



**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Mistwood Subdivision Phase II**  
**ADDRESS: 2650 Harrison Blvd.**

**LOCATION: City Hall**  
**DATE: February 10, 2015**

## PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

### IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Planning Director	(219) 462-1161
Tim Burkman, Engineering Director	(219) 462-1161
Adam McAlpine, Engineering Dept.	(219) 462.1161
Ed Pilarski, Water Reclamation Dept.	(219) 464-4973
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Mike Steege, Utilities	(219) 462-6174
Dave Souders, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Matt Evans, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612

Media

Email addresses for the above City of Valparaiso Departments can be found at [www.valpo.us](http://www.valpo.us).

### PRESENTERS:

Joe Lenehan, Olthof Homes  
[joe@olthofhomes.com](mailto:joe@olthofhomes.com)  
 Kevin Masten, Ellsworth Development  
 (312) 693-6202 / [kevin.e.masten@accenture.com](mailto:kevin.e.masten@accenture.com)  
 Trevor Murphy, Manhard Consulting  
 (630) 925-1035 / [tmmurphy@manhard.com](mailto:tmmurphy@manhard.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting:

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Mistwood Subdivision Phase II. 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:** Lenehan indicated that Olthof Homes has been building homes in the first phase of this community. Olthof plans to be the exclusive builder in the second phase. Lenehan said there is an area that has extremely poor soil conditions and they do not plan any building in this area; therefore it was necessary to revise the original plans that were submitted. Lenehan indicated that since there is a stub road on the south side by Lots 32-34 Murphy is proposing a cul-de-sac. Lenehan is aware that the City does not permit cul-de-sacs; however, he feels the cul-de-sacs being proposed meet the requirements in Section 8 of the ordinance of unique environmental situations. The second access to Mistwood is shown as far north as possible to ensure that this access does not align with Milkhouse Road. The road then circles back with another cul-de-sac. From this point on, the original plans were followed. Lots 1 through 13 on Wicklow Drive extending to the north is pretty much exactly what was part of the original plan. Lenehan mentioned that open ends will be left on the cul-de-sacs for snow removal. Lenehan indicated that he has read the ordinance and is aware of the requirements for density calculations, Class C bufferyard, street trees and open space.

### STAFF COMMENTS:

**BURKMAN:** Burkman understands there are very poor soil conditions in the area shown as Outlot D; however, the UDO prohibits the use of cul-de-sacs. Other attempts must be investigated to either connect Road C back up to Kerry Drive, potentially requiring the loss of Lots 35/36 and 45/46; or more ideally connecting Monaghan Avenue into Road C via the NIPSCO easement, potentially requiring the loss of Lots 30/31. This will require further discussion. Burkman mentioned the new entrance road off of Froberg is situated very near a low point on Froberg. It is necessary to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided through the design. The pathway needs to be extended

across the limits of the subdivision. The existing and proposed portions should be covered with an easement on the plat. ADA compliant curb ramps should be installed wherever the pathway crosses a street. ADA compliant curb ramps will be required for sidewalks as well. Burkman conveyed that a wetland delineation report was performed by Soil Solutions in 2005 on the property. It will be necessary to ensure there are no impacts to any wetlands with the development of Phase 2; however, if there are impacts it will be necessary to go through the proper regulatory channels. Burkman indicated that frontage improvements will be required along Froberg Road. This includes curb, gutter, pavement widening, accel/decel lanes and sidewalk installation. The Rule 5 Permit for the development must be renewed. Burkman stated it may be expired, or may not encompass Phase 2. Burkman asked if any more drainage will be going to the small basin at the southern end of the subdivision. Murphy said no more drainage will go to this basin. Burkman said he has concerns because some of the lower level window elevations are built very close to the elevation of that pond. If there is any fluctuation at all, we need to establish what the maximum high water level elevation could be in the pond. Burkman stated additional comments will be provided as the project moves forward.

**MCALPINE:** Providing a Storm Water Drainage Report is necessary for both the planned subdivision as well as the first phase of Mistwood. McAlpine is curious to see how things might have changed. This project must comply with the latest Storm Water Ordinance Standards.

**SOUDERS:** Souders is aware that Phase 1 was site reviewed in May and July of 2006. Souders is assuming the 30 ft. road widths approved for the original phase will carry through for Phase 2. The spacing between hydrants will need to be 500 ft. with a hydrant no further than 250 ft. from the furthest lot.

**ON BEHALF OF THRASHER:** No comments were provided.

**KENT:** The property is zoned General Residential. Referring to Article 4, Section 4.302 for subdivision density calculations will be necessary. The plat needs to include the lot size and dimensions. The lot width requirement is a minimum of 60 ft. The street yard setback is 20 ft.; side yard setback is 6 ft. for a total of 12 ft; and the rear yard setback is 25 ft. The maximum building height is 28 ft. The building lot coverage is 44%. The total lot coverage maximum is 50%. The minimum open space requirement is 10%. Per Table 3.301A the gross density calculation is 3.797 and the net density is 5.140. To figure these calculations referring to Article 3, Section 3.205, Densities will be necessary. The allowable signage is 2 monument style signs for the subdivision with a maximum square footage of 50 sq. ft. and 3 ft. of landscaping is required around each sign. Providing a copy of the proposed covenants, conditions and restrictions for the Plan Commission will be necessary. Referring to Article 11, Section 11.200 for single family residential building requirements is necessary. Kent indicated that depending on how garages are oriented on the building there are landscaping requirements for single family units and referring to Section 11.203 will be necessary. On lot landscaping is 1 large tree and 1 small tree per lot. Open space landscaping requires 10 large trees, 15 small trees and 40 shrubs per acre. The requirement for street trees is generally 60 ft. on center. A Class C buffer will be required for the lots that abut Harrison West to the east and Beauty Creek to the north. A Class C buffer will also be required for the 3 lots along Froberg Road. A tree survey is required and referring to Article 11, Section 11.603 will be necessary. Any tree over 10" in caliper will need to be shown on the tree survey plan. Three non-exempt trees can be removed for the overall area. Referring to Appendix B of the UDO for the permitted and invasive species lists is necessary. Checking these lists prior to submittal of the landscape plan is recommended. Kent conveyed it will be necessary to go through the subdivision process with the Plan Commission. This process takes approximately 90 to 120 days.

**EVANS:** Evans concurs with Burkman that connecting two of the cul-de-sacs, leaving only one would be an ideal situation. Evans stated he appreciates the open space off the cul-de-sacs for snow removal. As the design goes forward, Evans wants to ensure that the sidewalks are a

minimum of 5 ft. wide, there is curb and gutter and the ADA ramps conform with the PROWAG (Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines) put out by the Federal Highway. Evans noted that in all situations we try to aim toward perpendicular ramps rather than ramps with blended transitions. Evans presented examples of the perpendicular ramps preferred. Evans mentioned that Public Works can be contracted and costs provided to install street signs.

**STEEGE:** Steege said at this point in development he has no comments.

**PILARSKI:** Pilarski asked for confirmation that this is strictly a residential development with no commercial establishments or light industry. Lenehan confirmed this to be correct. Pilarski stated that since this will be strictly sanitary waste water and not from commercial establishments or light industry, he had no further comments.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

Landscaping Plan (with Tree Survey)

Erosion Control Plan

Rule 5 Permit

Right-of-way

Detailed Site Plan

Site Improvement Permit

Signage/Fencing Permit

Zoning Clearance

Storm Water Drainage Report (Phase 1 and planned Phase 2)

Hydrant Locations

Provide a copy of the covenants, conditions and restrictions

Subdivision Process (Plan Commission)

Perpendicular ADA Ramps