



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Vale Park Road 4-Plex
ADDRESS: 1502/1504 Vale Park Road

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: 8/16/05
ZONING: R-4
PARKING: 2 per unit
LOT COVERAGE: 60%

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
Dave Nondorf, Fire Chief	(219) 462-8325
Bill Oeding, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612

PRESENTERS:

Rich Hudson
 Bonar Group
 (462-1158)

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 two-four unit buildings to be located at 1502/1504 Vale Park Road. 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.

Hudson advised that this was reviewed on January 20, 2004. He advised that this was approved with conditions dated April 23, 2004. It says, "as soon as we have resolved the issues with the right-of-way dedication, the cost of improvements to the frontage (The frontage is considered along Vale Park Road) and the landscape plan, the building permit may be issued". They have frontage that they are improving on Vale Park Road, which is the north line of the property. There is an exception to the west, which is a Verizon control facility and was purchased by Verizon. They are developing two four-unit buildings for a total of 8 units with two parking spaces for each in a two garage. An additional eight spaces are provided outside along with a dumpster enclosure straight along the south property line in line with the drive coming down from the north. Detention basin calculations were provided and worked out with Matt Kras at the last presentation. Mr. Saterbak asked him to re-present this and he virtually went into the drawer, pulled out what was approved and made copies to present at this meeting. They are asking for the same approval. Nothing has been changed. Front yard setbacks are along Vale Park Road and the side yard setbacks for the east and west lines are still 10 feet. The drives are the same. The lot coverage is at 53-55% and

they are allowed 60%. The sanitary sewer, at least through the first manhole, will be public and the service through the buildings will be private. They will be serviced by City water.

Thrasher advised that State Design Releases would be required.

Phillips advised that in reality this project is two 4-unit buildings and a retention pond and very little green space beyond that. He is concerned about a repeat of a project previously done by the same developer from an access standpoint and from the placement of the buildings so close to the property lines the way they are. It technically meets the ordinance but we really have some concerns about the practicality of someone stepping out the back of units 3 and 4 into a retention pond. It is a gradual slope but this is really densely packed for the size of lot that it is on. It appears that the least amount of property necessary for this project was purchased and it does not seem to fit in with what we are trying to do in the City. We are concerned that we have this one shared access all the way down with a lack of maneuverability in some areas. There is a dumpster at the end and if cars are parked in the spaces there is nowhere to turn around. It meets the technical requirements of the ordinance but it is projects like this that are forcing us to take a look at new zoning ordinances. We are talking about making that 10' standard 30'. Are these townhouses that are going to be rented? Hudson advised that he assumes that they are going to be rented. Phillips said that he thought the original meeting minutes said that they were going to retain ownership or that Dave stated that they would have to retain ownership the way that it is designed. Phillips said that he wants to be up front in saying that this is another Ravenia and he is terribly concerned about how this is going to go in. Hudson said that this was the only property that is left out there so they could not purchase any other. There are buildings to the east and to the south. Craig said that he is concerned that when you drive into this development there is going to be people backing out into traffic since there is only one access. There is no handicapped parking and this may have to be compliant with ADA standards. Another big point is that there would need to be heavy landscaping between the parking lot and Vale Park, especially with the improvements planned for Vale Park. We would need a detailed landscaping plan to include a tree inventory and planting schedule. It technically meets the parking requirements since there are two spaces in each garage. The eight additional spaces are a positive. Lot coverage, if calculated at 53-55%, should be okay. Phillips said he would be interested in seeing if these units have access from the backs of the units to the area that is basically a drain. Hudson said that all he has in regard to the buildings show two doors that he calls "man-doors" of either side of the division line of the two units. There are no patio doors. They do not show any type of patios. Phillips said he would be interested in how they are going to use that area in the back. People are going to want to use that area and he is concerned about the lack of extra space in this development for that type of use, especially if there are families in this development. The only green space is by a road or is part of a retention pond or the flow into the retention pond. They will need to submit a landscape plan to include a tree inventory. Hudson advised that there are several trees on the site with an existing structure that will be removed. They show three trees that appear to be going. If this falls within 600' of the right-of-way of Calumet only monument style signs are allowed with a maximum height of 6 feet. It would also fall under all of the overlay requirements. We will need to check into the ADA parking standards to see if they apply. The fencing around the dumpster will need to be similar to the buildings in terms of color.

Phillips advised that if this development is approved as is or with modification, it can be sold off as separate lots and must remain under one owner. He just wanted to reiterate that he does have serious reservations about how this development is put together.

Oeding stated that he has no idea how they are going to plow snow in there. If you go through with a snowplow you will plow the doors shut to the homes. There is no place to push the snow; it would almost have to be scooped out with a loader. If this is going to remain a private street with rental units it probably is not our concern, it's just an observation. His only real concern is that the

water and sewer going into Vale Park Road that was just paved. His preference would be that the water line be bored and then we have to talk about the repair of Vale Park Road for the sewer line. Nondorf advised that this development does not work for him. From a safety point it is a nightmare. There is no room to get in a maneuver if there is a fire and no way to get to the back of the buildings.

Pilz advised that he just pulled the old file on this development this morning and it brought back some bad memories. Back when this was looked at before, to be brutally honest, we were basically told to approve the development by an administration official who is no longer here. That threat no longer hangs over our head. Dave does not feel that the setbacks, from a purely common sense standpoint, whether or not they are at a legal standpoint, are acceptable. East and west should be the rear yards and should be 30 feet or whatever that requirement is. He does not know how anybody can say that is a side yard. It just opens us up to horrible problems and does not meet common sense setbacks. If it does go through there will be dedication of the right-of-way required on Vale Park Road. The sanitary sewer will be private so if they want that short stub to be a City stub they would have to construct a manhole out in the street, which then makes a bigger hole in the pavement, which is a sensitive issue. Each of these buildings at the back has one access point and the code requires a stoop of some type and that would infringe into the drainage easement, which is exactly the problem we have in another project. If they would meet the rear yard setbacks as common sense provides that would not be a problem. It was approved once but no work was done for well over one year so Dave feels that those initial approvals are null and void and we need to review it as a new project.

Kras stated that the two rear or side yard swales would be a big area of concern as to whether they could be put in since there would be no patios or stoops allowed. They would need to make sure that the water would not run off onto the neighbors to the east or west. We would need plans for erosion control and soil stabilization for those swales. Also off of the southern parking area where the water flows to the west into the basin should have some type of turf reinforcement to prevent that from eroding. We would need a detailed erosion control plan. The big concern is getting the water into the detention basin and making sure it doesn't flow off to the neighbors before getting there.

Brown stated that the water line comes right down the center and it looks like each unit will have its own water service. They would do a directional bore for the water line under Vale Park Road. It looks like there would be a 6" or 8" line.

Phillips said we collectively have some concerns about how this was put together. Hudson said he cannot speak to what Saterbak will say. Hudson was questioning any type of approval. Pilz stated that he will not approve this project unless somebody tells him he has to. Phillips said that he is strongly thinking about not approving even though it meets technical requirements because it has so many issues associated with it. Phillips said it would have to come back to site review with the changes we have talked about. Hudson said right now it is here before the group as shown and technically meets all of the requirements. Phillips said from a realistic and a practical standpoint this is a really problematic development. Hudson said he is not questioning that but he would like to go away from here with an answer, he feels it is in limbo. Phillips said from a zoning standpoint it may meet requirements but there are other issues. Hudson asked if they are denying it. Pilz stated that he is denying it and Nondorf said the Fire Department would vote against it also. He can quote both Dave Pilz and Dave Nondorf.