

III. PRELIMINARY and FINAL APPROVAL:

- A. Request by Ricky Spoon for preliminary and final subdivision approval of Bobcat Point Subdivision, Phase IV (Lots 104 –108, 111 – 118), consisting of 13 lots on approximately 58 acres, off Poplar Forest Lane, Hadley Township.

Ms. Richardson reviewed the agenda notes for this subdivision request.

One adjacent landowner (who did not give his name) stated, "If it's good for Ricky then it's good for us".

Ricky Spoon, developer, was present.

There was no discussion among the Board.

Mr. McBee made a motion; seconded by Ms. Andrews to grant preliminary and final approval of "Bobcat Point subdivision, Phase IV (Lots 104 – 108, 111 – 118) as submitted and as recommended by the Planning Department with the following condition:

1. The plat not be recorded until the county attorney has approved the financial guarantee.

The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER SUBDIVISIONS: (Items V. and VI.)

V. SKETCH DESIGN APPROVAL:

- A. Request by David Johnson for subdivision sketch design approval of "Fern Creek Subdivision", consisting of 4 lots on approximately 15 acres, located off SR-1700, Sugar Lake Road, New Hope Township.

Ms. Richardson reviewed the agenda notes for this subdivision. She stated that staff recommends granting sketch design approval of the application as submitted with the following three (3) conditions:

1. The entire length of the roadway, portion serving three existing lots and new proposed portion to serve four new lots, be improved/built to the county private road standards.
2. The preliminary and final plats shall have a cul-de-sac roadbed with a turn-around radius not less than forty (40) feet and with a right-of-way radius of not less than fifty-five (55) feet.
3. A draft road maintenance agreement conforming to Section 6.2 D (2) of the Subdivision Ordinance shall be submitted at the time of preliminary subdivision submission with a report of the status of landowner participation.

David Johnson, applicant, was present.

Mars Davis, adjacent landowner, stated that he and his wife, Lisa Davis, own the property at the very end of the existing road (parcel #63518); that they are not interested in having the road widened; that the road has already been widened for Sugar Lake; and that they would be in favor of Mr. Johnson receiving a variance and not having to improve the balance of the existing easement (currently serving parcel numbers 67225 and 63518 as shown on attached map). Mr. Davis noted that the current private access is a 60-foot roadbed.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of bringing the existing 60-foot roadbed up to private road standards. Mr. Davis stated that they like the road the way it currently is.

Cindy Perry, attorney representing the applicant, was present. Ms. Perry asked Board members to visit the proposed site sometime during the time period before the actual lots are requested (preliminary and final plat approvals). She stated that the reasoning of the ordinance would be carried out if the Board would allow the applicant to not extend the road (currently serving parcels #67225 and #63518 as referenced above). Ms. Perry explained that the applicant is willing to spend a considerable amount of money to put in a county standard road that serves a subdivision that is going to be very much in keeping with the rest of the area.

Discussion followed. Ms. Richardson explained that the Board could table the issue to allow the applicant an opportunity to file for a variance request or that the Board could approve staff's recommendation/conditions. Ms. Andrews suggested adding language to staff's condition #1 as noted below in bold print.

1. The entire length of the roadway, portion serving three existing lots and new proposed portion to serve four new lots, be improved/built to the county private road standards **or seek a variance request.**

Mr. Megginson noted that a variance is requested at sketch or preliminary review time.

Ms. Perry stated that the reason a variance was not included in this application request was basically due to a timing issue. She noted that there were discussions with the Planning Department staff regarding the layout of the development and the interconnectivities involved; and that it was fairly late in the process when it was realized that a variance could be acquired.

Following discussion, Ms. Andrews made a motion; seconded by Mr. McBee to table the issue to allow the developer time to apply for a variance request. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that the applicant could request a variance and sketch design approval simultaneously.