



INDIANA 46383

TELEPHONE: 462-1161

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: New Office Building
ADDRESS: 259 Indiana Avenue

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: October 2, 2012

PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Asst. City Planner	(219) 462-1161
Taylor Wegrzyn, Asst. City Planner	(219) 462-1161
Adam McAlpine, Engineering Dept.	(219) 462-1161
Ed Pilarski, Water Reclamation Dept.	(219) 464-4973
Mark Geskey, Water Dept.	(219) 462-6174
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Matt Evans, Public Works	(219) 462-4612

Media

PRESENTERS:

Tom Krueger, K2 Construction, Inc.
(219) 531-5353 / tkruegerk2@comcast.net
James Drader, Century 21 Alliance
(219) 462-2090 / jamesdrader@21alliance.com
Bill Ferngren, Attorney
(219) 464-4500 / bill@ferngrenlaw.com

Email addresses for the above City of Valparaiso Departments can be found at www.valpo.us.

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting:

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss a proposed new office building to be located at 259 Indiana Avenue. Kent stated that site review is not an approval. Rather, it is a preliminary discussion of the requirements and issues to be considered by the developer or owner. It is possible it will need to come back before site review or to seek other approvals.

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT: Ferngren stated this project will be located at 259 Indiana Avenue. Currently a foundation does exist on this property and at one time was to be used for a proposed structure. Krueger explained that in June 2008 he had proposed an approximate 3,200 square foot building. The current structure will be a wood structure with brick veneers and metal siding and will have many of the same details as the main 259 Indiana building which recently won the Heritage Award. Krueger stated the building is to be used for office space. Krueger conveyed that changes have been made to the building since the Site Review in 2008. The building is smaller and will utilize the existing foundation. Ferngren indicated the original Site Review took place on May 27, 2008. A variance for lot coverage was granted in 1993 and a variance was granted in 2008 to allow the rear yard setback to be reduced to 2 ft and side yard setback to be reduced to 6 ft. Ferngren indicated that he has not seen the 1993 variance.

STAFF COMMENTS:

MCALPINE: There is a storm sewer line shown to the northern site with a blind tap into the main line. McAlpine requested clarification concerning this line. Krueger indicated this was installed by Dodrill when the building was revamped. Krueger further stated that the water in the parking lot does not interfere with the lower area. It goes out to Indiana Avenue. McAlpine asked if there are any drainage concerns for this property. Krueger stated there are no concerns. The front portion drains to Indiana Avenue and there is vegetation which captures water around the building. Most of the water at the back drains into the railroad easement. Krueger reiterated there were no problems with water. McAlpine asked about the existing foundation. Krueger explained that at

one time there was a steel shed that was removed. McAlpine questioned if the ten new parking spaces shown next to the railroad are actually on railroad property. Krueger stated that these ten spaces, as well as the spaces located by the engineering building are all located on railroad property. Kent clarified that in order for these spaces to count towards parking requirements, the spaces must be located on the property at 259 Indiana. This needs further review and discussion. McAlpine asked if a shared parking agreement or access easement agreement exists for the buildings. Krueger stated this was discussed with Todd Leeth in 2008, but Krueger did not recall what was said. Drader stated this is all one parcel and a subdivision would be required in order to sell off any property. McAlpine indicated that if a lease for parking exists with the railroad a copy needs to be provided. Drader was unsure if a lease exists, but this will be researched to see if anything exists concerning the parking.

PILARSKI: Pilarski requested clarification concerning the use of the new building. Krueger stated the top floor of the building will be leased to an attorney. Pilarski stated there is some confusion concern the building use since the plans indicate this is a garage addition. Krueger said they had originally planned to have a garage below; however, this was changed. Pilarski indicated that corrected plans are needed. Pilarski stated comments could not be made as there is not enough information provided. A Sanitary Sewer Profile Plan showing the connection point of the service line for this building is required. Both the corrected plan and Sanitary Sewer Profile Plan need to be submitted directly to Pilarski.

GESKEY: Geskey stated that he reviewed this project as a garage addition rather than an office building. Geskey asked if there were any comments from the Water Department included in the 2008 minutes. Ferngren stated there were no specific comments from the Water Department. Geskey inquired how this building will be supplied with water. Krueger said the water supply will come from the existing building. Krueger stated the existing building does have backflow protection. Geskey had no further comments.

THRASHER: A Construction Design Release is required before Building Permits will be issued. Thrasher clarified the Construction Design Release from 2008 cannot be used. Krueger indicated he has already received a new Construction Design Release. Having a separate address for this building is recommended. Krueger stated he is working with the Postmaster and then will work with Will Rose concerning the address. Thrasher asked if the Construction Design Release covers the entire building or the second floor. Krueger indicated it covers only part of the second floor. Thrasher stated that separate State Releases and separate permits will be required for the other spaces.

EVANS: Evans understands that the 6" PVC connection is already completed and no right-of-way cuts will be required. There are no further comments.

KENT: Kent stated the Unified Development Ordinance was approved in July 2009; therefore, the 2009 standards will be applied to this development. Kent is aware that variances were granted in 2008; however, the property has been rezoned from manufacturing to Central Place District. Referencing Article 2, Section 2.530 concerning office occupancies is necessary. Office occupancies may not exceed 40% of the total ground floor area within the boundaries of the continuous district. A calculation showing this is required. The required rear yard setback is 20 ft. Pursuant to Article 3, Section 3.207, the Landscape Ratio is 10%. A calculation for this requirement is necessary. The Gross Floor Area Ratio is .456 and the Net Floor Area Ratio is .507 and these need to be shown on the plan. The parking standard requires 3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. and should include all buildings on site. A calculation for parking is required. A discussion concerning the parking currently located within the right-of-way of the railroad is necessary. Providing the square footage of all buildings, including the new building is necessary. On-lot landscaping requirements include 8 large trees per acre, 16 small trees per acre and 46 shrubs per acre. The open space calculation requires 10 large trees per acre, 15 small trees per acre and 102 shrubs per acre. Building signage will be calculated as 1 sq. ft. of signage for every 1 linear ft. of building frontage. This will be difficult as this building does not face a street. This needs further

discussion. Architectural renderings indicating building materials being used are necessary. Referring to Article 11, Section 11.507 for permitted materials is necessary. If a dumpster enclosure is being considered for this building, it must be closed on three sides and gated at the front. The gate must be either wood or vinyl. A chain link gate is not permitted. The dumpster enclosure materials should match those used for the building. Ferngren asked if the variances previously granted could still be applied. Kent clarified that a three-year clause exists and the variances are no longer valid. This is an Indiana State law.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping Plan (with Tree Survey)
- Detailed Site Plan
- State Design Release
- Building Permit
- Signage / Fencing Permit
- Zoning Clearance
- Landscape Ratio Calculation
- Gross Floor Area Ratio Calculation
- Net Floor Area Ratio Calculation
- Parking Calculation
- Architectural Renderings
- Sanitary Sewer Profile Plan
- Corrected Plans for Office Building