The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Wednesday, February 9, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendricks County Government Center, Commissioners Meeting Room, 355 South Washington Street, Danville Indiana. Members present were Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Chairman; Mr. John Ayres, County Engineer; Mrs. Ginger Harrington, Environmental Health Team Lead; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor, and Mr. Ron Kneeland, Plan Commission Member. Also present was Mr. Ryan Robling, Senior Planner and Mrs. Brandy Swinford, Recording Secretary.

Mr. Dombrosky called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance. There was a quorum with three (3) members present.

Mr. Dombrosky stated the first order of business was the approval of the minutes from the January 12, 2022 meeting.

Mrs. Harrington motioned for approval of the minutes from the January 12, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

FOR – 3 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 0 –

Mr. Dombrosky noted that the first item on the agenda, **MIP 1149/21: William Wilson** had been administratively continued as they had asked for a continuance.

MIP 1152/22: ROB & RAMONETTE DUGAN; a 2-lot minor plat; 9.68 acres; Union Township; S10-T16N-R1W; located on the north side of E. CR 500 N., approx. 0.2 miles west of the intersection with N. CR 100 E. (Kruse Consulting)

Mr. Dale Kruse, Kruse Consulting, 7384 Business Center Dr., Avon, was present. He reviewed the location and noted that they wished to keep the existing house and barn on the western lot and build a new home on the eastern lot. He noted there were only two (2) staff comments regarding the right of way and septic and discussed those further.

It was noted Mr. John Ayres arrived at this time.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if Mr. Ayres was confident in coming up with the hold harmless language.

Mr. Ayres replied that he was. He thought it had already been sent over to Mr. Kruse.

Mr. Dombrosky opened the public hearing. There being no one signed in to speak, he closed the public hearing. He then asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mrs. Harrington motioned for approval of **MIP 1152/22: Rob & Ramonette Dugan** subject to staff recommendations.

Mr. Ayres seconded the motion.

FOR -4 - AGAINST - 0 - ABSTAINED - 0 -

The staff recommendations are as follows.

# **DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

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

# **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. A portion of the Existing septic system appears to be in the ROW. A Hold Harmless agreement with Hendricks County must be provided for this encroachment.

#### 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 plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Approval by the Plan Commission. 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. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
- 4. 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 required on each lot prior to final approval.
- 5. 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.

MRP 134/22: QUENTIN HUNTER; a 1-lot minor residential plat; 1.12 acres; Washington Township; S5-T15N-R2E; located approx. ¼ mile north of the intersection of US 36 on the west side of Raceway Road (Kruse Consulting)

**WA 326/22: MRP 134 HUNTER;** a waiver to the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Section 6.12.1.b: Sidewalks (Kruse Consulting)

Mr. Dale Kruse, Kruse Consulting, was present. He stated this was to correct an illegal lot split. He then went on to review to the staff comments and noted that it had received drainage board approval.

It was noted that Mr. Gaston arrived at this time.

- Mr. Dombrosky stated in regard to the sidewalk waiver, there was a creek and a drainage easement that would make it very difficult to put a sidewalk in.
  - Mr. Kruse replied that the entire stretch of Raceway Road is already developed.
  - Mr. Ayres asked if there needed to be a separate motion for the waiver.

Mr. Dombrosky replied they did need to be separate.

Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of **MRP 134/22: Quentin Hunter** subject to staff recommendations.

Mrs. Harrington seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of WA 326/22: MRP 134 Hunter.

Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion. Mrs. Harrington voted against.

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

The staff recommendations are as follows.

### DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

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

# STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Waiver:
  - a. 6.12(1)(b) Minor Plats: Sidewalks are required along the development side of all existing county roads, located within one (1) mile from an existing school, commercial area or trailhead, or in all subdivisions located in Brown, Lincoln, Washington, or Guildford Townships. The petitioner has requested a waiver from this requirement due to the location of a stream on the northern portion of property.
    - i. The Health Department is not in favor of any sidewalk waivers due to high rates of obesity, in children and adults, as well as the chronic diseases that result from limited exercise opportunities. Studies show that people with access to sidewalks get more exercise. Reduction of short car trips when engines emit the most pollution because they are not yet warmed up will also improve air quality.
- 2. All brush and trees within 10' from the edge of pavement must be removed prior to recording of the plat.

### **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 plan must be obtained from the Drainage Board
  prior to Approval by the Plan Commission. 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. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.

- 4. 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 required on each lot prior to final approval.
- 5. 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.

**MRP 135/22: MICHAEL SMITH;** a 1-lot minor residential plat; 7.26 acres; Washington Township; S10-T15N-R1E; located at 6422 E. CR 100 S. – Avon (Moench Engineering)

Mr. Brian Moench, Moench Engineering, 4000 Clarks Creek Rd., Plainfield, was present along with petitioners Mike and Mindy Smith. He reviewed the location of the property and noted that they had received drainage board approval. He then reviewed the staff comments. He stated that the dye test was scheduled and that Mr. Rich Burdine was going to do it.

Mrs. Harrington stated that she just needed documentation of it.

Mr. Moench noted that the other comment was in regard to the contours of the septic field. He stated that he was confident it was in fact on contour because he had been involved in laying out the septic field.

Mrs. Harrington replied that she was not confident and explained that the contour crosses two (2) or three (3) lines different trenches.

Mr. Moench stated that he would check on it, but he was sure they were on contour if they were to field check it.

Mr. Ayres asked why they would be wrong on the drawings.

Mr. Moench replied that it was because the contours were computer generated. He stated he could adjust them on the development plan. He stated the other staff comment was a drafting error on their part and he would get that fixed.

Mrs. Harrington stated she was not comfortable moving forward until she is confident it is on contour due to how tight the site is.

Mr. Moench asked if she wanted to meet on site to inspect the stakes in the ground.

Mrs. Harrington replied that he needed to provide her with something to make her feel confident, whether that was better elevations, better shots.

Mr. Ayres stated that if the drawings are wrong, they should have been fixed and made correct beforehand. He felt that Mrs. Harrington's concern was that if the contours are incorrect, due to the layout of the site, there would possibly be nowhere else to put a septic field.

Mr. Moench replied that what he would like to do, instead of waiting another thirty (30) days, is present spot elevations on the laterals by the end of day the next day. He would like to get approval subject to having that information to the Health Department.

Mrs. Harrington stated that she was not comfortable with that. If they cannot get it all in there, then the lot is not buildable. Making an approval on something that is potentially not a buildable lot is not something she is comfortable doing.

Mr. Moench stated that by verbal testimony he felt he was correct that the lines were on contour.

There was further discussion about the contour lines, and they pointed out on the plans.

Mr. Moench suggested meeting at the property as he was confident in the drawings.

Mr. Ayres motioned to continue MRP135/22: Michael Smith to the March 9, 2022 meeting.

Mrs. Harrington seconded the motion.

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

**DPR 499/21: CALIBER COLLISON (SECONDARY);** a development plan review for a collision repair shop; 2.45 acres; Guilford Township; S20-T14N-R2E; located on the southwest side of S. County Road 1025 E. and State Road 67 (Kimley-Horn & Associates)

Mr. Kaleb Sondergrath, Kimley- Horn & Associates, 250 E. 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Indianapolis, was present. He stated he believed the only thing they were waiting on for approval was the Tri-County approval. They received that yesterday. He noted they would get the abandonment logs when they are on site.

Mrs. Harrington asked if they showed both wells and septics on the plans.

Mr. Sondergrath replied they did.

Mrs. Harrington asked where the utilities were coming out of the building.

Mr. Sondergrath showed her on the plans. He stated the structures and pipes were shown on a separate sheet.

Mr. Ayres asked if they had the whole pipe on there, not just the end sections as it was shown previously.

Mr. Sondergrath stated they had made the change. He also asked if they needed to swap out the intermediate call out for base in the asphalt sections.

Mr. Ayres replied that was correct.

They went through the remaining staff comments.

Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of **DPR 499/21: Caliber Collision (Secondary)** subject to staff recommendations.

Mrs. Harrington seconded the motion.

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

The staff recommendations are as follows.

# DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

Subject to approval by Tri-County Conservancy District.

# STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Approved Modifications:
  - a. 7.2(Z)(1) Maximum Spaces.
  - b. 7.2(D)(1) Design Standards.
  - c. 7.5(F)(1) Perimeter Landscaping for off-street parking areas.
  - d. 4.5 Non-Residential Lot Standards.
- 2. Must show location of both wells and both septic tanks.
- 3. Provide well abandonment logs for both wells prior to recording the plat.
- 4. Provide proof of abandonment for both septic systems prior to recording the plat.
- 5. Provide inverts for storm pipe.
- 6. Typical asphalt sections must match the ordinance. Right of way pavement must have either 9" of stone base or the 330#/sy of intermediate asphalt must be base asphalt.
- 7. The 36" Pipe, not just its end sections, located on the east side of 1025 East must be numbered and included in the structure details and data table.
- 8. Details must be shown for the crossing of CR 1025 East. Directional bore is preferred, but if it must be an open cut backfill must be flowable fill to within 5" of the edge of pavement. The plans must reflect this.

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to secondary 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 Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Secondary Approval by the Plan Commission. 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. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
- 4. The applicant will have two (2) years from the date of approval to obtain an Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit. Should this two (2) year period elapse without the applicant having obtained the appropriate permit, the development plan approval will become null and void.
- 5. Development plan approval does not constitute approval of signage unless such approval is expressly granted by the Plan Commission as part of this development plan. Signage review and approval is typically carried out as a permitting process separate from development plan approval.

**MAP 749/22: THE FLATS AT HC (SECONDARY);** a 1-lot major plat; 17.152 acres; Guilford Township; S20-T14N-R2E; located at Raceway Road and Enterprise Drive – Camby (Banning Engineering)

Mr. Ryan Lindley, Banning Engineering, 853 Columbia Road, Plainfield, was present along with the applicant, Mr. Tim Shrout. He stated that this was for a 228-apartment complex in Heartland Crossing.

- Mr. Dombrosky stated they would need the sewer allocation prior to recording.
- Mr. Lindley replied they had it but did not have the paperwork yet.
- Mr. Dombrosky asked about the sidewalks along Heartland Boulevard.
- Mr. Lindley replied that there were no sidewalks along the entire stretch of Heartland Boulevard within the 1.6 miles in Hendricks County.
- Mr. Shrout stated there were none in Marion County either. They purposely did not put them along any of the boulevards due to it being such a busy street. That is why they connect the interior streets have them and why they connected their pathway to the Menard's parking lot.
  - Mr. Dombrosky asked where the trail went to the west.
  - Mr. Lindley replied that it connects to the end of the retail strip.
- Mr. Dombrosky noted his thought was that if it connected from the smaller building at the corner and connected into the perimeter sidewalk on Raceway Road, it would serve as their frontage sidewalk.
  - Mr. Lindley stated they had a drainage swale there, but they could put in a culvert.

There was more discussion as they looked over the plans.

- Mr. Dombrosky noted that they would still need to grant a waiver because it does not satisfy the ordinance, but he would be comfortable with that. He also noted that the pool plan would need to be reviewed by the Health Department.
- Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of **MAP 749/22: The Flats at HC** subject to staff recommendations and with the condition of applying for a sidewalk waiver and commitments made on the sidewalks.
  - Mr. Gaston seconded the motion.

FOR - 5 - AGAINST - 0 - ABSTAINED - 0 -

The staff recommendations are as follows.

### **DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

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

# STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Sewer allocation letter is required.
- 2. Locate and identify sidewalks along Heartland Blvd. Sidewalk must be located at least 1 foot inside of the right-of-way line, unless located within an easement outside of the right-of-way in accordance to 6.12(5) of the SCO.
- Pool plan review must be submitted to the Health Department prior to pool operation. For more information visit:

https://www.co.hendricks.in.us/topic/subtopic.php?topicid=245&structureid=16

# **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to secondary 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. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
- 4. Addresses must be added to the final plat prior to recording. 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.
- 5. Development plan approval does not constitute approval of signage unless such approval is expressly granted by the Plan Commission as part of this development plan. Signage review and approval is typically carried out as a permitting process separate from development plan approval.
- 6. A State Plan Release is also required for multifamily, residential and non-residential (commercial and industrial) projects. In no way will a Development Plan Review be construed as a substitute or a waiver for these other required permits.
  - **DPR 501/22: THE FLATS AT HC (SECONDARY);** a development plan review for a proposed 238 apartment community; 17.152 acres; Guilford Township; S20-T14N-R2E; located at Raceway Road and Enterprise Drive Camby (Banning Engineering)
- Mr. Ryan Lindley and Mr. Tim Shrout were present. It was noted that the primary was granted approval last night.
- Mr. Dombrosky stated they had not had a chance to recalculate the maximum lot coverage and wanted to talk through that.
- Mr. Lindley explained how they came to their calculations based on the 13 acres as the other is a different parcel. He noted that Mr. Shrout has the opportunity to in perpetuity provide a permanent easement to have the amenity area dedicated to the apartment project. If you added that into the total acreage, it becomes 14.2 acres which brings the impervious coverage down to 52% and open space to 14%.

There was more discussion about the open space and the protection of those areas.

- Mr. Lindley asked if they were using the 13% or the 14% on the impervious coverage.
- Mr. Robling replied that it would have to include the open space that is not on the current plans. The area that is south of the dog park, if they count that, they will be fine.
  - Mr. Dombrosky asked about the trees in the side slope of the drainage ditches.
- Mr. Lindley replied that they had checked the ten-year capacity of the swales and noted they were not in that. They cannot move the perimeter, but they could push them closer to the ROW line.

Mr. Ayres noted that they had some that are pretty far down the slope, and he was concerned from a maintenance standpoint.

There was more discussion about how to configure the trees in question on the slope.

They then discussed in more detail the corrected note and the cuts in the curb.

- Mr. Lindley asked if they needed to provide the actual allocation letter from Tri-County.
- Mr. Dombrosky replied they did.
- Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of **DPR 501/22: The Flats of HC (Secondary)** subject to staff recommendations and comments about the landscaping changes.
  - Mr. Kneeland seconded the motion.

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

The staff recommendations are as follows.

# **DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:**

Subject to approval by Hendricks County Drainage Board.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Modifications:
  - a. 4.4(Table 4.4) Residential Lot Standards. The Maximum Lot Coverage (all impervious surfaces) in the RE district is 50%.
    - i. The petitioner has requested a modification in order to allow for a maximum lot coverage (all impervious surfaces) of 57%.
      - 1. Staff does not believe that the proposed alternative development proposal meets the intent and spirt of the Ordinance. Maximum lot coverage serves two primary purposes in the RE district. The first is ensuring that there will be adequate pervious surfaces to capture storm water on site. The property is within the Tri-County Conservancy District which is suited to handle any excess storm water generated by the increase in impervious surfaces. The second is to provide ample open space for recreation of residents on the property.
      - 2. Staff believes that this modification is a result of the requested modification to minimum required open space. This modification is self-imposed and results in the need for additional modifications.
  - b. 7.18(E) Minimum Required Open Space. Developments in the RE district are required to provide 15% open space.
    - i. The petitioner has provided a site plan which provided 5% open space.
      - 1. Staff does not believe that this modification is in response to unique stie characteristics. Staff believes the alternative development proposal submitted by the petitioner does not represent a creative and desirable application of different standards. The minimum open space requirement was included to provide ample space for residents to conduct actives. The property has access to sidewalks, a multiuse trail, dog park, and pool which will allow activity space to the residents of the property; however, these provided spaces make up only a third of what is required by the Ordinance.

- 2. Staff believes that this modification is a result of the requested modification to maximum lot coverage (all impervious surfaces). The modification will result in the property being covered by an additional 7% of impervious surfaces. If the 7% were converted into open space it would likely reduce the need for one or both of these modifications and enhance the aesthetics of the site and supply functional recreational areas to the residents.
- c. 8.2(B)(3) Building Orientation. Multi-family buildings shall be oriented to the street or county road, a common open space, or clustered to form neighborhoods. Multi-family buildings shall not be oriented to parking lots.
  - i. The petitioner has submitted a site plan which orientates some buildings to parking lots.
    - Staff does not believe that this modification is in response to unique site characteristics. Staff believes the alternative development proposal submitted by the petitioner does not represent a creative and desirable application of different standards. Orienting buildings toward parking areas reduces open and green space, walkability, and visual quality.
    - 2. Staff believes that this modification is a result of the modification from maximum lot coverage (all impervious surfaces), and minimum required open space. The site layout should be designed so that it meets these requirements. If the site were designed to meet maximum lot coverage (all impervious surfaces), and minimum required open space requirements it could prevent buildings from being orientated toward parking lots. Converting impervious surfaces to open space would allow building to be oriented to open spaces, rather than parking lots, and therefore meet the intent and spirt of the Ordinance.
- d. 8.2(B)(5) Individual buildings shall be located to avoid more than 2 buildings with parallel orientation to a public street, unless offset by more than 20 feet.
  - i. The petitioner has requested a modification from this requirement to provide 3 buildings with parallel orientation to a public street without an offset.
    - Staff believes that this modification is in response to unique site characteristics. The property fronts along 3 public streets which prevents the location of buildings away from a right-of-way. Including the required offset would potentially cause issues with the location of other site features including entrances, and open space.
- e. 8.2(H) Automobile Storage. A minimum of 50% of required parking spaces shall be covered.
  - i. The petitioner has requested a modification from this requirement to provide 15% covered automobile storage.
    - Staff does not believe that this modification is in response to unique site characteristics. Staff believes the alternative development proposal submitted by the petitioner does not represent a creative and desirable application of different standards. However, providing fewer than required covered parking spaces will be unlikely to cause detrimental effects to the property, or residents.
- 2. Deny or revise modifications a, b, and c. Revise site plan to decrease maximum lot coverage (all impervious surfaces), increase provided open space, and orient buildings away from parking lots.
- 3. Trees are shown in the side slopes of the drainage ditches. This is not recommended, and plans should be modified to show them in different locations.
- 4. Storm water Operating Authority will be Tri-County Conservancy District. Currently listed on the Cover Page as Hendricks County Surveyor's Office.

5. Notes need to be added to the plans to show that wherever existing curb is removed it will be replaced immediately to protect the edges of the existing pavement.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. A properly executed County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided prior to secondary 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 Area Plan Commission. Secondary Stormwater Approval must be obtained from the Drainage Board prior to Secondary Approval by the Plan Commission. 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. The Hendricks County Planning and Building Department must be notified at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any site improvements being installed.
- 4. The applicant will have two (2) years from the date of approval to obtain an Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit. Should this two (2) year period elapse without the applicant having obtained the appropriate permit, the development plan approval will become null and void.
- 5. Development plan approval does not constitute approval of signage unless such approval is expressly granted by the Plan Commission as part of this development plan. Signage review and approval is typically carried out as a permitting process separate from development plan approval.

There being no further items to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 9:53 a.m.	
Tim Dombrosky, Chairman	