



**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Clark's Subdivision**  
**ADDRESS: State Rd. 2**

**LOCAT/ION: City Hall**  
**DATE: 8/9/05**  
**ZONING: C-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
Tim Burkman, Chief Deputy Engineer	(219) 462-1161
Matt Kras, Stormwater Engineer	(219) 462-1161
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Daryl Brown, Water Department	(219) 462-6174
Bill Oeding, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612
David Nondorf, Fire Chief	(219) 462-8325

### PRESENTERS:

Bob Palm
Jim Hipskind
Palm & Associates, Inc.
(574) 654-3450
Scott & Leonard Clark

### 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 subdivision on State Highway 2 across from Fetlas. 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. Palm advised that Clark's Subdivision will be a 6 lot commercial subdivision totaling 10 ¼ acres. There will be about 500 feet of new street build to city standards with a cul-de-sac. They have met with the State Highway in regard to the accel/decel-passing blister on the highway and it will be built to their recommendations. The site lies in a flood way and they have submitted a DNR permit. They are proposing a stormwater detention basin and calculate that to handle all of the runoff from all of the lots. There will be one medical building for certain as Dr. Maka owns a parcel. It could be a mixture of commercial businesses including medical.

Thrasher advised that when each parcel is developed it would come back for site review. Details for permits will come at that time.

Nondorf asked the distance from the first building to the cul-de-sac. He was advised it was just under 500 feet. This is a dead end system out there and we would like a hydrant at the halfway point, which would help the Fire Department.

Oeding asked if they are planning on having parking on the street and was advised that it would be off-street parking. Sidewalks will go around the entire development, which need to be built to Federal ADA standards with ramps. They can contact him for the standards.

Pilz advised that he would send them detailed comments. He asked if they anticipate that they will have to come back and split any of the lots. It is better to have smaller lots up front and then sell

somebody two lots that it is to come back and try to divide one because then we have problems with sewer services not being available. The way the drainage is shown is fine but we also have other requirements that pertain to individual sites so when, for example, the doctor comes in on his site he can not have more than 5,000 square foot of roof area, parking, etc. draining to the street without having his own drainage control put in. So as large as some of these lots are the people are going to have to put in their own detention basins also on their site in order to meet our requirements. The way they have it will require that there is a property owners association to maintain the back. That presents a problem for us because many times the owners don't pay their dues and there is nobody in charge when it malfunctions and the City won't know whom to go for to maintain. Pilz advised that they put in a conveyance system for the storm drainage similar to what is shown, have the sewer tapped to each lot, let each individual put in their own storm water detention sized to exactly what they are building. Individuals would then be responsible for their own basin and if we have any problems we go to that individual. That would enable them to decrease the size of the storm sewers that they are showing since they would only be putting it in to contain the outlets for everyone's detention basins and that would save a lot of money. They would not have to develop the large detention basin in the back and could probably just have a low area to convey the runoff out to the discharge site. That may also help them with the flood plain area back there. Our ordinance for any construction or fill in a flood plain requires that you give compensatory storage so if you fill any area of the flood plain up you then have to excavate an area somewhere else down to the flood elevations so that we have a corresponding storage. If they reconsider the storm drainage system it might help all of those issues and save some money. This way they would probably get away with having no property owners association.

Pilz asked if there was a date for the primary plat approval. Phillips advised that there is not but all of these changes would need to be made prior to primary plat approval.

Pilz said that the sanitary sewers are fine and drainage meets the standards but he thinks it would be good for them to look at the other option. They are providing 36' of pavement due to our ordinance but since they are providing off-street parking he would entertain reducing the pavement width to 30' to reduce the amount of impervious surface unless they anticipate having a lot of big trucks coming in and out. They could also mark it no parking on the street.

Phillips asked if the access would be off of Clark Road and no direct access to State Road 2. Clark advised that this is correct. Pilz stated that the driveways on Lot 1 & 6 would have to be pushed back.

Nondorf asked if they know what type of commercial buildings are planned back there. It is fine to say we will cut the road width but will that affect the turnaround at the end. Pilz stated that the turnaround would stay the same. It's hard for him to say that it's okay to cut the street width without knowing what's going in.

Palm asked if the City is not accepting any detention basins. Pilz advised that the City does not accept them, they have to be part of an association. Palm said that their thoughts were that it would be designed to handle the storm drainage from all sites so that is why they sized it so large and that is how they got their permit from DNR. It would also be an asset to the buyer to know that they had a basin designed for their site. Pilz said that the interest to us is how the water will get there so lots 1 & 6 would basically have to dump it in the street. Palm stated that they are going to put manholes on the site. Pilz said that they can do that but there would need to be some property owners association or some entity to maintain the detention basin.

Palm asked about the local flood plain ordinance. Pilz stated again that they are allowed to fill in the flood plain area, not in the floodway. The floodway is the narrow area right along the creek itself that carries the main flow. Phillips stated that this is not necessarily true, it is delineated on the maps and they determined that it is a floodway. Pilz said it is a floodway so if they fill in that area they need to provide compensatory storage in floodway area. Palm said that he couldn't

understand this since the impact is minimal or nonexistent. Pilz said that our ordinance states that if you do any filling in an area that is defined you have to provide the compensatory storage; it is outside the DNR. They are the ones that require that in our ordinance for floodways. Phillips asked if the flood way is delineated anywhere because if it matches the flood plain then almost the entire site is in the floodway before fill. As it stands now, all buildings on Lots 2,3,4, & 5 would have to get permission for the DNR to even construct because there is not a letter of macro vision or a letter of amendment. That is how we have to apply the rules from a zoning standpoint because we need some sort of proof that it is no longer in the floodway, otherwise we automatically refer every permit to DNR if it is in the floodway. Palm advised that the DNR permit approval was for the whole site, not just the pond. Pilz said he was talking about the area down on the south corner where it could be filling in to what is still a floodway area. Phillips said his point is mute because they have the clearance for the entire site from DNR. Pilz said it is hard to read contours, etc., but it looks like they are filling into the low area on each corner. That would be the area where there would have to be some provision.

Kent stated that each building would meet different requirements for parking, which will be looked at when each is individually site-reviewed. There is residential to the east so there will have to be a buffer but each owner can do that when site reviewed. There is a 30' front setback since it is on a local signature street. Phillips advised that the DNR approval should be attached to the primary plat or a note referring to it. Primary plat at the Plan Commission level is the next step.

Brown advised that the fire hydrants will be placed where the fire department wants them and cannot exceed 600' apart. They are tying an 8" line into a 12" line and the hydrants are 6" off of 8". Each lot will have its own service and that will be discussed at each separate site review.

Pilz said that there is a sanitary force main long the frontage on Highway 2.

#### ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping plan
- Erosion control plan
- Detailed Site Plan
- Sanitary/Sewer