

**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Monroe Street Project**  
**ADDRESS: 206 Monroe Street**  
**PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW**

**LOCATION: Zoom**  
**DATE: February 17, 2022**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Beth Shrader, Planning Director  
(219) 462-1161 / [bshrader@valpo.us](mailto:bshrader@valpo.us)  
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner  
(219) 462-1161 / [vthrasher@valpo.us](mailto:vthrasher@valpo.us)  
Bill Laird, Engineering Dept.  
(219) 462-1161 / [blaird@valpo.us](mailto:blaird@valpo.us)  
Tim Stites, Fire Department  
(219) 462-8325 / [tstites@valpo.us](mailto:tstites@valpo.us)  
Nate McGinley, Valparaiso City Utilities  
(219) 462-6174 / [nmcginley@valpo.us](mailto:nmcginley@valpo.us)  
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.  
(219) 464-4973 / [tfahel@valpo.us](mailto:tfahel@valpo.us)

**PRESENTERS:**

Paul Schreiner, Neighbors Corp.  
(219) 405-3070  
[schreiner1927@aol.com](mailto:schreiner1927@aol.com)  
Jeff Lewis, Shive-Hattery  
(219) 405-7445  
[jlewis@shive-hattery.com](mailto:jlewis@shive-hattery.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed apartment building to be located at 206 Monroe Street. Shrader 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:** The biggest change to this project is that the lower unit has been moved to the south to make it a true townhome. In earlier plans this lower unit was tucked underneath a portion of the upper units and was not considered a townhome. There is a full basement under the upper units. The lower unit is truly sharing the south wall. Shrader asked if a larger footprint is expected for the structure. Lewis confirmed there will be a larger footprint. Lewis stated there have been multiple versions of this project over the past couple of years. The project started out as more of a traditional townhome look that was site reviewed in 2018-19. While it met the requirements, there was a preference to have it look more like a single-family home because of the downtown neighborhood. Lewis stated they appeared in front of the BZA in 2020 with a five-unit building that was not approved because of the density. The most current iteration is this three-unit building. It keeps intact the single-family

residential look, with the three overall units. The upper two units are two-story, three-bedroom units facing Monroe Street. The third unit is at the south of the building and faces the south alley. Six parking spaces are being provided. Lewis indicated there will be two restrooms, one on the main floor and one on the upper floor. Lewis said the two-story portion of the building has been pushed closer to Monroe and the back yard is almost identical to the earlier plans.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**STITES:** Stites presented no comments on this project. It is small residential. Stites requested that a copy of the as-builts for the floor plans be submitted to him for pre-plans.

**THRASHER:** Thrasher asked if there will be any additional property lines. Lewis indicated it will be a single parcel. Thrasher asked if the units will be sprinkled. Lewis said they were not planning on sprinklers. Thrasher believes that under the townhome definitions a property line needs to run through. This will need to be checked out. One and two family only applies to one and two families. This is a three-unit building, but Thrasher is aware they are townhomes. Thrasher is not sure they meet all the requirements for the State definition of townhomes. It usually involves property lines, separate utilities, two one-hour walls, etc. This will need to be researched further. Lewis asked if the definition for townhomes is in the residential code. Thrasher believes this can be found in the residential code and there may also be some language in the Building Code. There is also a State Statute on townhomes. Thrasher knows that part of the definition requires that each has separate utilities and services. Gas and electric cannot be run from one unit through to another unit because then it essentially functions as an apartment building. Shradar asked if they could be in a condo format. Thrasher said this is only answering as to whether a sprinkler system is required per the Building Code more than anything. Shradar interjected that it could be categorized as a townhome by the zoning code standard but not necessarily considered a townhome by the building code standards. Thrasher confirmed. Thrasher advised that the State is very specific about how it defines townhomes, and the reason is it has to do with sprinkler systems. Thrasher asked about addressing. Lewis said they have not looked into addressing. Thrasher conveyed that it will be necessary to work with Will Rose, Engineering Department, to decide how the three units will be addressed. Should they be unit numbers or separate addresses? Engineering can work on this issue once there is a final set of plans. Thrasher advised that depending on whether the project requires a sprinkler system or not, the project may or may not have to be submitted to the State, otherwise a local Building Permit will be required. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City. Submittal of

a full set of paper plans (both site and building) will be required for the Building Permit. A pdf copy of all plans is also required. An as-built survey will be required once they get occupancy permits. All permit applications should be submitted to the Building Department for disbursement to other departments.

**FAHEL:** Fahel asked if the project is the renovation of an existing building. Lewis indicated that it is a new building. Fahel stated an internal plumbing plan will be required.

**MCGINLEY:** There is a 6" water main on Monroe and an 8" sanitary sewer main in the alleyway just to the west of the property. These will be the access points for water and sewer. There is an existing 1" copper from the previous facility that is still tapped off the City main. It might possibly be utilized; however, VCU will need to see an external utility plan (civil plan) showing how many water connections will be needed and the sizing and where the sanitary sewer connection is being proposed. Shaun Shifflett, Metering Department, conveyed that backflow will be required for this facility. Shifflett also needs to know the size of meters that will be needed. Shifflett needs this information as soon as possible so the meters can be ordered to avoid supply-chain issues. Lewis asked if the buffalo box and incoming water service is off of Monroe. McGinley clarified that the existing 1" is off of Monroe and is essentially right in the middle of the property. McGinley said they will need to discuss if multiple water services will be needed for the facility. McGinley indicated that one 1" service may not be larger enough to support the facility, but this can be discussed as the utility plan comes together.

**LAIRD:** Engineering will require a complete site plan that shows property lines, labeled and dimensioned, any and all easements, other building lines shown and labeled. Laird conveyed that Engineering wants to see existing and proposed contours or spot grade elevations on the site. Laird mentioned they are particularly interested in the proposed grading for the site. The existing conditions seem to fall quickly to the south. Engineering is interested to see how the site will be graded and how this will affect the storm water runoff into the alleys or neighboring properties. However, before more detailed comments can be provided, submittal of an updated site plan is required. Laird advised that Will Rose is out of the office for the remainder of the week and all of next week. However, as the new plans are submitted Laird will work with him to understand how this project will be addressed.

**SHRADER:** Planning has been trying to reduce the number of variances that may be required. To build anything other than a single-family home on this lot because of the size and the zone will require variances. The goal with the three-units was to have the maximum tolerable density but it still requires a variance. It will be up to the petitioner/property owner on much they want to try to avoid other

variances if they know they have to go before the BZA and request variances no matter what. As it stands, a single-family attached is being shown in the RT Zoning District which is considered a limited use. It appears that as long as it is in a townhome format and this is based in the definition in our UDO, not the Indiana Building Code, the limited use standards will be met because it is a townhome format, not less than three-units and not more than six-units, parking accessed from the alley, and located such that they front on the street that forms the boundaries of the RT District and the district on the other side of the street must be a non-residential district. The limited use standard is a little squirrely. Shrader finds that what is being shown meets the limited use standards. New calculations for lot coverage, etc. will be required. There have been discussions concerning accessory structures and exterior storage. Shrader asked if there has been a decision on how this will be handled. Lewis said based on the last conversation, they will not be providing a separate enclosure and having each resident's city-provided waste receptacle along the back of the property. The residents will have to wheel them out to the alley. Shrader asked if they will be up against the building on a pad or some sort of surface. Lewis confirmed. Lewis stated they are not sure what alley is used for trash and recycling pick up. Shrader conveyed that Public Works is responsible for trash and recycling pick up. They are not on the call, and they did not provide any comments. Shrader suggested Lewis contact them concerning this issue. Lewis will follow up. Schreiner mentioned that the southwest corner of the property is served by both alleys. Lewis said they have a parking space right there. It would be ideal if refuse could be picked up on the north/south alley. Shrader stated that since the project is single-family attached, there is no requirement for a dumpster; however, with that any totes, has any consideration been given to some sort of corral or fencing. Lewis indicated he and Schreiner could come up with some sort of screening. Shrader mentioned that for single-family attached in the RT Zoning District the minimum open space ratio is .15. This does not have to be subdivided out, but it is something that will need to be accounted for in the calculations. The gross density is 9.648 and the net density is 11.351. We know that the project will be over these maximum densities, but they will be in range of other single-family attached projects in the RT Zoning District within the vicinity of downtown. The other element that cannot be met for the site is the minimum area of parcel proposed for development. For a Single-family attached development, the minimum area of a parcel is 25,000 sq. ft. The area for this project is much smaller than that. These will be the guaranteed variances required. The lot area per unit for single-family attached in the RT Zoning District is 2,500 sq. ft. The lot width is 25 ft.; the street yard which is also the front yard is 10 ft.; the building separation is 15 ft. (not relevant) ; rear yard is 20 ft.; building

### Our City...Our Values

height is 28 ft. The maximum building coverage is 65%. Lot coverage is not applicable but there is that 15% open space requirement which is part of Table 3.301A and 3.305. Parking requires 2 spaces per dwelling unit, and this is shown. Shrader asked if there will be bicycle parking or accessible spaces. Lewis indicated they were not planning on it. It will be difficult to manage an accessible space. Schreiner mentioned a bicycle rack could be put along one of the sidewalks. Shrader asked if they are installing any exterior lighting. Lewis conveyed that typically an outdoor light would be installed along the walkway to illuminate the back yard for safety purposes. Shrader advised new lighting will have to meet the standards, and basically no light can escape off the property. It will be necessary to provide a photometric plan for any new lighting. The requirement for on-lot landscaping will be reduced based on the size of the lot. The requirement is 12 large trees, 24 small trees and 200 shrubs per acre. This is what is left over after any sort of bufferyard. The parking lot landscape standards in RT call for 1 large tree per 6 spaces and 1 shrub, perennial, or ornamental grass per 3 spaces. An AB bufferyard will be required between the RT and CP Zoning Districts. This can be discussed further. We need to make sure this works with the alley there. Schreiner asked where the bufferyard would be. Shrader explained it would be along the north/south alley. It is just where the RT Zone is adjacent to CP Zone. There are not a whole lot of design standards for single-family residential. Referring to Section 11.200 for the design standards is recommended. All calculations for the site and setbacks need to be shown on the site plan. The landscaping plan will need to list plant material and quantities. Parking should also be noted on the plan. Shrader asked if any trees will be removed. Schreiner noted that there are not enough trees on the site that have the virtue to survive. The site was cleaned up late last year. There may be one or two on the west side of the property that could survive. Shrader stated that a certain number of trees can be removed per year. However, if a tree is over 10 inches in diameter at breast height and of a higher quality species, the City would like to see the tree saved if possible. A Zoning Clearance will be required. Submittal of colored building elevations will be necessary and will need to include information about the materials and colors. Shrader would like some information on how they will deal with the trash enclosure. There is a limited use application that needs to be completed. Shrader will get this form to Lewis. Shrader asked about their timeline for getting the variances through the BZA process. Schreiner stated the application has already been submitted. Lewis said they do not have a rendering showing the trash enclosure. Can this be supplemented and added to the package? Shrader indicated this would be possible. The notice has to be issued and in the paper by March 5<sup>th</sup>. Planning will need to send the notice to the paper by March 1<sup>st</sup>. We would need all the

### Our City...Our Values

calculations that are missing by no later than Friday the 25<sup>th</sup>. Schreiner asked if the language for the neighbor letters can be provided. Shrader said this can be provided. Lewis asked if the BZA meeting will be virtual. Shrader explained they are in person meetings, but there is the option to join via Zoom.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

- Landscaping Plan
- Complete Detailed Site Plan
- Grading Plan
- Addressing
- Backflow Prevention
- Provide Meter Sizes
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release (if required)
- Building Permit
- Submit As-built Survey
- Submit Full Set of Site and Building Plans (paper and pdf)
- Contractors Registered with the City
- Submit As-builts for the Floor Plans (Stites, Fire Department)
- Submit Internal Plumbing Plan (Fahel, Water Reclamation)
- Photometric Plan for New Lighting
- Submit Colored Building Elevations
- Limited Use Application
- Zoning Clearance