

September 14, 2016

The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendricks County Government Center, Room 4 & 5, 355 South Washington Street, Danville, Indiana. Members present: Mr. Don Reitz, AICP, Planning Director and Chairman; Mr. John Ayers, County Engineer; Mrs. Sonnie Johnston, Plan Commission Member Representative; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor; and Mrs. Julie Haan, Environmental Health Director. Also present was: Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Senior Planner; Mr. Nick Hufford, Planner; 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 August 10, 2016 meeting.

Mrs. Johnston made a motion to approve the August 10, 2016 meeting minutes.

Mrs. Haan seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Reitz then called for the first item on the Business Session portion of the agenda as follows:

DPR 416/16 (SECONDARY): HENDRICKS POWER CO-OP, PHASE II; a development plan review to establish a storage unit facility, 4.22 acres, Guilford Township, S20-T14N-R2E, located on the northwest corner of County Road 500 East and Main Street (Old U.S. Highway 36). (Kruse Consulting, Inc.)

Mr. Michael Sells of Kruse Consulting, Inc. and Mr. Greg Ternet, CEO of Hendricks Power Co-Operative, appeared.

Mr. Sells stated that the project had received Drainage Board approval. He stated that the only staff recommendation was to provide a cost estimate for the determination of construction costs and to post a performance bond guarantee. He stated he had a copy of the proposal. Mr. Sells asked for a sample copy of a performance bond.

Mr. Sells was instructed to contact the Engineering Inspector, Roger Salsman, for that sample bond.

Mr. Sells stated that another requirement was an executed County Owner Inspection Agreement and he would provide them with that document. He stated that Hendricks Power Co-op would provide the inspection fee check of \$3,700.00.

He stated with regard to Clean Water, their plan had been reviewed and approved and issuance was pending payment of the permit fee. He stated they would follow-up with that.

There being no further questions or comments, Mr. Reitz called for a motion.

Mr. Gaston made a motion to grant secondary approval for **DPR 416/16: Hendricks Power Co-op Storage Building (Secondary)** subject to staff conditions and recommendations in letter dated September 6, 2016 and pending payment of all required fees.

Mr. Ayers seconded the motion.

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

The staff conditions & recommendations were as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project engineer must provide an estimate of construction cost and post a performance guarantee prior to the issuance of an Improvement Location Permit.

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. The applicant will have one (1) year from the date of approval to obtain an Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit. Should this one (1) 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.
6. No Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit shall be issued until any plat associated with Secondary Development Plan Review has been recorded.
7. 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 452/16 (SECONDARY): STORE NOW/JOHN LESLIE; a development plan review to establish a storage unit facility, 4.22 acres, Guilford Township, S20-T14N-R2E, located at the southeast corner of Union Mills Drive and Prosperity Circle in the Heartland Crossing Business Park and more commonly known as 10413 Prosperity Circle. (Holloway Engineering)

Mr. Jeremy Kaiser of Holloway Engineering appeared on behalf of the applicant, Mr. John Leslie. He stated that the project had received drainage approval through the Tri-County Conservancy District. He then reviewed the conditions and recommendations in staff's letter. He then referred to staff comment #4 requiring them to show that the existing road side ditch would handle the storm discharge without flooding or affecting the roadway. He stated he had not yet completed that but was confident it would handle the flow. He stated he would get that completed today and stated that the ditch was designed for the drainage basin it went to.

September 14, 2016

Mr. Ayers commented that the overall site was designed for a certain amount of detention. He stated he wanted to make sure that the ditch in question would handle the detention without over-topping the road.

Mr. Kaiser asked if he was talking about the ten-year or 100-year flood.

Mr. Ayers stated he would like to see both calculations.

Mr. Kaiser stated if the calculations did not work, then they could either redo the ditch or hold some water in the pipes.

Mr. Ayers stated it may be handled by making the ditch wider. He stated it may work fine but he wanted to see the calculations.

Mr. Gaston then commented that it would be nice to know how much water would back up in the pipe going under the road during a 100 year storm event.

There was some further discussion on the matter between Mr. Kaiser and Mr. Ayers.

Mr. Kaiser then discussed the rest of the staff comments by stating that he would comply with comment #1 as to providing the estimate of construction cost and posting a performance guarantee and he was okay with comment #2 as to the non-residential design standards. He discussed the modifications requested. He stated they wished to install a wrought iron fence for security reasons even though there would be security cameras also. He stated in regard to the bicycle parking, he added that he did not see a reason for it as there were plenty of parking spaces which could be utilized by a bicyclist.

Mr. Reitz asked for questions or comments.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he was aware there had been issues with communication and receiving documents in a timely manner due to Mr. Ayers being on vacation and the staff letters being sent out later due to late submittals from applicants. He stated he was not sure how to proceed with the approval for this project due to some conditions not yet being met.

Mr. Ayers commented that he was thinking how comfortable he would be approving this project subject to receipt of the ditch analysis. He stated that recognizing there had been some delays, he was still not comfortable with passing the project and if there were issues with the ditch, it could be major and could affect the site plan with major changes. He stated he was, however, okay with the modifications as they made sense to him.

There being no further comments, Mr. Ayers made a motion to continue for thirty (30) days **DPR 452/16 (Secondary): Store Now/John Leslie.**

Mrs. Johnston seconded the motion.

FOR 5 – AGAINST – 0 – AGAINST – 0 –

DPR 454/16 (SECONDARY): WEST BRIDGE CHURCH ADDITION; a development plan review to construct an addition to an existing church; 40.07 acres, Center Township, S16-T15N-R1W, located on the east side of County Road 75 West, approximately 0.5 miles north of County Road 200 South. (The Veridus Group)

Mr. Josh Hogan with the Veridus Group appeared on behalf of the West Bridge Church. He stated the church was developing a 6,000 square foot addition to their existing church building. He stated the plans included parking and detention. He stated they had addressed the staff's concerns as to the 10 x 20 parking spaces and also by moving the detention further from the proposed right-of-way. He stated

September 14, 2016

there would be more detention on the east side and primarily keeping the same drainage pattern and distributing on the east side of the property now.

Mrs. Haan asked Mr. Hogan if he understood that the commercial septic system had to be installed and approved before a building permit could be issued.

Mr. Hogan stated he understood and that they were first planning on doing the parking and drainage for the project.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the plans did show the phasing of the parking lot but it was not clear looking at the plans whether the building would be part of that phase.

Mr. Hogan stated that they were planning on doing the parking and drainage and the building prior to the septic system being completed but would not receive occupancy until the septic was completed and approved.

Mrs. Haan again repeated that the building could not be started until the septic system was completed and approved.

Mr. Hogan said he understood.

Mrs. Haan stated that another thing was where they were in the process with the Indiana Environmental Management Department for the public water supply.

Mr. Hogan stated that a representative was on site and went over the process with the church.

Mrs. Haan asked if they had been activated yet.

Mr. Hogan stated he did not know but would check on it. Mr. Hogan also stated that in regard to the Clean Water Department, they had received comments last week and would address them by Friday.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they had addressed his site concerns adequately.

Mr. Ayers stated that there were some concerns about the entrance and the effect on traffic. He stated he did not feel there would be an effect on traffic because the peak hours did not coincide and the volume was insignificant compared to the volume on the road. Mr. Ayers stated, however, that at the entrance it was showing 20 foot radiuses and he would like to see a 50 foot taper in and out.

Mr. Hogan stated he understood a 50 foot taper with ingress and egress.

There was further discussion on the entrance details between Mr. Ayers and Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Gaston asked if the parking spaces plan had been revised and now complied.

Mr. Dombrosky stated yes.

Mr. Hogan then asked a question regarding the buffer zone to the south and whether there was a possibility of including a berm.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the ordinance provided for a substitution by the addition of a three foot berm in place of a certain amount of shrubs.

Mr. Hogan asked if that was something they could discuss at a later date or had to be determined now.

September 14, 2016

Mr. Reitz and Mr. Dombrosky stated that they could be flexible.

Mr. Hogan stated the church wanted to see when they started constructing the parking if they had enough soil.

Mr. Dombrosky stated they could receive revised plans on that.

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

Mrs. Haan stated she was okay as long as the septic was installed prior to a building permit, which was stated in the staff conditions.

Mrs. Haan then made a motion to grant secondary approval for **DPR 454/16: West Bridge Church Addition (Secondary)** subject to the following:

1. Staff conditions and recommendations in letter dated September 6, 2016;
2. Addition of fifty (50) foot tapers on either side of road entrance; and
3. Receipt of four (4) sets of revised plans provided to County Surveyor.

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. The project engineer must provide an estimate of construction cost and post a performance guarantee prior to the issuance of an Improvement Location Permit.
2. This development is subject to the Non-residential Design Standards in the Hendricks County Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The existing church building has exterior finishes including brick, aluminum storefront with glass and metal siding. The applicant requested to use the same materials for the addition as is used on the existing church which requires a modification of Section 8.3 H. 4. & 6. (HCZO) to allow the use of metal siding. The Plan Commission approved this modification in accordance with Subsection 2.2(A) (17).
3. This property is not in an area served by a public wastewater treatment plant. A commercial on-site sewage system for this property and for the proposed use will have to be permitted and approved by both the Indiana State Department of Health and the Hendricks County Health Department prior to obtaining a building permit for any proposed building expansion.
4. The applicant must contact the Indiana Department of Environmental Management Drinking Water Branch for technical assistance to comply with the requirements of 327 IAC 8 as a public water supply.
5. Detailed drainage analysis must be approved for the proposed detention basins.

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. A septic system must be designed for these lots prior to building permit application to reflect the actual location and size. The initial review of the submitted soil analysis indicates that the soils are rated severe and that a septic system is 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.
6. 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.
7. To obtain addresses, the applicant must submit a request to the Planning and Building Department. The Plat Address Information Sheet submitted with the plat application does not constitute a request for addresses.
8. 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.
9. No Improvement Location Permit/Building Permit shall be issued until any plat associated with Secondary Development Plan Review has been recorded.
10. 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.

MAP 696/16 (REPLAT): GRANT PARK, LOTS 13A & 13B IN BLOCK A2 OF THE REPLAT OF BLOCK A; a replat in a major subdivision, 2 lots, 0.3 acres, Washington Township, Located at 4212 & 4214 Galena Drive in the Grant Park Subdivision. (The Schneider Corporation)

Mr. Dennis Grumpp of the Schneider Corporation appeared on behalf of Westport Homes. He stated they were proposing a replat for Lots 13A & 13B in Grant Park, a project that Westport Homes was

September 14, 2016

now building. He stated because of the product that was to be placed on the lot and the side setbacks and to make it all work with the zoning, we requested a change in the lot line between the units which would be the lot line of 13A & 13B. He stated that lot line would move approximately three foot to the west. He stated they had been through the Drainage Board and received approval. He stated there would be no change in utilities and no change in drainage. He stated it was just a matter of housekeeping to change that lot line which will be the party wall line between the two units

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gaston made a motion to grant approval for **MAP 696/16 (Replat): Grant Park, Lots 13A & 13B in Block A2 of the Replat of Block A** subject to the staff's memorandum dated September 7, 2016.

Mr. Ayers seconded the motion.

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

The staff memorandum was as follows:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative & Plat Committee
 Hendricks County Drainage Board

FROM: Plan Commission Staff

DATE: September 7, 2016

RE: **MAP 696/16 (REPLAT): Grant Park Lots 13A & 13B in Block A2 of the replat of Block A**

This revision is being requested in order to move the interior lot line between the two above referenced lots approximately 3' to the West. The resulting lots will still meet the requirements for development.

Staff is not opposed to the request.

Mr. Reitz stated that concluded the agenda items.

Mr. Salsman, Engineering Inspector, then asked to speak to the committee on a matter. He stated that this had to do with Parks at Prestwick and specifically Section 2. He stated there was a common area adjacent to where Section 8 went in and at this time it did not have sidewalks. He stated that Section 2's bond was gone and it was, basically, the county's now. He stated the common area ownership belonged to the HOA. He stated the sidewalk had been installed in Section 8 coming from the wooded area. He stated there was a park bench and there was also a gravel parking area. He stated when the utilities went through there and Beazer Homes refinished it, they had placed topsoil and seeded and mulched it. He stated he had spoken to Bill Bryant at the time and he had indicated that was the agreement with the HOA but that there was no discussion about the sidewalk.

Mr. Ayers asked if that was missed when the bond was released.

Mr. Salsman explained what had happened at the time and the decisions that were made. He asked if they should go after Beazer Homes and have them install the sidewalk or send out a letter from the zoning side to the HOA.

September 14, 2016

There was further discussion between the staff and Mr. Salsman on the matter.

There was a determination for Mr. Salsman to approach the Homeowner's Association on installing the sidewalk.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:29 a.m.

Don F. Reitz, AICP, Chairman