



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Proposed Glendale TND
ADDRESS: 701,703,705 Glendale Blvd.

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: December 15, 2015

PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Planning Director	(219) 462-1161
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(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
Mark Geskey, Utilities	(219) 462-6174
Jon Daly, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Matt Evans, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612
Media	

PRESENTERS:

Steve Uhlarik, Dunes Property Group
 (312) 785-8224 / steve@DunesPropertyGroup.com
 Steve Fleming, Radtke Engineering
 (219) 873-1100 / steve@radtke-engineering.com
 Matt Evans, ReMax
 (219) 241-8401 / matt@themattevansteam.com
 Jeffrey Haw, Radtke Engineering
 Jody Uhlarik, Dunes Property Group

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 the proposed Glendale TND. 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: Evans indicated the potential names being considered for this site are Oakdale Village or Oak Glen Village, however, this decision has not yet been made. Street naming has not been vetted out. Possible consideration may be given to including the name of the previous property owner. Evans said they would like to keep a wooded glen setting with trees surrounding the property. This will provide uniqueness to the development. They are shooting for mid-level pricing. Alleyways, walkways and common areas will be used to create connectivity between the residences. There will be a welcoming boulevard with a round-about to circulate people through. Evans said special consideration will be given towards the senior and access restricted populations. Specific marketing will be used to try to attract these buyers. The design inspiration for the project will be craftsmen, bungalow and/or cottage styling. Natural colors will be used to make the homes warm and livable. Evans said some of the community amenities will include raised garden pods, picnic shelter, greenways, dog park and garages for residential parking. Evans explained there will be 2 live/work mixed use dwelling units; 8 one-story senior/ADA compliant flats; 8 two-story duplex units; and 4 single family homes. The pricing will range from \$225,000 to \$275,000. Jody Uhlarik mentioned they wanted to keep as many of the existing trees as possible. The live/work units are located on the southeast corner and the 8 cottages are located on the opposite side. The driveway behind the live/work units will be omitted. Parking for these units will be located behind the units. The garages for the duplexes are located at the rear of the buildings. Parking for the cottages will be along the back side. There are 4 single family homes. The dog park will be located in the northeast corner of the site. There will be a gazebo in the center of the round-about. Uhlarik said the live-work units will be 1,200-2,400 sq. ft.; the senior/ADA accessible flats will be 1,600; the 8 duplexes will be 1,700 sq. ft.; the single

family homes will be 1,700-1,800 sq. ft. Fleming said they wanted to create a residential wall with the dog park and the two duplexes between the Walgreens and existing housing on Calumet. They want to open the site to the west and northwest with the trees and larger lots for the single family homes. The southwest corner is more of a walk-in, senior oriented living situation. Fleming said Radtke has designed the detention to be underground. Haw said overall drainage is from the north side of the site southward toward the main street. Haw stated they attempted to put the main drainage facility on the south side of the property. Haw said the soils are not necessarily ideal for infiltration; however, they are not necessarily bad either. Some borings will be necessary to confirm this. The infiltration bed is designed for ½" per hour. The bed is currently designed with a series of 3 ft. diameter plastic pipes perforated in a gravel bed and is similar to an ADS system. The remainder of the site drainage is taken off by a series of yard drains on either side of the property in the southwest and southeast corners. There are also drains on the south side of the green between the senior living area and immediately adjacent to the road. The drainage from the road is taken care of by the two sets of catch basins. Haw indicated they have two separate designs for sanitary and water. The plans originally submitted have the sanitary and water running right next to each other in several locations with the mandated 10ft. separation. Haw said this is a workable layout, but it is a little crowded and tight. Therefore, Radtke designed an alternate layout. The water layout shows more connections within the Glendale right-of-way, but the overall clutter is reduced within the site. They are maintaining the main water main loop around the public entry and right-of-way, but a connection is being made on the west side of the property rather than trying to connect everything from the main loop. The live/work buildings will each have their own connection to the water main in the street. The alternate sanitary plan is not too different from the original design submitted. Rather than making a brand new sanitary connection in the Glendale right-of-way, they will connect to the sanitary main that runs right through the property. Haw said since they do not have any knowledge about this main, they are not certain about elevations, inverts, sizing, etc. The alternate removes the work within the Glendale right-of-way and allows them to keep it internal to the site.

STAFF COMMENTS:

DALY: Daly asked what the overall radius is for the round-about. Fleming indicated the radius is 66 ft. Daly asked if parking will be permitted on the street. Fleming said there will be no street parking. They are proposing a small parking lot for the live/work units. The duplexes will have their own garages. Daly mentioned street parking will cause a huge concern for the Fire Department and ambulance service. Daly asked if the front doors for the duplexes will face the main street. Uhlarik indicated the front doors will be on the street side. The front doors for the townhomes will face the walking path. Daly indicated that using some type of way-finding signage for the senior units is recommended. Daly mentioned there are concerns with access for the Fire Department equipment. This will need more discussion.

PILARSKI: Pilarski mentioned he will defer comment about the sanitary sewer system to the Collections and Distribution Division and to the Engineering Department. Pilarski is concerned with what is being discharged into the sanitary sewer. Pilarski asked if this is strictly a residential development with no future considerations for commercial establishments. Uhlarik said the live/work units could have light retail, a medical doctor's office or small store. Pilarski asked if site reviews will be required for the commercial uses. Kent said site reviews will be necessary. Pilarski asked how waste from the dog park will be handled. Uhlarik said containers and plastic bags will be provided. Pilarski indicated that floor drains in the garages will not be permitted. Submitting an internal plumbing plan for a typical home, townhouse and duplex within the development is necessary. The internal plumbing plans should be sent directly to Pilarski. Pilarski asked when construction will begin. Uhlarik said they probably will not begin until fall of 2016.

GESKEY: Geskey indicated he will require two sets of 24"x 36" plans for the water and sewer. The plans should be sent directly to Geskey. Contact information was provided. Geskey indicated

the water tie-in for the west side should be on Glendale. The water main will be public. VCU will own and maintain the water main. Geskey said the hydrant on Glendale shown on the alternate plans needs to be moved to the south side of the alley and the other hydrant needs to be moved to the middle back of the round-about at the property line. An 8" water main will be required. A 6" could be used on the stub going up the west side, but this will require an auto-flusher at the end. The auto-flusher will need to tie-in to a storm drain system. An in-line water valve will be required next to each fire hydrant on the 8" main. The 24" x 36" plans will be require plan and profile for the water and sewer. Geskey said the water main should be in the right-of-way. Geskey requested a minimum 20 ft. easement, but would prefer a 30 ft., for the water main on the west side.

EVANS: Evans asked if the streets will be dedicated to the City. Uhlarik indicated the streets will be public. Evans asked if they are anticipating trash pickup from the City. Uhlarik confirmed the use of City services. Evans stated that it will be very difficult to plow. There is no place to put the snow. If snow is plowed off a divided entrance the snow will go right into the driveways or if the snow is pushed toward the gazebo the snow will be put on the sidewalk. Typically, cul-de-sacs are not permitted. Snow is pushed into the center of cul-de-sacs and in this case this is the only option. Evans said there is no easy or efficient way for Public Works to maintain the alleyways for snow removal. For example the snow in the alleyway on the right-hand side would be pushed right into the 10 ft. landscaped buffer. Depending on the amount of snow in a season if the snow does not have a chance to melt, then it becomes necessary to haul the snow out. The long stretch to north would require a plow truck to back all the way out. This is something they try to avoid. These same issues apply to the alley on the left. The turning radius is not sufficient for a truck with a blade. Evans said the alternate would be to run it with a pickup truck. This is necessary in a lot of places around the City and Evans feels he would be unable to deliver this service in a reliable manner. Evans said many of the same concerns exist for trash pickup. The trucks are approximately 45 ft. long and getting down the alleyways or into the cul-de-sac to pick up trash will be difficult. All trash and recycle containers might have to be brought to Glendale. This would mean approximately 44 totes lined up along Glendale. Evans provided information concerning a divided entrance and suggested they check widths. Evans mentioned there are some areas where there is 24" overall on the curbs and then there are areas where they are 18". Evans conveyed City specifications call for 24". The parkway looks narrower than 5-1/2 ft. wide. The City specification is 5-1/2" wide. The sidewalks appear to be 5 ft. wide which meets the City standards. Evans conveyed that parking is not permitted along the north side of Glendale. Evans stated the City does not maintain Glade which is to the west. This is a wholly private owned development. The City does not encourage these types of developments because it becomes a burden on the HOA to maintain the infrastructure. There is no way to connect into this proposed development; however, there is a road stub, but no connection is shown on these plans.

BURKMAN: There is a 30 ft right-of-way dedication required along Glendale's frontage. It appears there is about 20 ft. It will be necessary to dedicate the additional right-of-way. The UDO does state that cul-de-sacs shall not be permitted, except in instances where the Planning Commission finds an unusual or hardship circumstance to exist to justify their use. This requires further discussion. Burkman reiterated the tightness of turns, especially within the alleyways is a concern. There is no way to turn around and it would require backing down the whole length of the alley. Burkman asked if it is really critical to have the eastern duplex units rear-loaded. Burkman likes the idea of getting driveways off the front; however, if the alley serves only the rear of the live/work units, the duplex units could be pushed east. This might also better align the road entrance with the drive to the south. Looking at left turns out of each and the possibility of conflicts, the closer these can be aligned the lesser the chance there would be for the conflict to exist. Burkman questioned where visitors will park. There is no parking along the north side of Glendale. There will be no parking along the roads and alleyways being proposed. Anyone visiting will cause an obstruction, or they will have to walk across Glendale to park. It was

mentioned the road will be dedicated as public. Will this be the same for the alleys? Uhlarik said the alleys will be private. Burkman said at this point this always seems to make sense; however, it seems like every private street or alley ultimately wants to become public. From the City's end this is something that we need to be very cautious and careful about. Further discussion is necessary. Any landscaping in the center medians and the center circle, even though they are in the right-of-way, will be privately owned and maintained. Burkman conveyed there are other areas in the City where HOA's have become tired of doing this and basically want it to go away because they do not have the means, resources or people stop volunteering to help take care of the landscaping. This is a concern that must be addressed. Burkman said it is his understanding that the sanitary main line that comes through on the east end of the development is a 24" RCP. Burkman asked Geskey if he had any information on the depth of this main. Geskey said he has no information on the depth, but believes Radtke sent someone out to look at this. Fleming indicated he met with Mike on site. Fleming said it does not appear to be too deep, maybe 5 ft. Burkman said the easement is labeled as 10 ft. Burkman requested another 10 ft. to bring it up to our typical minimum width of 20 ft. It appears to be right along the western edge of the existing easement and an additional 10 ft. dedicated on the west side would be useful to the Utilities. As far as making connections into that, using an insert-a-tee device to make the tap into the main line is necessary. Making the other sewer being proposed for the western portion of the development a public sewer makes sense; however, access will be a concern, especially given how close the line is to the western property line. Is this constructable, given the proximity of the existing homes to the west? Burkman is unaware if there is an existing Utility Easement already provided on the western properties, but guesses there is not. This needs more research and discussion. Maybe there is a way to better serve it from the right-of-way. How will the vector truck reach those manholes for routine maintenance and cleaning? Some appear hard to reach. Geskey interjected he must be able to get an 80,000 lb. vehicle to these manholes. Submitting a drainage report will be necessary. Providing an overall grading plan to ensure the runoff from the site will get to the proposed detention area is required. A Rule 5 Permit is required. A Site Permit will be required. Burkman requested the existing sidewalks along the frontage be replaced if they are in poor shape or made worse during construction. The new standard for sidewalks is 5 ft. wide. The existing sidewalks appear to be 4 ft. or less. Procedurally, the Board of Works will ultimately have to approve the construction plans if the roads are to be public. The Utility Board will have to approve the storm and sanitary plans for what will be public.

MCALPINE: McAlpine stated he would prefer the drainage system remain private even if it is under a public road. However, this can be kept open for further discussion. The only portions at most that would be public are the portions under the road right-of-way and only the pipe from one structure to another. If the POA is already posturing to maintain the below grade detention system, McAlpine said it would be his preference that it all be privately maintained. This is the only residential area in Valparaiso that has a below ground detention system. Maintenance issues with these types of systems are suspect. Everything is out of sight so you don't know whether it is being maintained properly or it is being neglected. McAlpine said he feels more comfortable when it is a commercial property with a property manager who monitors maintenance. With a residential area there is an HOA Board that rotates in and out and it is hard to know if everything is functioning properly. McAlpine asked if an above ground drainage system could be considered. Haw said he could not speak for the owners, but from a technical perspective it certainly could be done. McAlpine said surface ponds can be explored. Fleming said surface ponds will take away space for units. McAlpine said one thing to keep in mind is that if it becomes necessary to remove and replace various chambers access for large pieces of equipment may be a problem. Infiltration is neglected with underground detention systems the same way it is neglected with a surface pond. Chambers will be sized based on all runoff, nothing soaking into the ground. McAlpine conveyed that drainage standards are available on line. There are updated standards based on a 1/2 cfs per

acre of development. McAlpine asked if any tree clearing is being proposed for the dog park. It appears the trees adjacent to the single family homes and those in the dog park will be preserved, but everything else will be clear cut. Uhlarik said they want to keep everything on the perimeter for screening purposes and the trees in the dog park. McAlpine said all the waste from the dog park can be contained and not transported down into the drainage system. McAlpine reiterated the parking issues. McAlpine stated all storm sewer must be RCP, except where connections are being made to the detention system. McAlpine said using perforated plastic for the underground system is acceptable. The storm sewer connection is just to the east of the current drive entrance and will be the outlet point to connect to the City drainage system. On the east side where there is a narrow gap between units, tiles can be buried that carry the downspout water to the roadway. McAlpine wants to avoid the nuisance puddles. McAlpine needs to see how water from the single family homes on the north side will be carried. McAlpine needs proof that this is not going to be a hardship for people on Albert Street or Glade Place.

THRASHER: Thrasher said the Fire Department will have to approve the access and radiuses. Thrasher asked if this will be one lot or multiple parcels. This will make a difference for permitting. Will the duplexes be owner occupied? Uhlarik confirmed they will be owner occupied. Thrasher said typically this will require a property line. This will need to be discussed. Are the townhomes true town homes with property lines or are they just apartments? This also needs to be addressed before permitting can be discussed. There are also questions about the requirement for sprinkler systems. Single family residences and two-family residences will not require State submittal. However, the townhomes may or may not require State submittal depending on if they are owned. Each one will require its own building permit. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City before permits can be issued. Proposed signage will require a permit. Any fencing included for landscape buffers will require a permit. Site review will be required for the live/work units.

KENT: As there are specific design guidelines and standards for TND developments, referring to Section 3.706 of the Unified Development Ordinance is necessary. A TND development is a permitted use within the Urban Residential (UR); however, it states that multiple family developments need to be reviewed as a Special Use. Kent said he needs to clarify this with the company that wrote the ordinance to address this. The final plans need to include the density calculations. The minimum open space requirement is 15%. Gross density is 5.822 and net density is 6.849. Section 3.701 contains language that states that no more than 50% of the dwelling units shall be attached housing types. This needs to be looked at. Kent commended the developer on the number of mixed housing types. Pursuant to Section 3.701, the plans must identify the sub-districts. There are standards with regard to the core, the general and the edge sections of the development and what types of uses are permitted within those sub-districts. A TND development plan showing the architecture, setbacks, building heights, maximum lot coverage, etc. needs to be submitted. Section 3.704 identifies the type of use and what is permitted within the sub-districts. It will also provide the minimum lot size and setbacks. Depending on the use, referencing this development pallet will be necessary. This must be shown on the plans specific to each type of use. This project must go through the Plan Commission for the sub-division process. Kent conveyed that parking for a Planned or TND development requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit. Parking for the overall development and specifically parking for the townhomes needs further discussion. The requirement for on-lot landscaping is 14 large trees, 28 small trees and 238 shrubs per acre. Kent said some of the existing trees can be counted towards this calculation. Providing a tree survey showing the trees that will be removed and the trees that will remain is required. If a parking lot is considered, the requirement for parking lot landscaping is 1 large tree per 8 spaces and 1 shrub, perennial or ornamental grass per 4 spaces. Kent said if the parking area is smaller than 15 parking spaces the trees and shrubs can be located around the perimeter of the parking area. Kent mentioned that if there are more than

16 lots, street trees around the street itself will be necessary; however if the number of lots is less than 16 street trees will not be required. It may make sense to meet the standard requirement to place some of these trees along the streets. There is a requirement for a buffer. The property to the north is zoned General Residential, therefore a Class A buffer will be required. The Class A buffer is 10 ft. in width with 1 large tree, 2 small trees and 17 shrubs per 100 linear feet. However, if there is not a Class A buffer on the adjoining property, a Class B buffer will be required. The Class B buffer is 15 feet in width with 2 large trees, 4 small trees and 34 shrubs per 100 linear feet. The property to the east is zoned Commercial General and the same standards mentioned above will apply. The plans currently show a 10 ft. wide buffer, but this may need to be increased to 15 ft. if there is not a landscape buffer along the Walgreens. Referencing Section 10.603, Sub-section E, Replacement or Contribution to the Tree Fund, concerning tree removal will be necessary. Depending on the caliper of the tree, there is a replacement ratio for these trees. Providing a tree survey indicating the diameter and species of the tree is required. There is also an exempt tree list. If the tree is a scrub tree, they will not count toward the calculation. Referencing Article 11, Section 11.200 with regard to the residential design standards is necessary. As the project moves forward, we will need to look at the architectural elevations, specifically for the townhomes facing Glendale. We need to ensure that these facades have some delineation in the architecture. Referring to Article 12, Section 12.301 for modulation requirements for the subdivision is necessary. If the alleyways are included, there are requirements specific to how the lots abut the alleyways. Kent conveyed that it makes sense to come back for another site review once all the requirements have been incorporated into this project. City staff will make themselves available for review prior to the second site review. Kent suggested the meeting should include the Engineering Department, Fire Department and Public Works; however, any department wanting to attend should do so. Kent stated this is a great plan, but there are some things that need to be addressed. The allowance for a subdivision sign is 50 sq. ft. Kent stated that as this moves forward with submitting plans to the Plan Commission, providing a copy of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for the subdivision will be necessary. Reviewing the permitted uses for the live/work units will be necessary. It may be necessary to limit some of the uses so there is less of an impact on parking, but will still allow for flexibility in the type of uses. Kent asked about the width of the small live/work unit. Uhlarik stated the width is 22 ft.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)
- Erosion Control Plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Drainage Report
- Overall Grading Plan
- Right-of-Way
- Detailed Site Plan
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release (if needed for townhomes)
- Building Permits
- Signage/Fencing Permit
- Internal Plumbing Plan (typical single family home, typical townhome, typical duplex)
- 2 Sets of 24" x 36" plans for the water and sanitary sewer (send to Mark Geskey)
- Parking Issues
- Snowplowing and trash pickup issues
- Fire Department Access
- All Contractors Must be Registered with the City
- Site Review for Live/Work Units

Second Site Review for TND Development

Final Plans Must Include Densities

Plans Must Identify Sub-Districts (Section 3.701)

TND Development Plan (include architecture, setbacks, building heights, maximum lot coverage)

Plans Must Show Development Pallet (Section 3.704)

Subdivision Process – Plan Commission

Bufferyards

Provide Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions

Board of Works Approval for Road Construction

Utility Board Approval for Storm an Sanitary Plans