



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Eastgate Plaza
ADDRESS: 2307 LaPorte Ave.

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: 7/12/05
ZONING: C-3/R1A
PARKING: Various

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
Daryl Brown, Water Department	(219) 462-6174
Marv McDaniels, Collections Department	(219)-464-2346
Bill Oeding, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612

PRESENTERS:

Kent Pollock	464-9398
Bruce Peterson	
Dennis & Richard Claussen	773-871-4737

Media

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 Eastgate Plaza located at 2307 LaPorte Avenue.

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.

Pollack advised that this is the second review of this project. This is a 19,239 square foot project with a mixed use of mercantile, business and retail. They have set the limits of the project up to the area zoned R1A. The pond in the back has been designed a little differently and is now oversized. They are going to fill the property and bring the elevation up to be almost level with the transmission shop. They have discussed two curb accesses to the Von Tobel property with Von Tobel and Eric Carlson. They are pretty much in favor of the front one but they have not given an answer on the back one. The back curb cut was not in the first go around and he put it in to give better access to equipment vehicles, service and fire trucks. They showed the plans for the building façade along with elevations. They have a wrap around drive for service to get to the back of the building and that will be a right hand turn only onto LaPorte Avenue. They have swooped the curb around to make it almost impossible to go for a left hand turn. The main drive is the same as before. The buildings are going to be brick veneer with towers and pitches to it. They have signage out into the front and have met the signature requirements for landscaping and signage with a 30' setback in front. Trees were cut down early and there is a tree description of what has to be replaced and put back in. There is a landscape plan. Claussen said that in the first review there was a building in the rear on the R1A property but this has been eliminated and they are

concentrating in the C-3 zoning area only. The building is almost identical to what was planned before. The parking is about the same as before with a cross easement in the back.

Phillips advised that no use variance is necessary now since there is only one building in the C-3 zoning. The spaces will be built out as tenants come in. They are planning on 1600 sq. ft. units but that can change. They do have one firewall set in place and there will be two-hour separation between occupancies so they will probably end up with 2 or 3 firewalls. Phillips advised that the architecture looks to be fine. The roof-mounted equipment will not show from either the front or the back of the building. Parking has been based on expectations and they split out in the three standard ways. Phillips said that based on the retail expectations there is 1/150, which means 96 spaces. Parking is questionable as there is no overflow. This will need to be looked at again. They established the mix by using 5700 for mercantile, 1500 for assembly and 12,000 for business. They expect this to be mostly business with maybe one restaurant in the front. The thought was that the restaurant would probably be busiest when the rest of the businesses are closed. Phillips advised that we would need to go over this again.

The other problem is the percentage of lot coverage in a signature corridor district. It can be no more than 75% and they are at 82%. We are a little concerned because as a standalone on this project they do not meet the standards. If they include the retention pond as part of that they do meet the standards. We cannot count any of the residential lots in the calculation for open space because they are standalone lots. We will look at this again also.

Phillips said that he had written down from the last meeting that we require a 120 right-of-way width in order to put in the pedestrian linkages along there. Pilz advised that he does not remember that. There is access to the site. The tree survey is on the landscape plan. There are a few trees that they left in limbo and they want to know what the contribution is for taking down these trees. Phillips advised that they should contact Steve Doniger in regard to this calculation. They have heavily landscaped and we will have the horticulturist check the plans.

We would like to have the access maintained between their site and the next site. They are proposing to pay for that access. Signage is monument style only and is based on the frontage of the building. They would need a variance to base this on any other portion of the building. They will need a building permit for the sign. Lighting will be decorative and will not interfere with any residential that may go in the back. We would like to see a lighting plan.

Pilz advised that he would send them a written list of comments by the end of the week. We will need more detail in regard to the two drive entrances. A main concern will be how we maintain the gutter line for drainage to that. They will need another cleanout in the service line at the back to split that length up. The connection into the existing city sewer will not be at the manhole but in front of the manhole because it is a service link, and service lines are not allowed to go into the manhole. They should consider the possible need for a standard exterior grease trap of 1,000 gallons. The sanitary service is under the building floor so they need to make plans. Pollack advised that they were going to do a double line and the grease trap was going to go between the building and the sidewalk. They are not going to pour the last 8 feet of concrete in the building so that line should be fully exposed if they need to add the grease trap in.

Kras advised that we would need drainage calculations for the sizing of the pond, showing what is going into the pond and the outlet. Pollack advised that the pond is actually 2-½ times larger than required. Overflow of this pond should not go to the west residential area. If it overflows it will go into the swale and there is an 18" line out to the east that was put in by Von Tobel out to the east side. Erosion control is important. Bruce advised that they are filing their Rule 5 with IDEM and we would like copies of that. The erosion control plan is still in the works and they will forward that when done.

Oeding wants them to make sure that their ramps on the sidewalk are ADA graded. Handicapped parking must be based on ADA regulations.

McDaniels gave them information on contacting Ed Pilarski in regard to the grease trap. Thrasher advised that if they were having a restaurant they would need at least a two-hour separation between that and any other tenant. They will need a State Design Release for the building and then for tenant buildouts. Actually, there is a two-hour separation between all tenants. Brown advised that the water line is in a different location than shown on their drawings. It is actually out more in the street. They can pick up and bore underneath and put in 12 lines and shut offs. Chuck McIntyre is working on the costs this week. Each unit will be required to have backflow protection at the meter and any irrigation will require backflow protection also. They went over the plans on where the line is and how it will go. Pollack asked if they would need another site review. Phillips advised that once they resolve any of the issues left open today they could go forward with permits. They should check with the Fire Department to see if they have any issues or concerns.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

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