon a second by Mr. Banicki, the motion carried.

Rich Deal, General Counsel at Great Lakes Capital, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2024-04**. Mr. Deal stated he was pleased to join Daryl Knip of Abonmarche and his team that evening who helped on the civil side of this project and other aspects. Mr. Deal stated the request before the Council that evening was an amendment to the PUD which would accommodate a joint building project that involved multi-family connected with a hotel. Mr. Deal stated the full Council had been aware of and supportive of the project in the past in other aspects, but they were proposing to take the Block 200 area, a TIF area, and subdivide the lot into 2 lots with one on which the hotel would be developed and one on which the multi-family would be developed and the buildings would be connected, therefore they were requesting approval for a variance in the PUD that allowed 0 line setback for the buildings to be connected. Mr. Deal stated he would greatly appreciate their consideration and was happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Hahn asked if he stated the hotel and the residential would be connected. Mr. Deal stated yes and that this would be a mixed-use project involving 246 apartment units that were wrapped around a parking garage and connected to the building was the 125-room hotel, so the buildings would share a common wall and they were going to have the lot line directly where the common wall was. Ms. Hahn wanted to know if there was going to be pass-through. Mr. Deal stated there was very limited pass-throughs, more for fire related items between the two but the idea was that this would provide some flexibility on the ability to finance the hotel development with certain financing and the multi-family development financing.

Question was called for at 6:16PM for **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-04 Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 9).**

Yes: Mrs. Hazen, Mrs. Voelker, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Banicki, Mr. Emmons, Ms. Hahn, Mr. Mammolenti, Mr. Violi, Mr. Hixenbaugh. The resolution passed 9-0, thus it became **ORDINANCE NO 5884.**

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING CONTIGUOUS TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF MISHAWAKA, INDIANA AND PROVIDING ZONING CLASSIFICATION THEREFORE

**Annex 1.5 Acres (crosshatch) & Establish Zoning as S-2 PUD & Amend existing Douglas
Common PUD to allow for storage units – 1693 Douglas Rd & Adjacent property
Public Hearing – No Vote**

John Piraccini, 633 Windy Cove Court, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mr. Piraccini stated they had a favorable recommendation from the Planning Commission and the staff and had a lengthy meeting that had some remonstrations with neighbors

to the northwest and to the east and he thought the Council Attorney and City Attorney could verify that there was no legal problem here whatsoever. Mr. Piraccini stated this was not a residential neighborhood and never had been and this had been zoned commercial, multi-family office for numerous years and to the east, there were warehouses in the back. Mr. Piraccini stated at the conclusion of the aforementioned meeting, he stayed with neighbors from the Cherokee Drive area to the northwest to try to answer some questions, mainly to agree to disagree and they got the comments that the city's growth was pushing up against county and this happened all the time. Mr. Piraccini stated they tried to appease the neighbors with the city's requirements with buffers and things like that. Mr. Piraccini stated Ray Powell from U-Haul would be doing a presentation on the phases of the project and how it folded into the land. Mr. Piraccini stated that one of the neighbors had reached out to Mr. Banicki, as this was his district and he met with him as well as meeting with a group of neighbors with Ray Powell. Mr. Piraccini stated there were about 30 people at that meeting with one third of the people living there with another third renting there and the final third doing an Air BnB type of deal. Mr. Piraccini provided the Council with a couple of handouts pertaining to the site. Mr. Piraccini stated with the project when looking on the business side of things, they were paying about \$2,000 a year in property taxes for vacant land and U-Haul was going to do probably \$6 million initially, as Ray would verify. Mr. Piraccini stated he did get some response from the neighbors at North Douglas, and some said they did not want apartments, and this had been for sale for about 30 years. Mr. Piraccini stated this seemed to be a natural fit for the site on Douglas with the road widened and the close proximity to Notre Dame and Grape Road in the Mishawaka-Main Street area. Mr. Piraccini stated U-Haul was privately owned and they had been great to work with and he did tell the neighbors that he could guarantee that they would have a representative to respond to if they had an issue. Mr. Piraccini stated Ray was in this region and there would be somebody in an office on Grape Road.

Mrs. Voelker asked Mr. Piraccini for clarification if the property as shown on the handout that needed to be rezoned was the small square and the property line was to the east of the easement and if that was correct. Mr. Piraccini stated the orange was his property line and to the east of that was the easement that was actually running on the adjacent property.

Mr. Hixenbaugh asked with regard to the self-storage facilities that were located to the east of the condominium development, how long those had been in place. Mr. Piraccini stated those were built in 1991 and the condos were built after that. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked for clarification if the condos were constructed after the self-storage facilities. Mr. Piraccini stated yes, but they sold the land to them at the time in 1990 or 1991.

Ray Powell, 17324 Brookwood Drive in Lowell, Indiana, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05** and was representing the U-Haul company. Mr. Powell stated they were a family-owned company and they had been in existence for almost 80 years and the entire time they had been family-owned and would continue to be. Mr. Powell stated they were looking to expand within the community of Mishawaka, and they were there that evening to talk about the properties at 16963 Douglas Road and the annexation there on the southeast corner. Mr.

Powell stated they were looking at building a 31,588 square foot building on the very southwest corner of the property and there was a sister building that was going to be 16,800 square feet that would be in the southwest portion of the property. Mr. Powell stated there were some secondary phases that were to the back, but pretty much all of the property that was going to be utilized in the primary build was going to be up there right on Douglas Road. Mr. Powell stated total investment on the site was somewhere between \$17 million and \$18 million between the property and the building itself. Mr. Powell stated it was going to consist of a total of three fours on the southwest side for a total of 95,000 square feet. Mr. Powell stated their intentions currently were the two primary buildings in the southwest and southeast corner right up next to Douglas. Mr. Powell stated they did not have anything on the books yet for their secondary phase and the rest of the property would remain intact as they saw it currently. Mr. Powell showed a photo of what the buildings would look like in his PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Powell stated they were more than willing to work with anything the city had or any kind of architectural guidelines or anything like that. Mr. Powell stated they have used different looks and different aesthetics on the buildings, and they would do that again to make them fit whatever it was that the city of Mishawaka would like. Mr. Powell showed examples of the buildings they have developed in other areas. Mr. Powell stated something that had been brought up a couple of times were the security features they had to offer, and they would have 24-hour monitoring with an off-site facility monitoring the building 24 hours a day and they would also have a full staff on-site from 7AM to 7PM Monday through Thursday, 7AM to 8PM on Friday, 7AM to 7PM Saturday and 9AM to 5PM on Sunday. Mr. Powell stated they would monitor everything internally and all motion sensors and cameras. Mr. Powell stated they had intercoms in case any customers had concerns while inside. Mr. Powell stated they would also have 24-hour digital HD surveillance video individually and all of the units would be secured 24 hours a day. Mr. Powell stated there were some sustainability programs they would be wanting to bring to the local area and wanted to city to be aware of. Mr. Powell stated they had programs such as truck share programs, box exchange programs and reuse areas for individuals to reuse certain products that were brought. Mr. Powell stated he was open to any questions.

Mr. Mammolenti stated he saw a slide that showed a car share and asked if there would be vehicles and large box trucks parked on the site. Mr. Powell stated they would set up a truck share program there for whenever customers needed to use it for the area. Mr. Mammolenti asked again if there may be multiple vehicles on-site for people to rent. Mr. Powell stated they did offer vehicles for them to share to use for moving in and out of the facility and they sometimes would be parked on-site. Mr. Mammolenti asked if he were to anticipate how many may be on-site, what number he would throw out there and if there was a minimum or a maximum. Mr. Powell stated they tended not to have a minimum or a maximum, but it could vary from 2 to 3 or more. Mr. Powell stated it was really about what was required in the local area.

Mrs. Voelker asked if truck share meant that she could go rent a truck from U-Haul and could do whatever she needed to do with it and then she could return the truck or was this truck share specifically related to people that were using the storage facility. Mr. Powell stated it would be

for both. Mrs. Voelker asked for clarification if there were two buildings on-site, the large 31,000+ square foot storage facility and then the 16,000 square foot retail facility. Mr. Powell stated they would both be storage facilities with the smaller one being a secondary storage facility where they would offer long-term storage at. Mr. Powell stated the retail store would be in the 31,000 square foot building.

Mr. Violi asked of all of the pictures he showed of their buildings, which one would most resemble what they were proposing for Mishawaka. Mr. Powell showed one of the slides to display it for Mr. Violi.

Mrs. Voelker asked what the red boxes were on the pictures displayed in the presentation. Mr. Powell stated they were fake doors that mimicked what would be found inside once an individual was inside.

Mr. Carroll asked for future use of the land, since they were not using all of the land right now, if there was a plan for it to be used at some point or maybe sold. Mr. Powell stated they did not typically sell property and they looked to invest in the area while looking for something that fit their needs and not changing or selling. Mr. Carroll asked if there were any long-term plans for the part of the property to the north. Mr. Powell stated no, and the primary focus was the two main buildings on Douglas. Mr. Carroll asked if they would be keeping the forest in place as was. Mr. Powell stated yes, they would not be touching that. Mr. Carroll asked once the facility was up and running, if they would grant 24-hour access or if there were quiet hours. Mr. Powell stated they would be restricting access from 5AM to 10PM. Mr. Powell stated even outside of the store hours when there were people on site, anyone that would have access to it would have to use their own security code to gain access to the facility. Mr. Carroll asked as far as the areas where they would be doing construction that were close to residential areas, if they had screening plans for line of sight for those folks. Mr. Powell stated he was sure they could take a look at whatever was required, and he did not know that at that point until they actually started getting some nonstructural guidelines in place. Mr. Carroll asked what would happen with other U-Haul affiliates in the area. Mr. Powell stated currently, they had some privately owned businesses that offered U-Haul as a service and one of the reasons why they were trying to look at this property at this location was they realized that they were starting to get overwhelmed and there was actually a need for their services in Mishawaka that they were not able to provide. Mr. Powell stated they wanted to try to alleviate what was going on in some of those privately owned businesses and create a more manageable environment so that they could kind of take care of what Mishawaka was looking to have.

Mr. Mammolenti asked when they developed the two buildings, would only a portion of the entire parcel be paved. Mr. Powell stated the white part of the picture he displayed would be what would get paved. Mr. Mammolenti stated the reason he asked that question was his fear was this would be used as a storage facility in terms of trucks, and they may have 20 to 30 vehicles lined up as a lot that folks could come and rent those vehicles. Mr. Powell stated they showed three to four lanes were the only space they had designated for any kind of equipment

utilization. Mr. Powell stated he could not really give him an idea of how many trucks exactly, but they were trying to make it a manageable situation so it would not become a problem.

Mr. Emmons asked about outside storage and if that was not going to be part of the building process. Mr. Powell stated as they went through the process, they refined their business plan and decided that based on the abutting storage property there that they already purchased that the exterior storage was not necessary for the time being. Mr. Powell stated it would be a project to be determined later.

Mr. Hixenbaugh asked if this facility, if it were approved and constructed, would be franchised out to another operator or if it would be a corporate facility operated by U-Haul. Mr. Powell stated this would be a facility operated and owned by U-Haul and managed by them internally. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked with regard to the sizeable investment that he referenced earlier and the detail that he provided them with regard to the security, if he could talk about what the price point was going to be for the storage component of what was available here compared to other storage facilities in the community, as far as to the customer. Mr. Powell stated typically they actually found themselves at the higher end of the self-storage industry and they tried to cater to the customer that was looking for more security with the higher end products and something that was obviously going to protect and keep their belongings secure. Mr. Powell stated they actually dealt with a lot of medical facilities and pharmaceutical reps, and it was one of the reasons that they kind of got attracted to the area with its many medical facilities. Mr. Powell stated they did try to over a high-end product which typically translated into a higher end price product because of what they did for the customer. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated if he understood him correctly earlier, he referenced the fact that he had been involved in the construction and development of other similar facilities in the past and asked if that was accurate. Mr. Powell stated yes. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked if he were to ballpark it, how many of the facilities he had been involved with. Mr. Powell stated this would now be the third project he would be involved with. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked with regard to the other projects what type of security issues or neighborhood encroachment issues he had experienced in those facilities. Mr. Powell stated he knew there some concerns in the beginning but he thought when they were actually able to get in there and show the neighborhood exactly how their services were taken care of and the product that they offered along with how secure it was, a lot of times they had a reputation of a high traffic type business. Mr. Powell stated with the self-storage industry as a whole, typically most people used it as a place to take their belongings and leave them and it was not typically visited very often. Mr. Powell stated they were a good neighbor in comparison to not only retail, but even sometimes apartment complexes because most of those had very high traffic. Mr. Powell stated they were a good neighbor in the fact that they offered a quiet, typically low impact type of facility that was not really going to change a lot that was going on. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked if he was a neighbor and wanted to contact an individual working on-site, how would he know who to contact and how did he plan on publicizing the identity and contact information of the person there on-site. Mr. Powell stated in all of their company-run stores, they had something they called a WOW program where anywhere from a dozen to more points in the facility, the manager of the facility's cellphone would be listed so you could actually call or text the manager's

cellphone directly and his personal cellphone was listed on the front door of the building as well. Mr. Powell stated any customer that was coming or going could have access to not only the managers, but him as well.

Mr. Banicki asked who was going to build this. Mr. Powell stated they tried to do local builds as much as possible and they built locations all across the country, but if they could find somebody local it tended to just do better for the project as a whole. Mr. Powell stated they did have an owner's representative that worked for them but typically as far as the construction went, as much as they could they wanted to find someone local. Mr. Banicki asked what kind of a timeframe this would have from start to finish and if he hoped to have this up in 12 months or 18 months or two years. Mr. Powell stated typically a project like this would take about 12 to 18 months depending on exactly what time of year you got started and all that kind of stuff as far as getting all of the conceptual finalized and that kind of thing. Mr. Banicki stated when looking at the map, it looked like there was one vacant parcel just to the west that was not part of this project and asked if that parcel was in Mishawaka, South Bend or the county. Mr. Powell stated it was in South Bend. Mr. Banicki stated this would then be the furthest point for Mishawaka on Douglas Road. Mr. Powell stated that was correct and that was why they were annexing in that small 1.5-acre parcel as well.

Mr. Violi stated they all knew there were other U-Haul locations and asked if those were company owned or were they all independent. Mr. Powell stated they currently had two company run locations that were relatively close by in Elkhart, Indiana and in South Bend off of Western. Mr. Powell stated both of those locations are fairly small and were built many, many years ago and they did not offer their current business model which was more tailored to the higher end storage and was another reason why they were looking for something in this area. Mr. Violi asked if most of them were truck sharing like they were discussing as far as the independent locations were concerned. Mr. Powell stated yes and that was what was typically offered. Mr. Violi asked if he were not looking to put them out of business. Mr. Powell stated no and if anything, they were looking to help them and partner with them. Mr. Powell stated it was not about taking business away and it was more about alleviating and managing in a better fashion.

Mr. Carroll stated as far as the storage units on the back, he assumed that would have a lot of light on it for security and asked if they were taking precautions with their lighting so there would not be a lot of light pollution going out in different directions there. Mr. Powell stated they took very careful precautions to make sure no lighting was really looking at any exterior properties and all lighting that would be pole mounted or anything like that would be facing inside of the storage facility only. Mr. Powell stated there was typically a buffering zone of some type between their property and someone else's when they would do that. Mr. Carroll stated with the color of those buildings, he assumed they were going to be reflective enough to project it out and he guessed being in backside there close enough to the two-story condo units, he would be really interested to see what kind of screening they would come up with to make sure that it was not a blinding light to people in their back windows. Mr. Powell stated as far as the exterior stuff, most of the lighting was relatively close to the ground and even though it was well lit, it was

actually self-contained within the storage units themselves. Mr. Powell stated as far as anything exterior wise, you did not get any light outside of the actual storage buildings themselves.

Rick Rottweiler, District Vice President of U-Haul, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mr. Rottweiler stated he just wanted to answer Mr. Carroll's question on screening and lighting and stated with any of the builds that they did and any time they were abutting any type of residential, they would generally screen it with trees. Mr. Rottweiler stated right now, part of their plan involved trees that were already back there so if it was insufficient in order to screen, they would make it sufficient. Mr. Rottweiler stated also with a lot of the exterior drive-up units, you would see a wall pack lighting instead of a pole mounted lighting so when they got to that point, they submitted photometric plans and had them reviewed and agreed upon prior to any construction. Mr. Rottweiler stated they were well aware that light pollution in somebody's home was certainly not a good thing, so they tried to build in respect to that.

John Piraccini, 633 Windy Cove Court, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mr. Piraccini stated he wanted to clarify on units and when they built next door, it was almost 400 units on 3 acres. Mr. Piraccini stated they almost had 14 acres in all, and the storage was going to go up in front. Mr. Piraccini stated that would be a ton of storage over the years and everybody was going inside those days, and he just wanted to give them an idea of how much land you would probably need for outside storage.

Elizabeth Roycroft, owner of a home at 17125 Cherokee Drive, spoke in opposition to **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mrs. Roycroft stated she was a new homeowner, living there just one year and when she did her due diligence in purchasing her home, she checked to see the zoning because the backyard of her home was 100% adjacent to the property in question. Mrs. Roycroft stated she was shocked to receive the notice of potential change in zoning, and it seemed unusual to have a change in zoning that impacted a property owner in this way. Mrs. Roycroft stated she had not been privy other than the first meeting notice to any conversations referenced in regard to conversations with homeowners, so she really knew very little of what was expected from her end other than to say it sounded a lot of it was hypothetical at this point with the site plans. Mrs. Roycroft stated once the zoning was changed and the property was sold, those decisions were gone, and they were decisions that needed to be made now. Mrs. Roycroft stated how to protect the rights of homeowners as well, giving the gentleman his ability to sell the property was important. Mrs. Roycroft stated she was concerned that they make a very careful decision about what was best for everyone and that they had some dialogue between the residents and the business owners so that they were sure of what was expected rather than just saying it might look like that. Mrs. Roycroft stated one of the things was really important for her to share with them was that she had heard some conversation about progress and that term had been jostled around a bit and the statements had been made that the residents of Cherokee Drive did not understand what progress was and they were trying to impede progress. Mrs. Roycroft believed it was the Council's responsibility to ensure that whatever progress occurred in the community was well thought out and beneficial to all. Mrs. Roycroft

stated when she looked at progress, she was thinking about affordable housing for this community and not progress that caused property value to decrease and upset the current owners of the property around them, because that was what she was looking at. Mrs. Roycroft stated she was looking at a really bad decision on her part to buy a home, build it up, fix it and tend to her yard when her property value was going to go significantly to the negative direction and she knew how hard it was to find affordable housing. Mrs. Roycroft was asking the Council to please think about the families and homeowners that were affected by a decision to possibly tear down every tree in the whole swath, to possibly pave the roads and to possibly put lighting in the area when they did not really know what was expected. Mrs. Roycroft stated lastly, she just wanted to say that she thought that there was some collaborative planning that could go into place there so everyone would be content and did not feel stepped on, so she encouraged them to find some creative ways that they could make this a win-win rather than simply having the impression that someone was coming in and pushing them out. Mrs. Roycroft stated she knew the Council valued people who lived in the community, and they would not be sitting in the positions that they were if they did not. Mrs. Roycroft thanked the Council.

Mr. Banicki stated she spoke about affordable housing and things like that and when looking at this property, in his opinion there were some things that could be a little bit worse like if they were to put in a large apartment community then they would have more traffic, more visitors and more lighting so he did not know if this was the worst thing in the world. Mr. Banicki apologized to her and stated he knew she only had lived there for a year but this is just one of those things that can happen and looking at some of the things that could go wrong, he just did not see this as one of the worst and then the other side was that if it were in fact industrial and they put in some type of factory and you had a stamping machine making noise all night, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, that would be bad as well. Mr. Banicki stated these were fairly well regulated and there were some other ones put in close to there and with the all secure self-storage, they were put in a bunch in counties all around them and they had done a very nice job as well so while he did sympathize with her he also looked at what could happen and they were just speculating. Mr. Banicki stated they hoped that they could trust them and in talking to Ray, he seemed very professional, and he trusted what he was telling him. Mrs. Roycroft stated she appreciated him giving some comparisons and she trusted them all as a body that neither of those worst-case scenarios would occur because they would care about the existing homeowners and the bottom line with progress for this community, they needed to think about what did it look like and what did it feel like and it was not just strip shopping centers and all of that sort of thing. Mrs. Roycroft sympathized with anyone who was trying to buy a home and start a family because it was very, very difficult and she thought they should give some consideration to loss of green space in the community because it was trickling away and once you tore all of the trees down, you would not have any so while he was throwing back other examples of worst case than what it was now, it sounded like he was telling her she to choose one since the others were bad so how about they worked together to figure out a way that they could have the beautiful facility but not also impact the residents who directly were adjacent to the property in question. Mr. Banicki stated he agreed, and he thought with LED lighting directed certain ways, obviously he had seen lighting where it could be dimmed down during certain hours unless there was motion and things

like that so he thought there were some things that could be done to help alleviate that. Mrs. Roycroft stated that sounded great, but once the decision was made, who was controlling whether or not that occurred, and you were trusting someone else.

Mr. Carroll stated when they were looking at the plans, she was not concerned about anything affecting her property because hers was the one that was the furthest to the east and in the center either in phase 1 or phase 2, because that was going to be separated by quite a bit of forest. Mr. Carroll stated it sounded like she was concerned with a potential phase 3 in the future and asked if that was correct. Mrs. Roycroft stated for her personally, yes. Mr. Carroll stated the other thing too was that his understanding as far as the green space was concerned was the owner could take the forest down at any time since they were a private property owner and he was not sure that the Council had the ability to really control a whole lot of that anyways but he wanted to make sure that as far as her property was concerned, she was not seeing anything in the current plan that would really affect her in any way. Mrs. Roycroft stated it could potentially affect other homeowners in her area including the condominium complex. Mr. Carroll stated the only one he could see was the neighbor on the corner there and it looked like they had a significant buffer of forest. Mrs. Roycroft stated she did not know because she had not seen what any of this was going to look like, but she knew that it was not her property and it was someone else's property and they could develop it any way they wanted to but she was speaking that evening to them all who had a decision to make about the proposal and making sure they were controlling the decision making the purchaser had with regard to some aspects of the project. Mr. Carroll stated that's why he was saying as far as the aspects of the project, there was nothing she had identified as part of the project that affected her property. Mrs. Roycroft stated she did not know because she had not seen the whole layout and had just heard conversations about some possibilities for the project. Mr. Carroll stated at this point, they had indicated that they were going to keep it as green space from what he had heard and that there currently was not anything in the plans for that. He just wanted to make sure he was clear that point was not missed.

Mr. Mammolenti asked if she had a blank canvas and she could put her requirements in a dream world, what would she want to see on that back portion if it were to be developed. Mrs. Roycroft stated you could do a lot of things that would appreciate the green space and the community itself, but once you clogged up that lane, you could not do anything back there. Mr. Mammolenti stated he was speaking more specifically that if this were to get approved and they were to develop and move forward into phase 2 and phase 3, what would give her peace of mind. Mrs. Roycroft stated she was concerned about the lighting, the noise, the people coming back there and who they were, concerned about what level of fencing she would be required to put up in order to protect herself from that which changed the whole dynamic of her property value. Mrs. Roycroft stated her number one concern was that this would devalue her property.

Allison Kincaid, 17130 Cherokee Drive, spoke in opposition to **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mrs. Kincaid stated she had been a resident for almost four years at the Cherokee neighborhood directly west of 1693 Douglas Road and the adjacent vacant property the proposal referred to. Mrs. Kincaid stated she fell in love with the location of the house as soon as she

viewed it. Mrs. Kincaid stated it was conveniently close to South Bend, Granger and Mishawaka and they had the toll road just north of them as well as US-23 just west and Douglas just south of them. Mrs. Kincaid stated what sold it for her were the woods surrounding the street that created a woodland paradise for all of the families that lived there. Mrs. Kincaid stated she felt enclosed, safe and at peace in her neighborhood. Mrs. Kincaid stated eliminating over half of the forest that surrounded the area would trigger numerous adverse consequences. Mrs. Kincaid stated there would be an increase to noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution, a decrease to property values and tearing down and killing of protected species that lived in the woodlands. Mrs. Kincaid stated in the Planning Committee meeting, they had stated the easement did little to provide any sort of barrier to the rest of the property west of the easement. Mrs. Kincaid stated she was the meeting point between South Bend, Granger and Mishawaka and considered herself a citizen of all three cities and therefore, would advocate for all citizens from each city. Mrs. Kincaid stated at the Planning meeting there were several objections to the petition and the rebuttal of the petitioner did little to calm the masses. Mrs. Kincaid stated Mishawaka did have ordinances on light but from seeing other U-Haul storage facilities, they were aggressively lit to shine on everything around them. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated he did not want to stifle her creativity and what she wanted to share with them, but he did want to state for the record that every councilmember had access to the recording of the Plan Commission meeting and what transpired there and they also had been provided a summary by the Planning Department of the written comments that were made at the meeting and then any documents that were submitted after the fact, so just so she knew they were already in possession of that and he asked her not to re-plow ground they had already been over. Mrs. Kincaid stated she appreciated that. Mrs. Kincaid provided the Council with an image of another U-Haul facility in Kentucky to demonstrate their lighting. Mrs. Kincaid stated these units were aggressively lit to shine on everything around them and she had yet to see light regulations enforced and another issue that was brought up during the rebuttal was that of noise pollution. Mrs. Kincaid stated the woods were a sound barrier between them and the city noise and allowing the land to be rezoned and used as commercial industrial would increase the noise level to residents all around. Mrs. Kincaid stated that phase 2, which was not covered at the Planning meeting, would destroy a lot of the woods to her neighbors' side and was close to her property as well. Mrs. Kincaid stated in August 2023, the EPA release that noise, air and light pollution affected the lives of millions and their studies showed a direct link between noise, light and health. Mrs. Kincaid stated heart disease, depression, stress-related illnesses, hearing loss and others came from this. Mrs. Kincaid they were harping on the woods so much because U-Haul currently did not have plans for the woods and while that seemed reassuring, this came from a big company that did not have any trustworthy standing with the residents around the property or the community, in her opinion. Mrs. Kincaid stated she was glad Douglas Commons residents were included in the conversations, but Cherokee residents and other neighbors who spoke in opposition were not. Mrs. Kincaid requested a written contract stating 99% of the woods would not be eliminated. Mrs. Kincaid stated they were losing green space, and the petitioner did not touch on the fact that ridding the community of the woods would lead to significantly more air pollution. Mrs. Kincaid stated they also missed the endangered species that would be uprooted. Mrs. Kincaid stated there were many species in danger that called the woods home, including species of plants. Mrs. Kincaid stated not only did

the petitioner and most of the Planning Committee seem to not realize the lives of the people living around the woods would be affected, they also did not realize that the protected wildlife would be dangerously affected as well. Mrs. Kincaid also stated they did not address the danger coyotes would post to the families and children along US-23 if the woods were knocked down, moving their dens closer to the families and daycare nearby. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated he appreciated her passion and the points she was making but it felt they were becoming repetitive at that point in time and asked her if she could move on to any other points she wanted to make briefly and that would be appreciated. Mrs. Kincaid stated she was a critical care nurse and had been for 11 years working overtime to make ends meet and it all went back to affordable housing that she and the other neighbors were concerned about. Mrs. Kincaid stated the notion that storage units were progress had been referred to often and storage units were not progress to her and all it meant was that people were holding onto too many things. Mrs. Kincaid stated storage units were a symptom of maximalism and progress would be people and residents being able to live their best quality of life. Mrs. Kincaid stated there were medical businesses, lawyers and residential areas in that community and people lived there. Mrs. Kincaid stated there were four storage units within a mile radius of that location with a fifth one being built on US-23 on Cleveland and the area was becoming saturated with storage units. Mrs. Kincaid proposed some alternate locations for U-Haul storage units south of Mishawaka to the north just on Main Street where there were three vacant lots for sale and a fourth lot for sale on Main Street with the former USA Skate building that was rundown and needed addressing. Mrs. Kincaid stated they were all aware the woods could be destroyed at any time and their community had been very grateful for the woods and did not want to see them go. In conclusion, Mrs. Kincaid stated she wanted the woods to be the solution to the noise, light and air pollution. Mrs. Kincaid stated after this went through the Council, it was out of everyone's control.

Carolyn Tingle, 17160 Cherokee Drive, spoke in opposition to **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mrs. Tingle stated she received a letter from Ryan Dvorak and his legislative assistant sent them all a copy of it. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated the record would reflect that the Council all received the letter. Mrs. Tingle stated in the board meeting there a couple of weeks ago, it was vague what the zoning requirements would be to have storage units on this property and her understanding was that it would have to be rezoned to industrial commercial. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated the public hearing component was designed for comments by people such as herself and it was not a question-and-answer session, but he pledged to her that as soon as she concluded, he would ask their legal counsel to address that issue for her. Mrs. Tingle thanked Mr. Hixenbaugh and stated personally, what most greatly concerned her was the idea that some actually believed that tax revenue was more important than the health and welfare of the people they represented or worse, that the prosperity of some took such precedence that others became expendable after all. Mrs. Tingle stated the whole area over there was going commercial anyway and that was progress.

Kurt Urbanski, 5625 Irish Way Apartment 10 and Treasure of North Douglas Condominium Association, spoke in opposition to **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05**. Mr. Urbanski stated he was thankful that Mr. Piraccini, and the U-Haul folks were able to meet with the condo

owners the other day to discuss the plan in more detail. Mr. Urbanski stated he did reach out and send some comments to the Council that they had all received. Mr. Urbanski stated a couple of concerns specific to the condominium complexes were the proposed entrance on the northeast corner right across from the existing entrance to the storage units was creating a four-way intersection right there and he was concerned about potential increase in traffic there. Mr. Urbanski stated he was sure if it were approved, it would have to go through several departments to figure out if that was going to be okay there. Mr. Urbanski stated in the proposal, there was a statement that customers and community residents who wished to use the on-site dumpsters for disposal and refuse may gain permission to do so and would be assessed an additional fee. Mr. Urbanski stated a concern for North Douglas was that people that came to dump their stuff from the storage units could fall upon them in the neighboring community to pay the fees and they already had some problems of this nature. Mr. Urbanski stated another thing that was very important to the longevity of the North Douglas condos was that they were a development that was originally planned to have 216 units there and unfortunately the developer went bankrupt in 2007 or 2008 and unfortunately they only had 32 units built so far and it made it difficult to spread the common expenses over 32 units, so recently within the last year the Condo Association settled litigation with another party to establish the title to some of the vacant land to the north of their condominiums and their plan was to work with a developer to not completely finish the original 216 planned units, but to at least add onto the development and double the size because there was enough vacant land owned by the Condo Association to fit up to two more buildings to add another 32 units. Mr. Urbanski stated that would really give them the opportunity to have a developer come in, contribute to the reserve fund and pave the road because the road was never finished after the development began and that was a concern. Mr. Urbanski stated the roofs were also a concern and they were operating on a pretty thin budget, so the concern for the longevity of the community was an issue especially with potential storage units coming in as to what it would look like and if the developer would still want to come in after the fact. Mr. Urbanski stated his condo was on the backside of the 5625 building directly overlooking the woods and with the easement, there would be a little bit of a buffer but he was on the second floor and if they were going to have storage units back there, he did not think that the lighting was going to be shielded by solely the trees and they would have to put up a fence. Mr. Urbanski stated he did not get any strong confirmation on that and he did not know if regulations had changed or there were new ways to install lighting, but from his one window that was facing that direction he could see the lights at night from the opposite side storage units and he imagined it would only be brighter if there was nothing to direct the light downwards. Mr. Urbanski stated he was not opposed to developing the vacant area right off of Douglas on the corner and in the area where they were proposing the three-story building, but he did not know what they were exactly proposing would be the best possible thing for that area. Mr. Urbanski stated he would like to see the house and property gone, as it was an eyesore and there had been a trash buildup over there in the past. Mr. Urbanski stated he would like to see something go in there and looked forward to having a sidewalk or a bike path along there because it gave the residents of North Douglas an opportunity to connect from their development all the way down to the new bike trail that went along the north side of Douglas and had been extended out to State Road 23. Mr. Urbanski stated he was more concerned about phase 2 rather than phase 1.

Mr. Hixenbaugh noted for the record that several points were made and he appreciated the passion and information that was shared with the Council with several questions asked rhetorically and several points were made that he believed were answered by the staff report and the proposed ordinance in their council packet as they had ordinances that covered all types of development and lighting but there were specific conditions of approval that if this were passed would touch on lighting issues, so he invited everyone to visit the city website where the packet that the Council had in front of them was contained electronically as well and they would see some of those conditions and hopefully answer some of the questions they may have.

The public hearing on **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-05** was closed at 7:35PM and pursuant to Indiana Law, they would vote on this proposed ordinance at their next regularly scheduled council meeting on April 22nd.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-06

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING CONTIGUOUS TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF MISHAWAKA, INDIANA AND PROVIDING ZONING CLASSIFICATION THEREFORE

**Annex 30.64 Acres & Establish Zoning as S-2 PUD – NW corner of Capital Ave. &
Cleveland Rd.**

Public Hearing – No Vote

Angela Smith, Danch, Harner & Associates 1643 Commerce Drive, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-06**. Mrs. Smith stated the Council had the packet of information in front of them, so she wanted to go over the proposal briefly and then answer any questions. Mrs. Smith stated the request showed a rezoning and annexation of 30 acres and the parcel itself was just over 21 acres and the additional 8 acres was because, per state law, they had to take in the adjacent right-of-ways. Mrs. Smith stated this would be an extension of the PUD that was approved by the Council to the west of the site, so at the time the previous PUD came through they were discussing purchasing this to help round out the canvas they were looking for here, which was essentially an auto mall so it would have services for auto sales and related services. Mrs. Smith stated all of the uses in the original PUD and all of the restrictions would extend to this with the exception of one thing. Mrs. Smith stated the current PUD in front of them that evening included R-1, because there was a life estate on the property so the gentleman would continue to live on the property so that use was added for that. Mrs. Smith stated the restrictions about no fueling station and no billboards in the other developing standards that were adopted in the previous PUD would extend to this as well. Mrs. Smith stated they were continuing to work with adjacent property owners because they all knew they had to get water and sewer to the site which was not there yet and it was quite a ways south of them, so they continued to work with the property owners to try to work on that and that would not require an annexation but may require additional future zoning work depending on how that panned out. Mrs. Smith stated she was happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Hixenbaugh thanked her for the information and stated he had the chance to speak with her last week and before he got into the topic that they discussed, there were a series of conditions that were built into not only the staff report, but the proposed ordinance that would be asked to be approved. Mr. Hixenbaugh asked if she had the authority to commit on behalf of her client that she was in agreement with those conditions as proposed by staff. Mrs. Smith said yes, and they forwarded this to the client, and they reviewed them and understood all of the conditions of the development. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated as reflected in the staff report, no specific users or contingent purchaser had been identified and at times, there were good reasons for the underlying landowner or end users' identity to remain anonymous. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated although he thought as a general matter it was good government for the specifics to be known and it helped them to decide whether or not this was a development that was in the best interest of the community and he asked at that point in time, if she was at liberty to share any additional information with regard to the identity of the end user. Mrs. Smith stated out of preservation of their relationship with their client, they were not supposed to disclose that, but she could answer any questions related to that. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated he did not profess to be the greatest detective, but through a google search using the name of the individual who signed the petition as well as the address on the document that authorized her to represent the individual, it appeared the underlying land user would be Gurley Leep and asked if she was aware of any facts that would lead him to believe that he were wrong with regard to the identity of that underlying land user. Mrs. Smith stated she did not know of anything, but in fact the email address of the individual she had also had Gurley Leep in the name. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated just from his standpoint that the beauty of the fact that they were not going to cast a vote that evening was that he would be able to ponder the fact that there was not the transparency there and absent a persuasive explanation as to why the identity was not being made public, he reserved the right to vote no based only on that ground itself but he would be happy between now and the time of the vote to receive any additional information that she would like to provide to them to help shed light on that issue. Mrs. Smith stated as she mentioned, they were still under negotiations and investigations on how to get the water and sewer on-site and she did not know under state law or under their practices if they were required to reveal the specific company going to a property and that was new to her. Mrs. Smith stated generally, they looked at the use and the users and it was in fact an auto dealership and from their conversations, they could probably figure out who it was. Mrs. Smith stated outright that it was in fact Gurley Leep, and they had up to that point kept that more on the quiet side not out of a lack of transparency, but because the plans were not fully developed, and their acquisitions were not fully finished. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated he appreciated that clarification and again, this was the reason why he called her on Friday.

The public hearing on **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-06** was closed at 7:43PM and pursuant to Indiana Law, they would vote on this proposed ordinance at their next regularly scheduled council meeting on April 22nd.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-07

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING CONTIGUOUS TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF
MISHAWAKA, INDIANA AND PROVIDING ZONING CLASSIFICATION
THEREFORE**

**Annex & Zone to S-2 PUD for Residential Subdivision – SE Corner of Bremen Hwy &
Dragoon Tr.**

Daryl Knip, Abonmarche Consultant 315 W. Jefferson Boulevard in South Bend, spoke in favor of **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-07**. Mr. Knip stated he was representing the developer and applicant and requesting their approval to annex and zone S-2 PUD which was approximately 18 acres on the southeast corner of Bremen Highway and Dragoon Trail into the city with a PUD zoning that would allow for single family residential development. Mr. Knip stated the PUD would allow for a combination of single family detached homes, attached single family homes and possibly attached townhomes which would all be owner occupied homes with a maximum of 30% of the homes being attached or townhomes. Mr. Knip stated the home prices were estimated to be approximately \$500,000 and they had met with City Planning and Engineering staff to discuss the access, drainage, land use and the future road widening of Bremen Highway and effects on the site. Mr. Knip stated at the Plan Commission meeting, they heard from a few neighbors regarding safety concerns over any entrance from Bremen Highway and they wanted to reiterate that they were not proposing any entrance off of Bremen Highway and the entrance would be off of Dragoon based on site distance and slopes and felt the safest location would be the east end of the site on Dragoon and this would acquire a deceleration lane and some work on the roadway. Mr. Knip stated the developer agreed to work with the city and county to provide additional right-of-ways for future Bremen Highway widening and respectfully requested their approval.

Mr. Emmons stated he mentioned that the entrance and exit would be off of Dragoon Trail and asked if that were correct. Mr. Knip stated that was correct. Mr. Emmons stated but there was a roadway up there called Princess Drive that went basically up to one house, and it was his understanding that the house would be preserved. Mr. Knip stated that was correct and the house would be preserved but it would have access from the new internal roads, so the existing Princess Drive would go away. Mr. Emmons asked if they would close that off then so that home would have another driveway to get out. Mr. Knip stated that was correct.

Mr. Carroll stated the concerns he heard mainly had been congestion and traffic issues and increased pressure on residential roadways to get through and asked if there were any traffic studies done. Mr. Knip stated no formal traffic studies were done, but they did look at trip generation anticipated for the development, and it would add about 2% to 3% to traffic counts on Dragoon and about 1% to the traffic counts on Bremen Highway. Mr. Carroll stated a major concern was that people were going to use Merrifield as a cut-through to that as opposed to going on one of the major roads so that was something to keep in mind.

The public hearing on **PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2024-07** was closed at 7:48PM and pursuant to Indiana Law, they would vote on this proposed ordinance at their next regularly scheduled council meeting on April 22nd.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mayor Dave Wood made an announcement regarding his annual State of the City Address on Thursday, April 11th at 6PM in the Council Chambers. Mayor Wood stated he would cover their hometown and all of the issues they were facing in the progress of their city. Mayor Wood stated this was open to the public. Mr. Hixenbaugh stated they were looking forward to it.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Emmons made a reminder that the West End Neighborhood meeting would be Thursday April 18th at 7PM at St. Bavos where Mayor Dave Wood would be giving his State of the City Address for those who may have missed his first Address or wanted to come listen once again. Mr. Emmons looked forward to seeing everyone and there would be refreshments from the West End Bakery.

Mr. Mammolenti made a reminder that the Twin Branch Neighborhood Watch meeting would be Wednesday, April 17th with a location to be determined but it would take place at 7PM. Mr. Mammolenti stated their guest speaker would be Chris Jamrose, Director of the Engineering Department for the city of Mishawaka and she would be discussing some current and future developments and changes to the Twin Branch area as well as addressing questions or concerns from the neighbors. Mr. Mammolenti stated once he figured out the location, he would let everyone know.

ADJOURNMENT 7:50PM

Deborah S. Block /s/
Deborah S. Block, IAMC, MMC, City Clerk

Gregg A. Hixenbaugh /s/
Gregg A. Hixenbaugh, President

These minutes are a summary of actions taken at the Mishawaka Common Council meeting. The full video archive of the meeting is available for viewing at www.youtube.com/@cityofmishawaka635 for as long as this media is supported.