

September 9, 2020

The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Wednesday September 9, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in the Hendricks County Government Center, Rooms 4 & 5, 355 South Washington Street, Danville Indiana. Members present were Mr. Tim Dombrosky, Chairman; Mr. John Ayres, County Engineer; Ms. Krista Click, Environmental Health Director; Mr. David Gaston, County Surveyor. Also present were Mrs. Suzanne Baker, 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 four (4) members present.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the first order of business was the approval of the minutes from the August 12, 2020 meeting. He stated that we were still waiting on Mr. Gaston to phone into the meeting.

Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of the minutes for August 12, 2020.

Ms. Click seconded the motion. Mr. Kneeland abstained.

FOR – 3 – AGAINST – 0 – ABSTAINED – 1 –

Mr. Dombrosky introduced Mr. Kneeland as the new plan commission representative. Due to the state statute for residency requirements, Mr. Pell is no longer able to serve.

MIP 1123/20: MICHAEL SMITH; a 2-lot minor plat; 7.26 acres; Washington Township; S10-T15-R1E; located at 919 S. County Road 625 E. and 6422 E. County Road 100 S., Avon (Moench Engineering)

WA 314/20: MIP 1123 MICHAEL SMITH; a Waiver of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Sec. 6.12.1.B Sidewalks, Pathways and Pedestrian Ways (Moench Engineering)

Mr. Brian Moench, Moench Engineering appeared with Mr. Mike Zeilinski, Moench Engineering as well the owners of the property, Mr. & Mrs. Mike Smith. He stated that Mrs. Smith's parents lived there for approximately forty (40) years on what would be Lot 2 of this property. Mr. & Mrs. Smith have started purchasing property along County Road 100 S. and that property tucks in behind some of the lots on the front of County Road 100 S. Mrs. Smith's father is wanting to sell part of his lot to give them more land. He stated if it were not for Mrs. Smith's father retaining ownership of the northeast corner, his part of the property would not be part of this discussion. He stated that they had addressed the comments in the staff letter. They have enlarged the area on County Road 100 S. to show the water flow not coming out into the street, but that there is a small swale and ravine that comes out there. They are requesting a modification for lot ratio. He stated that Mr. Zeilinski was there to answer questions on how the contours drained as he was the one who surveyed the property. He pointed out on the slide the area where the existing ditch line comes down to.

Mr. Ayres asked if there was a ditch back to the east.

Mr. Moench replied there was, but it was not much of one. By putting in the driveway culvert would maintain any drainage that is east of them.

Mr. Ayres stated that they needed to put the invert elevations on the driveway culvert so they know it will match up with the ditches.

Mr. Moench stated he understood and that there was a ditch out there that intercepts that drainage. He noted that there was a comment about wells on the lots to the south of Lot 1. He stated that they were on city water.

Ms. Click asked if there were previous wells.

Mr. Moench stated they had been on city water for a while, but he assumed years ago there were wells.

Ms. Click stated they thought they were, but a lot of times they go to water they do not abandon the wells. She wanted to verify they were abandoned.

Mr. Moench stated that the Smith's owned a second lot as a rental property and pointed it out on the slide.

Ms. Click stated that the second one to the right is the one where it is close the primary septic field so they wanted to verify there were no old wells that are within a 50-foot radius that could get into the septic field area. If there are none there, they would need documentation that states that.

Mr. Moench asked if that could just be on their letterhead stating they visited the site and observed no wells.

Ms. Click replied that they would like something more than just standing on the property and observing. They did not observe any when they were there either, but a lot of times they are not visible. They need to verify with the homeowners that there are no wells.

Mr. Moench stated that they had received drainage board approval. He understood that staff was recommending a continuance, but they would like to get it pushed through today if possible. He stated that the set aside soil borings should have been sent over by Mr. Tom Ziegler.

Ms. Click stated that they were still waiting on some updated plans. The soil boring numbers were not correct.

Mr. Moench stated they have an electronic copy, and he could bring them a hard copy as well. The revised plans were finished up last night based on the comments.

Ms. Click stated that it would have helped to have those beforehand to review before the meeting.

Mr. Moench stated he would like to address the sidewalk waiver. He believed the recommendation of the county is that it be denied, and sidewalks put in because it is in Washington Township. He asked if that was a blanket statement for any new projects in Washington Township.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that it was not a recommendation on the staff letter, but that they just noted that it was required because it was in Washington Township. It just needed to be discussed. He noted that there was a five (5) percent slope in front of Lot 2. He did not think that was very practical. His only concern was that it was a fairly active area with the sports park across the street and new recreation center going in to the north. It would be nice to have sidewalks to get to those places. He was unsure how practical it would be to construct sidewalks across Lot 2.

Mr. Ayres stated that it probably was not very practical given the slope.

Mr. Moench stated that on Lot 1 the westbound would be going into a ravine, so he did not think that would be good for safety reasons. All the lots to the east are established homes.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he was more concerned with all the other comments that needed addressed. He noted that the Health Department still had five (5) outstanding issues. In looking at the revisions there are still issues with those. He then listed those issues. The revisions were due last week.

Mr. Ayres stated he believed the issues were resolvable, but that he was not comfortable voting today.

1. Mr. Dombrosky asked Mr. Moench if he knew where the subservice drain was outletting for Lot 1.

Mr. Moench replied that there was an intermittent creek that went along both Lots 1 and 2. They have extended the outlet to that creek.

Ms. Click asked if it outletted all the way back.

Mr. Moench replied that it did.

Ms. Click stated that they would need invert elevations.

Mr. Moench stated that they had that on the plans.

Ms. Click asked where the point was on the plans.

Mr. Moench stated it was on the far north property line.

Ms. Click stated that they would want to connect that. She then asked if they were daylighting it.

Mr. Moench replied that they were.

Ms. Click stated that they would need the comment added about having the 10-foot of solid pipe, rip rap and animal guard.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that there was an issue that has been addressed numerous times on the certificate of ownership. He pulled up the slide and showed what the error was. They need to add the word "not" into the statement in question.

It was noted that Mr. Gaston appeared at this time via teleconference.

Mr. Gaston believed that part of the problem is that surveyor that is stamping the plans is not understanding the comment because they are not present at the meetings. It seems there is a disconnect there. It would be great if Mr. Gill, the surveyor, could be at the meeting so they could explain this to him since he is stamping the plans. He asked if that was possible.

Mr. Moench stated that it could be possible.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that a lot of the typographical errors he would be okay approving contingent to changes being made but verifying the well and reviewing the invert elevations must be done first. He also noted that the street trees were in the wrong places.

Mr. Ayres stated he was not comfortable approving with contingencies.

Mr. Ayres motioned to continue **MIP 1123/20: Michael Smith and WA 314/20: MIP 1123/20 Michael Smith.**

Ms. Click seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

MAP 739/20: SONORA PUD, SECTION 5 (SECONDARY); a 52-lot major residential plat/PUD; 15.939 acres; Brown Township; S5-T16N-R2E; located on the south side of CR 700 N. and approximately 1400 feet west of Raceway Road (Banning Engineering)

Mr. Jason Coyle, Banning Engineering appeared along with Mr. Matt Howard, MI Homes.

Mr. Gaston noted that this had received approval from drainage board.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that comment five (5) had been resolved.

Mr. Coyle stated that when he looks at plans, he does not look at details and look to see where they are on the plans. He looks at plans and checks to see if those details are shown. They have the Hendricks County Regional Sewer District that has four or five plan sheets in there with their details specifically. They also have Citizen Water with their specific details. He stated that they could possibly pick one or two off if they went through them. He asked if there were specific details they wished them to remove.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that the comment was regarding the stop bars and crosswalk markings. There was a detail for it in one of the previous sections, but it was not on the plans. He not that Mr. Roger Salsman, Engineering Inspector, stated that they had to end up painting a stop bar at Raceway Road that was not on the plans originally because the detail was there.

Mr. Howard stated that for Section 3 they had wanted a stop bar in the crosswalks. He noted it was shown in the detail sheets, but it was not shown on the traffic plan.

Mr. Coyle stated they could remove those from the plans.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that if there is an ordinance that needs to be met and it is not on the plans, we would use the requirement in the ordinance and the detail to impose that, Even though it's not noted on the plans, the plans are subject to the requirements of the ordinance and the details.

Mr. Coyle was unsure what the comment was. Did they not want the detail on the plans?

Mr. Dombrosky replied that he just read and talked to Mr. Salsman this morning, so he needed Mr. Ayres to clarify that stop bars at crosswalks are not required by any ordinance.

Mr. Ayres stated that he did not think that was true. He thought it needed to be discussed outside the meeting. His interpretation of the comment was that if there were details on the plans that did not apply to the section, then they should not be on the plans because it adds clutter.

Mr. Howard explained that he believed that what happened was that someone noticed that that detail was in the plan sheet but was not on the drawings, but they are enforcing it because it was a detail.

Mr. Coyle asked where they enforce the detail if it is not specified.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they enforce it where it is required. If it states it in the ordinance that they are required where they define them as needed, then that is where it is enforced.

Mr. Coyle asked if it was in the ordinance.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that is what he was asking Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Ayres stated that he assumed that stop bars were required at all intersections.

Mr. Coyle stated that they would investigate and get back with them on that issue.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that comment four (4) was regarding the water line plans. He did not think they had the most recent plans. He asked if those were reviewed.

Mr. Coyle replied that Citizens Water reviews the plans extensively. They typically go through two (2) to three (3) revisions with them. He stated they essentially prepare the plans for them. They are what they are based on Citizens Water's comments.

Mr. Ayres asked if they were included with what was given to them.

Mr. Coyle replied that they were included.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if they were finalized.

Mr. Coyle replied that they have one more review as they are addressing their last set of comments.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that comment three (3) regarding sub service drains in the rear was what they needed to discuss. Mr. Gaston was not at the last TAC meeting until after they had left. He called on Mr. Gaston to discuss the sub service drain in the rear.

Mr. Gaston stated that it has been discussed before that on a new subdivision, they are not aware of which lots will be on slab or a crawl. His concern is that he does not want sump pumps dumping onto the ground. The ordinance gives the option, and he understands that. If we can avoid it in new subdivisions by putting a pipe in to collect the sump pumps if they think there will be crawls, then that is the preferred option. The backyard swales are minimum, and the water goes to the road and freezes. The only other option is to take a sump to the tile under the curb, and the engineering will not allow that. Unless we know for sure there will be no sump pumps, he asked why not think ahead. He understood that Mr. Coyle stated that it is in their ordinance. He stated his only other choice would be to change the ordinance.

Mr. Coyle stated that in any future plans, they will meet the ordinance as written.

Mr. Ayres stated they are asking them to meet them in these plans as well.

Mr. Coyle replied that all the lots are noted on the plans as slab lots. MI Homes has no intention of putting in basements. They do not offer it right now.

Mr. Ayres noted that the key phrase was "right now". He stated that in an email last week they stated they were reluctant to make a commitment to that because the market could change. Because there is still a possibility, it is a lot easier to put that into the plans now than to have to fix it afterwards. That way they are covered regardless of how the market shifts.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Howard if they would be willing to make the commitment for no basements.

Mr. Howard replied that they probably would in this case.

Mr. Coyle stated that the comment on section four (4) was to put something on the plat. That would restrict what can be done on those lots.

Mr. Ayres stated that is what they want to do.

Mr. Coyle stated that their ordinance does not require it.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they understood that. They believe it is best practice to do so. The ordinance also allows them some judgement in applying best practices.

Mr. Coyle asked if they could get a verbal commitment from Mr. Howard and MI Homes for no basements or crawl spaces.

Mr. Ayres stated it needed to be more than just a verbal commitment.

Mr. Coyle stated that this is a meeting with recorded minutes.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that if they wanted to go that route, then we could get a Development Commitment Recording Form with that verbiage on it and it gets recorded at the Recorder's Office. He stated there was a process for that.

Mr. Howard stated he would have to verify that with his boss to make sure.

Mr. Ayres asked for them to show him on the plans how many lineal feet of drainage they were talking about.

Mr. Howard replied that a rough estimate was \$800 per lot. They are seventy (70) foot lots at \$10 a foot and then \$150 per connection, so it would be \$850 per lot.

Mr. Coyle noted that there are existing structures in place that must be poured to allow for those connections. He stated it is not a cheap undertaking.

Mr. Howard stated they didn't have a problem putting it in if it were going to be used, but they did not want to charge the end user an additional \$850 for something they were not going to use, was where they were struggling with the issue.

Mr. Gaston stated that if they just commit to all slabs so they do not have to put the tiles in, then they would be good.

Mr. Ayres stated he agreed. He believed that was his comment initially; if they could find a way to formally commit to all slabs.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if they were willing, as they were not previously.

Mr. Ayres stated that Mr. Coyle's email comment last week stated they were not willing to do so.

Mr. Coyle replied that based upon their current ordinance unless they could provide him with an ordinance that states that it is required, they were meeting the ordinance with what they have shown.

Mr. Ayres stated that those are the minimums. They can make requirements of what they believe is in the best interest of the community. In this case, we would like to see the sub service drains or a commitment that they are not going to be needed.

Mr. Coyle stated that they would seek legal counsel and get response back to them.

Mr. Ayres replied that if they were going to do that, then he was not going to vote to do anything today.

Mr. Coyle stated that his client needed to go back to his legal team and his boss to make sure that it okay for him to make that commitment. There is nothing in the ordinance that says it is required, it is only a recommendation. He asked what the form was that needed to be done.

Mr. Dombrosky stated it may be in the packet already. It is the Development Commitment Recording Form. He would get it to them if it is not in the packet.

Mr. Ayres asked Mr. Howard when they could have a ruling on that from his boss.

Mr. Howard replied that he should be able to get them something later today. He was going to call him right after the meeting.

Mr. Coyle asked if the drains would be regulated drains once the ordinance is changed.

Mr. Gaston replied that they probably would be. It just depends. Right now, you must have a minimum of twelve (12) inch to be a regulated drain. They are going to look at that. It probably will be since in 20 years it will be hard on an individual homeowner to replace an entire run of tiles. He stated that would be his goal is to make them regulated drains. He noted that they had the developer for Woodcreek put in a minimum of 12-inch pipe because they wanted to have crawls and it was so flat. Those were regulated drains. They made them do that, but they were willing to do so.

Mr. Coyle stated he believed that MI Homes would be willing to do it if they thought basements were going to be sold.

Mr. Howard stated it was a warranty issue if they discharged onto the ground.

Mr. Gaston stated that he pushed for that based on twenty (20) years of history of seeing the problems. It makes for a horrible neighborhood. They are looking out for the for the homeowner down the line.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that he did not see anything about pavement markings in the ordinance.

Mr. Ayres stated that he was pretty sure they were required. He could not recall where in the ordinance it states that. He does not know why they would not be.

Mr. Coyle stated that they will look and see if they could find it. He stated that if they drove through most communities, he did not think you would see stop bars on crosswalks. He stated it would be helpful for them if when they make a comment, that they cite where in the ordinance so they may verify it. The first thing he does is go through and find where it is required in the ordinance.

Mr. Gaston stated that he did not understand the comment. He asked Mr. Coyle if his goal was to prove them wrong.

Mr. Coyle responded that his goal was to understand the position of the comment. If he cannot find where it is written in the minimum standards, then he questions the comment.

Mr. Ayres stated they are only minimum standards. They can require something above that.

Mr. Coyle stated that he was not an attorney, but he suspected there was case law that stated otherwise.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if they were willing to install stop bars at crosswalks if it is a requirement.

Mr. Howard replied that they would prefer not to. He received a quote, and it is \$12,000 just for Section 1. Once they are installed and the maintenance period is up, he believed upkeep would be an issue.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that it becomes a part of the public road after the maintenance period is up. He believed they should last the three (3) years.

There was some discussion on whether the crosswalks were a separate issue due to state law and possible ADA requirements that would need to be followed.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that they were in agreement on the Development Commitment Recording Form, and he believed it was unfair of them to make a decision on this section regarding the pavement markings since it was just brought up to him this morning.

Ms. Click motioned for approval of **MAP 739/20: Sonora PUD, Section 5 (Secondary)** subject to staff recommendations and a Development Commitment Recording Form being filed for the installation of sub service drains or a commitment for an all slab construction.

Mr. Kneeland 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. The original County/Owner Inspection Agreement must be provided.
2. An allocation letter is required before a construction plan will be approved and before on-site construction may begin. Failure to acquire sewer allocation would result in the need for an onsite sewage disposal system that shall be sized and designed to meet state and local requirements. The Hendricks County Health Department strongly recommends that a suitable location be reserved on each lot for a future onsite sewage disposal field and a future secondary septic field easement until sewer is allocated. Uses shall be limited to those consistent with the proper operation of a septic system and that will not result in soil compaction.
3. There must be an SSD provided behind all lots for sump pump connections, regardless of current projections for foundation types.
4. Waterline plans must be reviewed and cleaned up.
5. Unused details must be taken off the plan sheets.

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 Surveyors 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.

MRP 120/20: LORA & TROY GORHAM; a 1-lot minor residential plat; 8.0 acres; Clay Township; S27-T15N-R2W; located at 3455 S. CR 550 W., Coatesville 46121 (Kruse Consulting)

Mr. Dale Kruse, Kruse Consulting, appeared on behalf of the petitioners. They are requesting approval of a 1-lot minor residential plat to correct an illegal lot split. The parcel is located north of Amo. There is an existing house that is being torn down and an existing septic they want to connect to. He went through the staff comments. The first one being the 3:1 ratio. They are asking for a modification to that. There is a pipeline easement that runs through the property as well as a ravine. It does not make the back of the property unusable; it makes it difficult to get to. He pointed out on the plans where the ravine was located. The next comment talks about the history of when it was created. It missed the window of being a legal parcel by a short time. The third comment is looking for detail on the pipeline easement. They have added that to the plat. It is already a reduced easement and not a blanket easement. They received that from their title commitment. The fourth comment talks about contours sloping towards the road. He stated they do slope towards the road, but they are using the existing driveway. There is a small ditch there already. He did not think there was enough depth to show up on the LiDAR.

Mr. Ayres asked if they were doing much work to the grading.

Mr. Kruse replied that they were not. The house they are building is in the back, basically behind where the high point is.

Mr. Ayres stated that the ditch is minimal. He asked if there was a pipe under the drive.

Mr. Kruse replied that he was unsure. He could not tell from the picture they pulled up.

Mr. Ayres stated that if he would like to see the existing pipe dug out at both ends or replaced just to make sure.

Mr. Kruse stated that the last comment talked about it being a two-bedroom septic. They understand and are okay with that. He asked if Mr. Salsman would go out and inspect after they clear it out.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that he would.

Mr. Ayres motioned for approval of **MRP 120/20: Lora & Troy Gorham** subject to staff recommendations and the restoration of existing driveway pipe or installation of a new pipe.

Mr. Kneeland 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. Does not meet the 3:1 ratio (existing parcel)
2. This lot was created in 1998 and was a parent parcel from the surrounding properties and was split around the same time as MIP 787 was approved.
3. More detail needed on the pipeline easement. Is this a blanket easement?
4. Contours go towards the road. A roadside ditch may be needed to ensure water does not flow off this property onto the road.
5. Existing septic system is designed for two bedrooms.

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. 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.
6. Secondary septic field easements (SSFE) must be shown on the plat, or separate easement document to be recorded with the plat must be provided.
7. 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.

September 9, 2020

MRP 121/20: RAY SEVIER; a 1-lot minor residential plat; 3.15 acres; Liberty Township; S32-T15N-R1W; located 0.4 miles east of the intersection of W. CR 400 S. and S. CR 200 W. on the south side of the road (Kruse Consulting)

Mr. Kruse, Kruse Consulting, appeared on behalf of Mr. Sevier. It is located on County Road 400 S. west of State Road 39 about a mile and a half. He stated the issue is the existing septic system. The comment about verifying the fingers are outside the 50-foot separation from the well and septic. They have not been able to expose the fingers yet. He stated that they could either continue it or commit to putting in a new system.

Mr. Ayres stated that there would be changes to the plans if they are putting a new one in as well as things they would need to review.

Mr. Kruse stated that they had been digging with shovels, then they brought an excavator in and still have not located it.

Mr. Dombrosky asked for clarification. He asked if they had exposed where they thought the system to be or could it be somewhere else.

Mr. Kruse replied that he did not know. The client is sure there is a system there. They did find a tank.

Ms. Click stated that her staff found a tank also but could not identify the fingers.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if it had received drainage board approval.

Mr. Gaston replied that it had.

Mr. Ayres motioned for a continuance of **MRP 121/20: Ray Sevier** until the October 14, 2020 meeting.

Ms. Click seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

There being no further items to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.

Tim Dombrosky, Chairman