

October 9, 2019

The Hendricks County Area Plan Commission Administrative and Plat Committee held a meeting on Wednesday October 9, 2019 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. Bart Harvey, Highway and Bridge Project Manager; Mrs. Krista Click, Environmental Health Director; Mrs. Tiffany Dalton, Deputy Surveyor, and Mr. Jeff Pell, Plan Commission Representative. 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 five (5) members present.

Mr. Dombrosky called for the approval of the minutes of the September 11, 2019 meeting.

Mrs. Dalton motioned for the approval of the September 11, 2019 minutes.

Mrs. Click seconded the motion.

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

MIP 1115/19: DANE SNYDER; a 3-lot minor plat; 21.35 acres; Eel River Township; S3-T16N-R2W; located on the southeast corner of County Road 700 North and County Road 575 West. (Crossroad Engineers)

Mr. Derek Snyder, Crossroad Engineers appeared on behalf of the petitioner. He stated that they had received drainage board approval yesterday for proposed relocation, regrading and regulated drain easement reduction. He stated that they had received the staff comments last week. He noted that they had already addressed the Health Department comments with the revised development plan that was sent out yesterday. There were a couple other staff recommendations that he was pretty sure had been addressed prior to the revised plan submission.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if the October 2nd development plan was the most current. He pointed out the tree on the west side of the plans.

Mr. Snyder replied that he had made a revision yesterday to address the Health department comments. The note was added for the tree.

Mr. Dombrosky asked about the slope on the swale being addressed at drainage board.

Mrs. Dalton replied that the slope was not discussed, but that they typically require a 2 to 1. She stated that they would work with them during the process.

Mr. Snyder stated that the comment was referring to the longitudinal slope. He noted that they were replacing the tile as part of that, so he assumed replacement of the legal tile drain it would address that comment.

Mrs. Dalton stated they were fine with that.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if all the soil boring reports have been addressed.

Mrs. Click replied that they had received the report. She stated that she did not look to see if staff comment number five (5) was addressed, but that it was an easy fix.

Mr. Dombrosky noted that the health department was still unclear as to where the perimeter drains were tying into.

October 9, 2019

Mrs. Click replied that the revision did address some of that. The revision that was sent yesterday shows lot 1 going, not to the ditch, but up to the legal drain between lots 2 and 3. That is fine, it's in the easement, as long as that doesn't mess with anyone else's requirements, that will work for them.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if it needed to be noted that it was a silt tight connection.

Mrs. Click replied that was her question as well. It appears that all of the them are daylighting into the legal drain. I think there is some question as to if it's going to be tied in or daylighting at the legal drain. They did make a note that the last ten (10) feet are solid pipe with animal guard and riprap on each of them. She also noted that one of the notes may not be pointing to the correct line.

Mr. Snyder stated he was pulling up the pdf version on his phone. He had grabbed the wrong plans when he left.

Mrs. Click stated that she wanted to clarify that. On lot 3, it was a little confusing that it was pointing to the right line as far as the note they require when it is daylighting. The main problem was that it is crowded in there and it's hard to see what is noting. She stated that he may just need to change where that was pointing to. He may need to add a clarifying statement somewhere, where it bends at lot 1 to go into the easement. There are so many lines there, it looks almost like it's ending there because it's overlapped with another line that's pointing to an elevation. Clarifying those would make sure there were no questions.

Mr. Dombrosky asked about the culvert at the intersection being an issue with the county engineer.

Mr. Harvey replied that he did not think it should be required.

Mr. Dombrosky replied that they would just exclude comment number seven (7) from the staff recommendations. He stated on comment number eight (8) they had some concerns about the future crossing of the legal drain from lot 1 because there is a buildable area to the east of the legal drain. The comment stated that a future provision for crossing the legal drain should be approved by the surveyor's office. He asked Mrs. Dalton if that was enough to have it in the letter or should it be on the plat.

Mrs. Dalton stated that they will require it to be on the plot plan as well as the perimeter drains. If they are going to the legal drain, they will request that a "T" be put in the legal drain if you are replacing that instead of daylighting. They will have to physically tie into the tile itself.

Mr. Snyder confirmed that there could be no daylighting at all.

Mrs. Dalton replied they could not.

Mr. Snyder asked if the animal guard and riprap notes get removed.

Mrs. Dalton replied that he would not have to do that. She felt it made it easier for everyone that way. It is done through permitting process through their office.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that his concern was that it wasn't going to be in the near term. It could be twenty (20) years and someone puts a foot bridge or something over that that might obstruct flows.

Mrs. Dalton stated that if they don't get a permit with us, then they have the right to go in and take it out.

Mr. Snyder asked if he needed to add a note on the development plans.

October 9, 2019

Mr. Dombrosky stated he was suggesting that they do.

Mrs. Dalton stated that they do not require them to add it, but it wouldn't hurt if they wanted to add something.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if all three (3) lots perimeter drains were going to the legal drain.

Mr. Snyder replied that they were.

Mr. Dombrosky confirmed that they all needed to be tile connections.

Mrs. Dalton replied yes, they could put a "T" in.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if lot 3 drainage ran along the road and if it was in an easement.

Mr. Snyder replied that it did run along the road, outside the right of way. It was not in the 15-foot easement.

Mrs. Click pointed out that on both the primary and secondary septic field for lot 3 which is north. We had some discussion because of the 100-year flood elevation was above where the septic fields are. We can't deny it because it's not a regulatory flood elevation, it's not DNR. We just wanted to put that in case DNR would change that in the future. Just know that it's a potential risk. More importantly, we just wanted to point out that there's so much grading on that property. to make sure to not disturb the areas where the septic fields will go.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Dombrosky opened the public hearing. There being no one signed up to speak, he closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Click motioned for approval of **MIP 1115/19: Dane Snyder** subject to staff recommendations, excluding staff comment number seven (7).

Mrs. Dalton seconded the motion.

FOR – 5 –

AGAINST – 0 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff conditions and recommendations are as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A 7 ½ foot easement on each side of the lot line may need to be wider if it is also utilized by non-adjacent lots.
2. There is one tree within 10' of the edge of pavement that needs to be removed.
3. The swale across this site is graded at 0.63% slope. By Ordinance there should be a subdrain on swales less than 1% slope.
4. Provide September 23, 2019 soils report for Lot 3.
5. Note that the soils report for Lots 1 and 2 were from August 6, 2019. The plans reflect August 16th.
6. For Lot 1, the septic perimeter drain must terminate at a tile, intermittent stream, or body of water. The subsurface drain outlets for Lots 2 and 3 need to clearly reflect connection to a tile or daylighting with a note to install 10 ft of solid PVC pipe with animal guard and riprap. Maintain invert elevation of outlet points on the plans.

7. Lot 3 will be divided by the legal drain. Any future provision for crossing the legal drain must be approved by the Hendricks County Surveyor's office.

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.

MIP 1118/19: JOHN KOFODIMOS; a 2-lot minor plat; 13.52 acres; Guilford Township; S22-T14N-R1E; located at 6926 E. County Road 825 S., Mooresville 46158 (Kruse Consulting Inc.)

WA 309/19: MIP 1118 JOHN KOFODIMOS; a Waiver of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, Sec. 6.12.1.B Sidewalks, Pathways and Pedestrian Ways (Kruse Consulting Inc.)

Mr. Joel Brame, Kruse Consulting Inc. appeared on behalf of the petitioner. He stated that they did receive drainage board approval yesterday.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that there was only one note about the abandoned well. They were showing street trees but were requesting a sidewalk waiver.

Mr. Brame stated that was correct.

October 9, 2019

Mr. Dombrosky asked what the discussion was in TAC about the sidewalks. He was not present for that meeting.

Mrs. Baker stated that there were no sidewalks in the immediate area.

Mr. Brame replied that he did not recall any discussion. The development across the street was developed with no sidewalks.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if the trees were already installed.

Mr. Brame replied that they were not yet installed.

Mr. Dombrosky asked if there were any roadside improvements.

Mr. Brame stated that there were none. He believed that Mr. Ayres only comment was that there was some brush in the area and near the culvert that needed to be removed, but he was okay with everything else. He made mention of something, there's a very large tree in front of the house, but he didn't require that one to be removed.

Mrs. Click noted that the health department usually votes against the sidewalk waiver to encourage community connectivity and physical activity.

Mr. Dombrosky stated that it was separated from the main town by the quarry and that would never have sidewalks he would imagine.

Mr. Brame stated that the field to the east is all floodplain as well.

Mr. Dombrosky opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jeff Banning, 8031 S. CR 675 E., Mooresville appeared. He stated that he is the adjoiner to the west. He has lived in Newman Ridge for over twenty (20) years. He developed that area. He stated that they have many people who walk around the block. He would strongly suggest no sidewalks. He asked if there was going to be a roadside ditch required.

Mr. Dombrosky stated he was unsure.

Mr. Banning stated that he would be against that because of the existing trees in front of the probably 18-year-old brick house. He stated that drainage is fine.

Mr. Dombrosky asked him if he thought the new drive would impact drainage at all.

Mr. Banning replied he did not believe so.

Mr. Dombrosky closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Click motioned for approval of **MIP 1118/19: John Kofodimos** subject to staff recommendations.

Mrs. Dalton seconded the motion.

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

Mrs. Dalton motioned for approval on **WA 309/19: MIP 1118 John Kofodimos**.

Mr. Pell seconded the motion, with Mrs. Click voting against.

October 9, 2019

FOR – 4 –

AGAINST – 1 –

ABSTAINED – 0 –

The staff conditions and recommendations are as follows:

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Show abandoned well location on the back of Lot 2.

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.

There being no further items to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 9:57 a.m.

Tim Dombrosky, Chairman