

November 12, 2015

The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Thursday, November 12, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendricks County Government Center, Room 3, 355 South Washington Street, Danville, Indiana. Members present: Mr. Don Reitz, AICP, Planning Director and Chairman; Mr. James Andrews, Acting County Engineer; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor; Mrs. Sonnie Johnston, Plan Commission Member Representative; and Mrs. Julie Haan, Environmental Health Director. Also present was: Mrs. Lesa Ternet, Planner; Mr. Owen Young, Planning Technician; and Mrs. Joanne Garcia, Recording Secretary.

Mr. Reitz called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance. There was a quorum with five (5) members present.

Mr. Reitz then called for approval of the minutes for the September 9, 2015 meeting.

Mrs. Johnston made a motion to approve the September 9, 2015 meeting minutes.

Mrs. Haan seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Reitz then called for the first item on the public hearing portion of the agenda:

**MIP 1068/15: SHEA PIERSON;** a 2-lot minor subdivision, 16.6 acres, Center Township, S21-T16N-R1W, located on the north side of County Road 350 North, approximately 0.25 mile west of Washington Street. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse, Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared along with Mrs. Shea Pierson, the applicant. Mr. Kruse stated that they were requesting approval for a two lot minor plat and he reviewed their compliance with the staff's conditions and recommendations. He stated the first recommendation concerned compliance with the Residential Design Standards of the Zoning Ordinance and they would comply with those standards. He then discussed the second recommendation having to do with some of the trees shown as part of the landscaping requirement. He stated those trees were in areas that would be standing water or saturated much of the time and the staff's request was to consider relocating those trees. Mr. Kruse stated they relocated the trees and had shown the same amount of trees on the plans but had placed them closer together.

Mrs. Ternet asked if the trees were still within five feet of the right-of-way.

Mr. Kruse stated yes. Mr. Kruse then discussed the third recommendation regarding tiles that the perimeter drains outlet to needing to be shown on the plans. He stated he was not sure how to comply with that comment. He stated he knew the direction but not how they got there.

Mr. Gaston stated that he believed that comment had been added by Mr. Ayers, the County Engineer, who was not present at this meeting. Mr. Gaston stated he believed dye testing had been done and it was found where they outletted.

Mrs. Haan stated that she believed Mr. Pierson had dye tested but that she did not have certification from Mr. Kruse and she did not know if that had been satisfactory to Mr. Ayers. She stated that there had been emails back and forth on this matter with Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Kruse stated that Mr. Pierson had obtained the dye from him and had run the tests.

Mrs. Haan stated that Mr. Pierson had shown a diagram of where he had dye tested but she did not have specific information where it showed putting the dye in and where it went out.

Mr. Gaston asked if that satisfied Mrs. Haan's concerns.

November 12, 2015

Mrs. Haan stated that yes the tests satisfied her concerns. She stated there might be an issue if the tiles were not functioning.

Mr. Gaston added that the comment in the staff's letter had been from Mr. Ayers. Mr. Gaston stated that he was fine with it.

Mrs. Ternet asked Mrs. Haan if that comment was different from the comment Mrs. Haan had added to the first page of the staff's letter.

Mrs. Haan stated she did have verification that dye testing had been done.

Mr. Kruse stated he would get back with Mr. Ayers on the matter. Mr. Kruse went on to discuss the last recommendation regarding the roadside ditch being shown where needed to ensure water did not encroach onto the road and also showing the ditch flowline being shown with flow arrows. Mr. Kruse stated that a culvert was being shown on the plans. He stated that the rules had changed and roadside ditches or shoulders were no longer required. He stated because of that they were in uncharted territory on how to proceed. He stated there had to be enough of a ditch to drain the culvert.

Mrs. Ternet stated that this was a questionable area and that Mr. Ayers would want something presented to him to see if the plan was acceptable.

Mr. Andrews responded that Mr. Ayers' only comment to him was that he wanted it stated on the plat that water would stand on the property.

Mr. Kruse stated that they had added a statement to the plat which stated "from time to time there would be standing water on Lot 1 near or along the road right-of-way for County Road 350 North." He stated that he and Mr. Gaston had discussed this at the Drainage Board meeting.

Mr. Gaston stated that the statement should be approved as to content by the County Attorney.

Mrs. Ternet commented that they needed to know what that statement would be because if there were going to be roadside improvements, the engineering inspector had to know what those were going to be and if acceptable. She stated that the findings could be written to say it would be acceptable to the County Engineer.

Mr. Kruse stated he understood that it would be whatever ditch was needed to drain a driveway culvert

Mr. Gaston stated that Mr. Kruse and the County Engineer could work out the details and he would be fine with that and the language used on the plat to let future homeowners know that there would be water that stands on the tiles especially on Lot 1 because of the depression area.

Mr. Reitz then asked if everyone was okay with the matter subject to Mr. Ayer's approval. He asked exactly what Mr. Kruse would be committing to.

Mr. Kruse responded that whatever ditch work needed to be done to drain the driveway culvert would be completed.

Mr. Reitz stated that should be part of the motion.

Mrs. Ternet stated that the recommendation was also set out in the staff's letter and that it should also be subject to Mr. Ayers' approval.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Reitz opened the public hearing.

November 12, 2015

Mr. Barry Miller, 394 West County Road 350 North, appeared. He stated he lived just to the west of the Pierson property. He stated he had no problem with the Pierson's plans to construct a home. He stated his concerns were about the standing water that came over the road and backed up on his property.

Mr. Gaston stated there was an equalizer pipe under the County Road that allowed water to go from one side of the road to the other side.

There was further discussion on Mr. Miller's concerns with the County Surveyor, Mr. Gaston. Mr. Gaston stated he would work with the property owners in the area to address the drainage concerns. He stated he would bring the matter up before the Drainage Board in two weeks and see about resolving the issues. He stated a regulated drain was an option to discuss with the Commissioners.

There being no one else signed up to be heard, Mr. Reitz closed the public hearing.

Mr. Reitz then called for a motion.

Mr. Gaston made a motion to grant approval for **MIP 1068/15: Shea Pierson** subject to the following conditions:

1. Staff recommendations and conditions in letter dated November 3, 2015;
2. County Engineer approval of roadside ditch design; and
3. Note on plat stating that lots have periodic standing water with language to be approved by the County Attorney.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff conditions and recommendations were as follows:

**DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

Subject to Drainage Board approval and the conditions of the County Surveyor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. This development is subject to the Residential Design Standards in the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance; (HCZO Chapter 8.1).
2. Some of the trees shown as part of the landscaping requirement will be in areas that will be standing water or saturated much of the time. The applicant should consider relocating them.
3. The tiles that the perimeter drains outlet to need to be shown on the plans, not just the risers.
4. A roadside ditch must be shown where needed to ensure water does not encroach onto the road. Ditch flowline should be shown with flow arrows.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to approval with all appropriate fees paid prior to the start of any construction.
2. This project is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit covering storm water quality. Procedures there under are governed locally by the Hendricks County Stormwater Management Ordinance and corresponding Technical Standards Manual. An application, fees, construction plans, specifications and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be presented for approval to the Hendricks County Drainage Board separately from the application to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval for a plat, PUD or development plan must be obtained from the Drainage

Board prior to Secondary Approval (or Approval in the case of minor plats) by the Plan Commission or its Administrative and Plat Committee. In addition, an Erosion Control Permit issued by the Hendricks County Surveyor is required for individual building lots prior to obtaining a Building Permit from the Planning and Building Department.

3. A septic system must be designed for these lots prior to building permit application to reflect the actual house location and size. The initial review of the submitted soil analysis indicates that the soils are rated severe and that septic systems are feasible on these lots. Additional soil borings for each lot may be required at the time of septic permit application. Proposed subsurface drain outlet elevations are needed on each lot prior to final approval.
4. The absorption field areas must be fenced in such a way that accidental crossing of the site with equipment is prohibited. This may be done by farm fence, snow fence, or other similar materials. Preservation of the absorption field areas is the responsibility of the developer and if these areas are not preserved it could make the lots unbildable.
5. Secondary septic field easements (SSFE) must be shown on the plat, or separate easement document to be recorded with the plat must be provided.
6. Prior to recording a statement must be added to the plat that states: Those designated as secondary septic field easements (SSFE) are secondary septic field easements that are hereby expressly reserved for the purpose of the placement of a sewage disposal field. Uses shall be limited to those consistent with the proper operation of a septic system and that will not result in soil compaction. The easement shall terminate only with the written approval of the Hendricks County Health Officer
7. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
8. Addresses must be added to the final plat prior to recording. The Director of the Plan Commission will not sign the final plat without addresses included. To obtain addresses, the applicant must submit a request to the Planning and Building Department well in advance of the recording package being forwarded to the Hendricks County Engineer's Office. The Plat Address Information Sheet submitted with the plat application does not constitute a request for addresses.

**MRP 056/15: JANICE FISHER;** a 1-lot minor residential plat, 2.105 acres, Liberty Township, S36-T14N-R1W, located on the south side of County Road 1000 South, approximately 0.50 mile east of County Road 100 East. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

**WA 266/15: MRP 056 JANICE FISHER;** a Waiver of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Sec. 2.11 (2.b) Lot Frontage and Access – Access Limited. (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Dale Kruse of Kruse Consulting, Inc. appeared on behalf of Janice Fisher, applicant. Mr. Kruse reviewed their request for a one lot minor plat and the location of the property. Mr. Kruse stated that the new lot would be an acre and three quarters in size. Mr. Kruse then reviewed the staff comments. He stated that comment one had to do with an existing home on the remainder parcel and not located on the lot to be created. He stated while he understood the concern with the septic system on that remainder parcel, this application had to do with the new lot being created which had no existing house. He stated he would not be addressing comment number one further except to say that if there was an issue with the septic system, it should be handled as a separate issue and not tied to the current petition in any way.

Mrs. Haan responded that she had not had time to discuss the matter with Dr. Stopperich, the County Health Officer, and because the Health Board would not be meeting again until January of 2016, she planned on opposing approval of the petition for Janice Fisher as she did not feel comfortable voting for the minor residential plat. She stated after she met with Dr. Stopperich and the Health Board and reviewed their policies on the matter, she would go from there with a decision.

Mr. Kruse responded that he understood her decision. He then went on to discuss comment number 2 addressing the drainage adjacent to the roadway. He stated there was a slight swale and drainage ditch along part of the road frontage of the property. He stated they had moved the driveway to the high point so that they were not crossing the roadside ditch. He stated that the existing roadside ditch would continue to drain and a driveway culvert would not be needed because of the location of the driveway on the high point of the property.

Mr. Reitz asked Mr. Andrews if Mr. Ayers had some comments on that matter.

Mr. Andrews stated he did in that he felt the water would not drain off the roadway naturally and that some drainage ditch would be needed.

Mr. Kruse responded that he would not know how to address that concern as approximately three quarters of the property had a swale that drained west, the driveway would be located at a high point and on the eastern side of the property on which the plat was being created, it would fall away. He stated that since the last time he presented a petition before the commission, the rules on drainage ditches had changed. He stated it was uncharted territory now on how they were supposed to address drainage ditches.

Mrs. Ternet asked if Mr. Ayers had seen the plans that showed the new location of the driveway.

Mr. Kruse stated the plans had been changed since the TAC meeting.

Mrs. Ternet responded then that Mr. Ayers appeared to still have an issue with it.

Mr. Gaston commented that he could not address the matter as he had not spoken with Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Kruse then added that he would not have a problem meeting with Mr. Ayers or meeting with him on the site to discuss the matter.

Mr. Gaston commented that he felt whatever concerns Mr. Ayers had with the plans could be addressed.

Mrs. Ternet stated that since the policy on roadside ditches had changed, each petition had to be looked at on a case by case basis.

Mr. Reitz stated this was a transition period for the roadside ditches. Mr. Reitz asked Mr. Kruse to address the remaining comments.

Mr. Kruse stated the last comment had to do with the request for the waiver of the access limited requirement.

Mrs. Ternet then added that in regard to comment number one, at least an easement on the Fisher property should be provided for the remainder portion so that if a new septic system was required, it could be outletted through the new lot.

Mr. Kruse stated he understood and had discussed that previously.

Mrs. Haan commented that she would discuss that with the Health Board and let them decide. She stated currently there was a policy in place that if a record did not exist for a septic system and there was a desire to split the property, they had to show there was some type of sewage treatment on the property and that it was not discharging from the property. She stated that the Indiana Code also required that.

Mr. Kruse responded that he would understand if the existing home was on the newly created lot.

Mrs. Haan responded that they were taking property away from the remaining parcel which could be used for a suitable septic system and there was also a concern about the drainage and whether or not the existing house would be able to use that system.

Mr. Kruse responded that Mrs. Ternet's comments about creating an easement across the new lot was something they could do.

Mr. Gaston then commented that since it was on the same parcel and the owner was splitting it, that there was some responsibility. He stated it could as a planning process be looked at not just for the newly created lot but for the entire parcel. He stated that there was an area back there on the property where a system could be placed and he liked the idea of an easement being created.

Mr. Kruse stated his concern that since the Plan Commission created the process for a one lot minor residential plat for the purpose of making a way for a person to create a one lot parcel, there might as well not be a minor residential plat process if the entire parcel would be considered in the decision.

Mrs. Ternet stated that the purpose of creating the MRP process was to allow one split and not require improvements on the remainder of the property.

Mr. Gaston stated they were not requiring improvements on the remainder but just an easement across the property for a future septic system. He stated the easement was to make any future septic system on the remainder viable.

Mr. Kruse stated he understood the reason for the easement.

Mr. Reitz asked for further questions or comments. There being none, Mr. Reitz called for a motion.

Mr. Gaston made a motion to grant approval for **MRP 056/15: Janice Fisher** subject to the following conditions:

1. Conditions and recommendations in staff's letter dated November 3, 2015;
2. County Engineer to work with the project engineer to address Item #2 in staff's recommendations; and
3. An easement being placed on the recorded plat for a future drainage outlet for the remaining parent parcel.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion with Mrs. Haan against.

FOR – 4 –                      AGAINST – 1 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Gaston then made a motion to grant approval for **WA 266/15: MRP 056 Janice Fisher** subject to the conditions previously approved.

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion with Mrs. Haan against.

FOR – 4 –                      AGAINST – 1 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff conditions and recommendations were as follows:

**DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

Subject to Drainage Board approval and the conditions of the County Surveyor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. According to the tax records, this home was constructed in 1964. A septic system record is not on file for this property. Using a tile probe, Health Department staff successfully located a septic tank, but was unable to locate an absorption field. 410 IAC 6-8.3-52 General sewage disposal requirements state (d) "Any dwelling that is not connected, or cannot be connected, to a sanitary sewerage system shall be provided with a residential onsite sewage system that includes a septic tank and a soil absorption system that has not failed." The property owner must demonstrate that there is an absorption field that is treating the sewage onsite prior to Health Department approval. In the event a new septic system must be installed for the existing home, an off-site easement may be necessary to provide an outlet for the perimeter drain.
2. The contours show the ground falling away from the roadway therefore negating the need for a roadside ditch. However, it appears that there is a slight swale/ditch along at least part of the frontage. The drainage adjacent to the roadway needs to be addressed by the applicant.
3. The applicant has requested a waiver of the Subdivision Control Ordinance (HCSCO Section 2.11 2.b.) requirements that prohibits residential driveway access from a rural minor arterial road. Staff does not object to approval of this waiver due to the access being for one lot only.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to approval with all appropriate fees paid prior to the start of any construction.
2. This project is subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit covering storm water quality. Procedures there under are governed locally by the Hendricks County Stormwater Management Ordinance and corresponding Technical Standards Manual. An application, fees, construction plans, specifications and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be presented for approval to the Hendricks County Drainage Board separately from the application to the Hendricks County Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval for a plat, PUD or development plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Secondary Approval (or Approval in the case of minor plats) by the Plan Commission or its Administrative and Plat Committee. In addition, an Erosion Control Permit issued by the Hendricks County Surveyor is required for individual building lots prior to obtaining a Building Permit from the Planning and Building Department.
3. A septic system must be designed for these lots prior to building permit application to reflect the actual house location and size. The initial review of the submitted soil analysis indicates that the soils are rated severe and that septic systems are feasible on these lots. Additional soil borings for each lot may be required at the time of septic permit application. Proposed subsurface drain outlet elevations are needed on each lot prior to final approval.
4. The absorption field areas must be fenced in such a way that accidental crossing of the site with equipment is prohibited. This may be done by farm fence, snow fence, or other similar materials. Preservation of the absorption field areas is the responsibility of the developer and if these areas are not preserved, it could make the lots unbuildable.
5. Secondary septic field easements (SSFE) must be shown on the plat, or separate easement document to be recorded with the plat must be provided.
6. Prior to recording a statement must be added to the plat that states: Those designated as secondary septic field easements (SSFE) are secondary septic field easements that are hereby expressly reserved for the purpose of the placement of a sewage disposal field. Uses shall be limited to those consistent with the proper operation of a septic system and that will not result in soil compaction. The easement shall terminate only with the written approval of the Hendricks County Health Officer.
7. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.

8. Addresses must be added to the final plat prior to recording. The Director of the Plan Commission will not sign the final plat without addresses included. To obtain addresses, the applicant must submit a request to the Planning and Building Department well in advance of the recording package being forwarded to the Hendricks County Engineer's Office. The Plat Address Information Sheet submitted with the plat application does not constitute a request for addresses.

**MAP 643/15 (REVISION): PARKS AT PRESTWICK, SECTION 8 (SECONDARY);** a revision to the cul-de-sac on Berkley Court, within the Parks at Prestwick, Section 8, a 33 lot major residential subdivision on 24.75 acres, Washington Township, S8-T15N-R1E, located north of County Road 100 South and 0.30 feet east of County Road 400 East. (Weihe Engineers, Inc.)

Mr. Rusty Skoog of Weihe Engineers and Mr. Richard Henderson of Beazer Homes appeared.

Mr. Gaston asked about a recommendation regarding not removing the gabion baskets.

Mr. Skoog responded that they wanted to know if there would be any modifications before a final recommendation was made. Mr. Skoog then went on to discuss the one comment in the staff's memorandum dated November 3, 2015. He stated they had placed that note on the plat.

Mr. Gaston asked to see a copy of the proposed plat. Mr. Gaston asked questions of the project engineer.

Mr. Skoog responded that they had added the gabion baskets but would need to add the steep slopes.

Mr. Reitz then invited two members of the audience who were present for this matter to address their concerns or questions.

Mr. Jerry Perrill, representative for the architectural control committee of the Parks at Prestwick and Mr. Fred Palmer, a resident of said subdivision, approached the members.

Mr. Gaston then commented that most of the concerns regarding the project had been addressed and they were close to giving approval.

Mr. Skoog asked what other concerns were there for the project.

Mr. Andrews responded that Mr. Ayers had informed him that he needed to see a detail for the handrail.

Mr. Skoog stated he thought that was shown on the plat. He stated it was going to be a guardrail as he did not feel that a handrail was needed. He stated they thought a handrail would be something for kids to climb and jump off of.

Mr. Gaston asked if Mr. Ayers wanted a handrail.

Mr. Andrews stated that was what he had been told.

Mrs. Ternet stated that Mr. Ayers had not discussed a handrail with her.

Mr. Skoog stated that the plans showed a guardrail.

Mr. Gaston stated that there was a 3:1 slope there.

Mr. Skoog stated the fall would be about ten to twelve feet which was the same in a lot of places in the subdivision.



Mr. Gaston asked if Mr. Ayers had provided any other comments.

Mr. Andrews stated no.

Mr. Gaston stated he had thought that the guardrail was the big issue for Mr. Ayers and that the issue of a handrail was new and he was not sure about that.

Mr. Skoog stated a handrail was more for pedestrian concerns.

Mr. Gaston stated he felt that matter should be ironed out with Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Skoog stated they had a 3:1 slope currently which was the same as what was on a lake bank, which was not an extreme slope. He stated it was not a real safety issue at the 3:1.

Mr. Reitz asked Mr. Gaston if he was comfortable with the guardrail and not the handrail.

Mr. Gaston stated he would be as long as Mr. Ayers was also.

Mr. Andrews commented if the handrail was required, Mr. Ayers wanted to see a detail.

Mr. Skoog stated he would not be opposed to the motion stating that if Mr. Ayers wanted to see a handrail there, it could be done.

Mr. Gaston stated he would be okay with making the motion subject to Mr. Ayers review and approval of that requirement.

Mr. Skoog then commented that in regard to the maintenance of the steep slopes, if they were up against the property owner's lot, some sort of inspection would be needed.

Mr. Gaston agreed that he was only concerned with the areas where improvements were being added.

Mr. Skoog stated there were areas where they wanted to keep an eye on the slope and he discussed the matter in further detail.

Mr. Perrill asked who would be in charge of those improved areas.

Mr. Skoog responded the Homeowners' Association.

Mr. Palmer expressed his concerns about erosion. He stated he had paid to have erosion problems on his lot corrected and he did not want to pay for someone else's.

Mr. Skoog responded that it depended on where the problem occurred. He stated if it was on the lot, the homeowner was responsible. He stated if it was off the lot, he was not sure. He stated there were common areas all over the subdivision, which would be overseen by the Homeowners' Association. He discussed the drainage further. He stated they were protecting those areas with gabion baskets and other treatments

Mr. Palmer discussed further his concerns regarding erosion and asked questions about the common areas.

Mr. Gaston explained that they did not want residents of the subdivision coming back to the county afterwards to request repairs to the slope from improvements made by residents. He stated, therefore, the resident was responsible for what was on the lot and the HOA would be responsible for the Common Areas.

November 12, 2015

There was further discussion between Mr. Gaston, Mr. Palmer and Mr. Skoog regarding drainage in the subdivision from the lots and common areas and how the drainage problems were being addressed by the developer and project engineer.

Mrs. Ternet repeated that all of the common areas in this subdivision were the jurisdiction of the Homeowners' Association and that the county would not be involved.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Reitz called for a motion.

Mr. Gaston then made a motion to grant approval for **MAP 643/15 & PUD 20/15: The Parks at Prestwick, Section 8 (Secondary) (Revision)** subject to the following conditions:

1. Conditions and recommendations in staff's memorandum dated November 3, 2015;
2. Adding wording to the O & M Manual regarding erosion control; and
3. Working out handrail requirement with the County Engineer.

Mrs. Haan seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –                      AGAINST – 0 –                      ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff memorandum was as follows:

#### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee  
Hendricks County Drainage Board  
**FROM:** Plan Commission Staff  
**DATE:** November 3, 2015

**RE:                      MAP 643/15 & PUD 20/2015: THE PARKS AT PRESTWICK, SEC. 8, SECONDARY, REVISION**

The applicant has requested a revision to the approved secondary plat for the above referenced project. The revision includes adjusting the location of the cul-de-sac, some of the storm structures and lot line locations.

The plat must be revised to include the following statement:

“Due to the potential erodibility of the existing soils and the existence of steep slopes in The Parks at Prestwick – Phase 8, erosion control shall be inspected and maintained by the Homeowners Association and/or by the individual property owner”.

If the proposed revision requires additional permits from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) for additional erosion control measures, the applicant must submit said permits prior to recording the plat.

All other conditions of the original approval are required.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

---

Don F. Reitz, AICP, Chairman