



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Home Place Decorating
ADDRESS: 1306 Vale Park Road

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: 6/21/05
ZONING: C-3
PARKING: 1/150
VARIANCES:

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
Daryl Brown, Water Department	(219) 462-6174
Joe McLees, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Bill Oeding, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612

PRESENTERS:

Joe Scalise
Home Place Decorating
462-1104

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 project for Home Place Decorating to move to 1306 Vale Park Road and add on. 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.

Scalise advised that he is planning on putting an addition on the existing structure at 1306 Vale Park Road in two steps. The first step would be the first addition with the parking lot and then a year or two down the line he would put on the second addition and the balance of the parking in the rear of the building. They are a retail shop for home accessories, draperies and blinds. The first addition would be all retail. The second addition will be incorporated onto the building. There will be some storage space.

Phillips asked if this was a home. Scalise advised that it was. Phillips advised that this property is located within the Calumet Avenue Signature Corridor District and with that comes some special standards. The biggest issue with that is the setback from Vale Park Road. The C-3 district does allow a 5' setback, however the Corridor District standards require that it be a 30' setback and they supercede the zoning standards. There are no sidewalks on that side of the road. Sidewalks may need to be installed or a waiver signed. The lot coverage seems to be okay but is at the maximum. The lot coverage would increase if the addition needs to be scaled back to allow for the 30' setback. There is only one tree on the property and if it were removed it would need to be replaced based on the size of the current tree. To the west is a law office and to the east is an easement and then a private home, Verizon substation and then condos. Phillips advised that a landscape plan would be required. In the 30' setback there is a requirement that it be heavily landscaped. He can check the Signature Corridor requirements by check Article 29 of the Zoning

Ordinance on the city web site. Signage must be monument style if ground style. He can put signage on the building. We have to decide as a group today if we will allow front yard parking. The architecture of the additions will be similar to that of the existing building.

Scalise asked the required parking requirements. Phillips advised that it is based on the square footage of the building and is one space per 150 sq. ft. of public space, anything that the public can access. Scalise asked if there is a problem in his paving to the lot line. Phillips said there is not in this case.

Oeding asked if the entrance to Vale Park Road would stay the same. The drive would be moved to the west since the existing drive is where the addition will go.

Pilz advised that they will be required to dedicate additional right-of-way on the street and that would be an additional 15'. With the loss of that 15' and then the 30' setback he is losing most of the planned first addition. If they proceed they will be adding a lot of impervious areas, which then result in increased run-off and they will have to manage that run-off. They will have to hire a surveyor or engineer to do calculations and plans to show detailed elevations, dimension and so forth. There is no outlet for the run-off now, it just sort of sheet-flows to the rear and we discourage just dumping the water onto adjacent properties from commercial sites. We like to have a defined outlet to handle that water. They will be required to have an erosion control plan.

Scalise asked if the parking lot is included in the 45' that he will be losing or just the building.

Phillips said that he does not necessarily have a problem with parking in the front as long as it is heavily landscaped. Scalise asked at what point the parking lot in front could start from the street. Phillips stated that it is probably about as far forward as it can go. We would have to work with him on a significant landscape plan, especially in front of the parking lot. Phillips stated that he would look at slightly modifying the 30' setback based on heavy landscaping in the front. The 15' right-of-way would take them back to the first parking space so additional parking may not be possible if landscaping has to be included. The plat for the subdivision shows a 55' building line so this would not comply with the subdivision plat.

Brown said that since this building is going from residential to retail/commercial it would require a backflow protection device at the water meter.

Parking required might have to be in the back. Phillips asked if it would work if he had a couple spots in the front and the rest in the back. Scalise said it would. Phillips said he would be okay if there were two spaces in the front with one being ADA accessible.

Phillips said that he is going to have to go through this a little more with Scalise. Craig did ask if the committee is comfortable with allowing two parking spaces in the front yard allowing room for possible pathway area and landscaping. Pilz stated that he does not feel comfortable making that decision since it is an aesthetic thing. Phillips said that we could approve it subject to the landscape plan. Pilz stated that he feels it should remain a landscape strip since that is in the ordinance. Phillips asked that Scalise get a landscape plan together and bring it to us along with a parking proposal for the front yard contingent on us reviewing the landscape plan. He will have to come back to this body after that.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping plan
- Erosion control plan
- Right-of-way
- Detailed Site Plan including Drainage requirements
- Backflow Prevention
- State Design Release
- Building Permit