



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Executive Park PUD
ADDRESS: 500N/St.Hwy 49

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: 4/5/05
ZONING: County R-3

PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

IN ATTENDANCE:

Craig Phillips, Planning Director	(219) 462-1161
Tyler Kent, Asst. Planner	(219) 462-1161
Dave Pilz, Engineering Director	(219) 462-1161
Matt Kras, Stormwater Engineer	(219) 462-1161
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Chuck McIntyre, Water Department	(219) 462-6174
Joe McLees, Fire Chief	(219) 462-8325
Bill Oeding, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612
Media	

PRESENTERS:

Aaron Taylor
Matt Keiser
Duneland Group, Inc.
926-1007
Todd Leath
Hoepfner Wagner & Evans
464-4961

Email addresses for the above City of Valparaiso Departments can be found at:

<http://www.ci.valparaiso.in.us/>

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting:

The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed project known as Executive Park PUD. Phillips stated that site review is not an approval. It is meant to be a preliminary discussion of the requirements and issues to be considered by the developer or owner and there may be some cases where it will need to come back before site review or to seek other approvals.

It is a planned unit development and they will be asking for that rezoning. It is now an R-3 in the County. It is located at the northeast corner of 500 North and Burlington Beach Road. Taylor advised that this development is in a proposed annexation area. It contains approximately 25 acres and will include 30 residential lots and 6 commercial lots. The commercial lots will be close to Highway 49 on the eastern portion of the development. It will be separated from the residential area by an open space and a tree preservation area. There are 28 residential lots within the PUD that exits off of 500N and there are two residential lots that will not be connected internally that will front on Silhavy Road. The commercial spaces will be offices and not retail or restaurants. They plan to exit and enter from 500N. The street will be built to city standards with a 60' right-of-way plus curb and gutter. It will be a dedicated public street.

Leath asked if financial institutions would be included in the "office" description of the commercial portion. Phillips said that it would include any professional type offices. The detailed use descriptions are included in the development plan. Using the term "office" would just clear things up for the public hearing stage of the project.

Phillips advised that this development will be included in the Northeast Annexation area. This area is shown as an office area in our Growth Plan. The PUD is to be a mixed use but they will be deviating a little bit from the ordinance so they will be asking for a variance from the standards of the PUD. He asked if they had a general idea of the lot sizes for the residential. Taylor stated that

they will range from 60' wide by 140' deep to 60' wide to 150' deep and between 8,400 square feet to 9,000 square feet. Phillips asked that this be included in the development plan. The parking standards will be met for both residential and commercial. He stated that they should keep in mind that medical offices have a much stricter parking standard. They are pretty much meeting the general standards for the development based on the underlying zoning districts that would go along with the categories that they are talking about. This is not only a PUD but it is also in the overlay district for State Road 49 so those standards must be met. There is a 25' setback required from all land zoned or used as residential outside of the PUD. That would only apply along the south property line where Lot 36 potentially comes in contact with residential and also on the north and south sides of Lots 29 and 30. They will need to ask for a deviation from that standard as that 25' seems to be a little excessive since that is a compatible use right next door to both of those properties. There is a 30' setback required along State Road 49 and we would like to adhere to that as much as we can. Phillips said that he would like to go over this with them again to compare PUD standards, the Corridor Overlay standards and the zoning standards. There is a two acre minimum for lot sizes in the 49 standards for commercial uses so they will need to get a deviation for that. Minimum lot width is 160' and they are probably meeting that but if not it will need to be noted. The front yard setback will require a variance. The most restrictive standards are the overlay standards which require 90'. He asked if they are planning parking on the west side of the building or between the buildings. Taylor advised that they are planning on having the parking on the internal side of the buildings and the presentation will be towards 49. Leath asked if parking is allowed between the building and 49. Phillips said it is if this group has no problem with it they can allow that. It can be discussed at the reviews for each specific site. If there would be any parking between the buildings and 49 we would require heavy landscaping but we would like to avoid that parking if at all possible.

McLees asked about the height of the buildings. Taylor said that at this point the only thing he has heard from the developer is two story will be the height maximum but nothing has been determined. McLees stated that if the fire department needs to use their tower they are going to have to have room to put it and set it up which requires about 26'. They can not set up next to a building. He is concerned about how many parking spots they are going to have in the back. If they are going to have only 20' between their last parking spot and the curb of the structure or the front end of the structure it will be very hard to get equipment, especially the tower, in. Phillips also advised that the height of the building will affect the setbacks.

There will be no outdoor storage. Signage will be limited to monument style signage. Building signage is allowed according to the sign standards. At the Plan Commission meeting we are going to be adopting a resolution to incorporate a new chapter in the Growth Management Plan in the form of Greenways and Alternative Transportation Master Plan. There are elements that affect three sides of this development so we need to make sure that they are incorporated into the general concept for the PUD. We will get them the information they need in regard to this. There will be no overhead utilities. This is a regional gateway as defined by our Zoning Ordinance and on the northeast most parcel, Lot 31, we want them to pay particular attention to heavy landscaping on that property as a result of that standard. Landscape plans will be required for each project within the development.

Phillips asked what the open spaces consist of. Taylor advised that the open spaces on the east are natural. There is a drain that runs through there that is heavily wooded. This will create a buffer of trees between them and the existing residences along Silhavy Road. Phillips asked if there could be an effort on the part of the developer in the form of restrictive covenants to have penalties in place in the event of tree removal. Taylor advised that the open space between the residential and commercial includes an existing tree line and there may be some green space on the other side of the trees and in the right-of-way before you get to the back of curb there. They

also intend to leave a buffer of open space and green space in between the residential and commercial on the south side of the project. There is actually a buffer that goes north/south through this site as well as the drain creating a buffer between the development and other properties to the west and south. There is a pipeline that runs through the southern portion of this property and they do intend to put an easement there. There is a point of easement on the property at this point and they are planning on getting that reduced and maintaining that as open space along with the pipeline easement. Phillips said that there is a subdivision standard that says when you have 30 or more residential units it calls for a secondary entrance to the property. Maybe there should be some type of emergency access situation. McLees stated that the fire department likes to have more than one way to get into a development. Pilz said that the logical place to have one would be through Lot 29 or 30 but that would mean that we would have to have a crossing of the drain which can be expensive for the developer and not good from an environmental standpoint. He would prefer not having a second entrance if it means crossing the drain. Phillips said that they will then need to be careful that the access road coming off of Burlington Beach is adequate for the fire department's needs. McLees said that he will talk with Chief Nondorf in regard to this. Leath stated that two of 30 lots are serviced outside of the subdivision so it would not be affected by that zoning stipulation. Pilz said that they have 36 lots altogether so it really would apply. Leath said that the enhanced entranceway could take care of this. McLees said that they would like to discuss this. If they have one limited way in they would have to go around the entire development to get back to a site. The Fire Department will work with them in regard to the safety issues of the entrances. Phillips asked if there is going to be any way that some of the open space can be recreational. Taylor said that the open spaces they have are going to be wooded and natural but will be accessible to the residents. Phillips stated that any time we put a subdivision in that is not close to City's parks we want to try to provide some sort of opportunity there for recreation. He would like them to consider this although we do not condone cutting down trees.

Taylor advised that at this time the developer has not determined what type of residences they will be marketing. This is located within the Flint Lake Drain Floodway but this is not a delineated floodway on the maps. It is a drain but not a floodway. Leath said it is delineated to the north in Hawthorne and delineated to the south in Audubon. Pilz advised that it will be required by the City to be mapped and delineated here too. This will need to be done so that it will not be encroached upon and to set building elevations appropriately. They do not plan to build anywhere near the floodway. There is no Zone A floodplain located within this development. There is .14 acre of wetlands. They are between Lots 32 and 31 on the east side of the road. The only impact they will have on that is the road crossing. Also it runs down between Lots 4 & 5. They advised that they will work with the Army Corps of Engineers in regard to this.

Pilz said that the gross acreage shown should be fixed so that it does not include the roads and will show a realistic number for the lots only. Pilz advised that we have been working with INDOT and pushing very hard to have an interchange not only at 400N and 49 but also at 500N and 49. There has been no official change to that approach but it seems to have slid aside. He raised this only as it is an issue hanging out there that needs to be clarified. If this development is developed the way it is, it will become very expensive and difficult to put an interchange in. Pilz feels that the City needs to take a position if this is important and if they are going to take a stand this development plan needs to be revised. If it is not an issue it needs to be taken off the table. Officially our intermodal transportation shows an interchange at that location so it may require a variance or revision of the plan. The floodway/floodplain will need to be established, especially to set building restrictions for building height, elevations and opening elevations. Our ordinance does say that if any portion of the flood plain is filled there has to be compensatory storage provided somewhere else. In regard to the entrance road, we would like it to be moved as far to the west as

possible, away from State Road 49 for ease of traffic flow. We would encourage them to plan for some type of a passing blister on the north side of the road so that cars coming off of 49 can turn left and other cars can get by if they need to. Looking ahead, your half width right-of-way on 500N will be 40' from the section line. With regard to detention, they are relatively close to the north end of the watershed or channel and there are different theories on this but Pilz would like to see more of an offset; inline detention where you really wouldn't have a controlled discharge. They would calculate the volume of storage they would need but rather than putting in the controlled storage it would basically be a connector pipe so that the stream itself can rise and it could use some of the storage if it needs to. It would probably a little easier for them to work in as they will not have elevation restrictions.

Pilz asked about the annexation date. Phillips said that the targeted date for the annexation is around Thanksgiving. Taylor said that their intentions are to go through the City for the PUD and once the annexation is complete the PUD would become official and they would go forward from that point.

Pilz said that there would be one more variance required since we require commercial areas to have streets 36' wide back-to-back of curb and there is no reason for that here. He will support a variance to allow the 30' pavement width through that area. McLees said that he feels it should be allowed only after determining where the parking is going to be. There is to be no parking on the west side of the road. Pilz said that we have 30' wide pavement supporting many, many more lots than what we have here and 36' pavement is absolutely not warranted here. Phillips said that along the commercial side of the development there would be no parking on the west side of the road. Oeding said there should be none on either side except in the residential. Pilz then said that if there is not going to be any parking on either side of the road why would we need 30' since it is not needed for two vehicles to pass. Pilz said that we have to get away from the mentality that roads need to be wide enough to carry intercontinental ballistic missiles down them. McLees said that must have been some thought in regard to making the road widths initially. Pilz stated that he would like them to look at creating a passway through the openspace. They have a fantastic opportunity to do something that the residential people and the workers in the commercial area could use. He would be willing to support waiving the sidewalks on one side of the streets if they do something like that.

Kras advised they will need permitting for crossing the wetland area with the road. When they move forward they need to keep in mind that erosion control will be an issue and we will be looking at that carefully. They need to plan the phasing for the project and temporary seeding, silt fencing, etc.

Phillips advised that he has had several calls from residents in that area about the drainage issues associated with this project. They are concerned about the actual drain itself. He just wants them to note this as it will probably come up at the public hearing stage.

Oeding said that he likes Dave's idea of a single 8' wide path around the outside of the road as opposed to two sidewalks. Any sidewalks or pathways have to meet ADA standards. He appreciates Joe's concerns for the width of the street, however if it is not necessary he would like it to be as narrow as possible. He feels it slows traffic and is more calming. His concern would be on-street parking and would like most of the parking to be off-street in the driveways of the residential area. Phillips advised that there is going to be a change in the standards requiring at least 20' between the sidewalk and the garage door. Oeding said that too many times we build the streets narrow but then there are parking problems where the service trucks and equipment can not get through. He asked if the open spaces will be maintained by a POA and they advised that they will.

McLees asked if they have any plans now where they are putting hydrants or the water mains. They do plan on connecting the water main at Silhavy and 500. They will meet with the City in

regard to hydrant locations. McLees said that we have a problem with Hawthorn now because the water is not looped which restricts the amount of water available and they will be the same unless it is looped. McIntyre said that he would like to see the water lines looped. He asked if there would be a possibility of extending the pipeline easement and forming some type of loop going back to Silhavy. McIntyre said that it does not affect the pressure but does affect the quantity of water available when needed.

McLees said that maybe they would take into consideration sprinkling of the commercial buildings. Thrasher said that this will be reviewed at each site review as this is determined by the size of the building and the use. McLees said that even if it is not required the facts show that if a building is sprinkled the amount of loss due to fire is less.

McIntyre advised that looping of the water line is always a benefit when it can be achieved. He advised that they are in the wellhead protection area so during construction if they have any type of fuel containers on site they must be double contained. The wellhead protection zone will have to be shown on the preliminary and secondary plats. They would like to see the water main extended from Hawthorne to approximately 50' beyond the proposed blister on 500N. Normally they would require it to go all the way into the subdivision but in the event that we may end up going underneath the bypass at some time they want more room to work. The main is on the north side right now so if they would extend it 50' past the proposed blister it would be acceptable. After getting preliminary plans he will put valves and hydrants on it. There is now a 24" main and they will extend that. The zoning ordinance states that the water department must look at the site plans. They can forward it to Daryl Brown and will not need a special meeting.

Thrasher advised that she has nothing now. Everything specific will be taken care of at each separate site review.

Oeding asked if the actual name of this development is Executive Park. He was advised that it is. Oeding said that his concern is that any traffic coming off of 49 can get backed up into the intersection so this must be considered. It would be nice to have a turn lane for east bound traffic coming up to the development.

Phillips advised that this is within the Washington Twp. School District so it may be a good idea to call them since it may affect their district. They should also have continued discussions with INDOT in regard to the treatment of the intersection at 49. Any decisions they make will affect the project.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping plan	Sanitary/Sewer	Detailed Site Plan
Erosion control plan	Backflow Prevention	
Right-of-way	State Release	Building Permit