



INDIANA 46383

TELEPHONE: 462-1161

**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Planned Unit Development**  
**ADDRESS: SE Corner of SR 49 & CR400**

**LOCATION: City Hall**  
**DATE: August 13, 2013**

### PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Asst. City Planner	(219) 462-1161
Taylor Wegrzyn, Asst. City Planner	(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, Water Dept.	(219) 462-6174
David Nondorf, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Matt Evans, Public Works	(219) 462-4612
Media	

#### PRESENTERS:

Todd A. Leeth, Hoepfner Wagner Evans LLP  
(219) 464-4961 / [tleeth@hwelaw.com](mailto:tleeth@hwelaw.com)  
Don Weiss, Weiss Entities  
(219) 650-6015 / [dweiss@wisewayfoods.com](mailto:dweiss@wisewayfoods.com)  
Robert Collins, Weiss Entities  
(219) 650-6015 / [rcollins@wisewayfoods.com](mailto:rcollins@wisewayfoods.com)  
Angela Fielder, Weiss Entities  
(219) 650-6015 / [afielder@sjbzmgmt.com](mailto:afielder@sjbzmgmt.com)  
Randell S. Peterson, Abonmarche  
(219) 850-4624 / [rpeterson@abonmarch.cm](mailto:rpeterson@abonmarch.cm)  
Terrence J. Smith, BSB Design  
(847) 705-2200 / [tsmith@bsbdesign.com](mailto:tsmith@bsbdesign.com)

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

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting:

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss a proposed Planned Unit Development to be located at the southeast corner of SR 49 and CR400. 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:** Leeth explained this is a mixed use project that has been submitted to the Plan Commission and City Council for approval as a Planned Unit Development. The southern 118 acres was originally through the City Council last December for rezoning to BP (Business Park) and UR (Urban Residential) which allows for a multi-family residential apartment community. At that time we indicated to the City Council this would come back with an overall plan and would likely have a PUD. The new northern 32 or 33 acres is an extension of the Business Park up to Vale Park Road. There is significant frontage along Bartz Road to the east with access. Evans Avenue is at the south with access. There is a road through both developments connecting Evans and Vale Park. There is a significant change to the layout for the multi-family development. The locations for the different buildings are fixed. The roadway has been moved away from the Pine Creek Development. The homes along Bartz Road are significantly setback and are much deeper than the City platted lots in Pine Creek. There are also detention ponds that provide greater buffering to the homes that lay outside the City but are still considered neighbors. The Business Park totals 37 platted lots and range in size from 1.1 acres to just under 4 acres. At this time it is unknown if there will be 37 different businesses, or whether it will be a combination of 2 or 3 lots or a combination of 5 lots. The development has gone from a conceptual point to an

engineered set of drawings. Abonmarche has put together the plan development documents and BSB Design has helped with the multi-family. Architectural renderings for the multi-family complex were presented. Nine wetlands have been delineated throughout the development. The wetlands have been incorporated into the site plan. The storm water has been analyzed by Abonmarche and a storm water management plan is in place. There were a series of commitments for the multi-family when the rezoning took place in December. The proposed PUD Ordinance submitted on July 12, 2013 incorporates the restrictions. There will 408 apartments in the multi-family complex. There will be a mixture of building types. The buildings that are next to homes in the Pine Creek area are oriented so the side of the building faces these homes. On the other side of the property line the buildings are oriented so there is more of a frontage. There were also restrictions concerning the western property line. Efforts will be made to preserve the tree line. Also additional buffering and screening will be provided. Leeth introduced Smith. Smith mentioned that there is a delineation of private and public for the north/south road in the multi-family area. Smith said that west of the north/south road will be the private rental development and east of the private road will be a dedication of public property and park area. Smith presented the renderings for the multi-family complex and discussed the building types.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS:**

**GESKEY:** The Water Department has not seen any plans for construction. Geskey had no comments at this time.

**PILARSKI:** Pilarski indicated the need to know the type of discharge flows that will be produced by the entire facility and the connection points into the sanitary sewer system. The business and potential light manufacturing will be required to meet the limits and specifications in Chapter 52 of the City of Valparaiso Municipal Codes. A copy was provided. Pilarski had no other comments at this time.

**NONDORF:** Accessibility appears to be satisfactory. Nondorf said that during discussions on the project mention was made that at least 24 ft. of access around the Type 3 buildings would be required for the aerial apparatus. Also, mention was made about possibly trying to soften some of the turning radii around the larger buildings. The Fire Department should be involved concerning the location of fire hydrants for both the Business Park and the apartment complex. It is possible a hydrant may have to be added on site. Nondorf indicated that the fire flow for the subdivision should be available by the end of the week. Nondorf stated the Nick Road access was discussed during an earlier meeting. Nondorf feels this access is a safety issue and more of a benefit for the Pine Creek subdivision. This project meets all access requirements without extending Nick Road. Nondorf understands there is opposition to extending Nick Road; however, Nondorf requested some type of fire access road to Pine Creek be put in for emergency purposes. Nondorf pointed out that landscaping along the road or in the parking lot should not exceed 15 ft. in height.

**EVANS:** Evans stated that his understanding is the main trunk line, entrance and Nick Road will be dedicated to the city. All remaining roads will be private. Mr. Oeding stated that if Nick Road is to be a through street it becomes a private street. Weiss stated that once the decision has been made concerning Nick Road this needs to be discussed further with the City. Evans mentioned that during a snow storm, the City plows around the outer edge of a cul-de-sac. The center of the cul-de-sac is not cleared until after the snow event is over. Evans said this could create an inconvenience for businesses. The use of cul-de-sacs may not be advantageous for those businesses. Evans stated the City is very tree-oriented. Evans cited that the Callery Pear and Hackberry are not suitable for planting in the right-of-way. Evans said it usually takes 2-3 years for a tree to get established and consideration needs to be given to ensure trees are planted during the appropriate season. Some species are planted in the spring; however, many species are planted in the fall and generally trees are not planted during the summer. Evans requested provision of a two-year warranty for the trees if possible. Evans also stated traffic calming

measures need to be considered. Further discussion is required concerning road maintenance.

**MCALPINE:** The wetland delineation report was obtained in 2005. This needs to be updated prior to submission to the USACE for the jurisdictional determination. Additional hydraulic investigation needs to be made into the downstream receiving channel and culvert to determine available flow capacity for the proposed development with respect to existing upstream uses and potential downstream drainage restrictions. The downstream receiving channel is the Porter County regulated drain, and therefore, the Porter County drainage standards of .13 cfs/acre should be used in determining the peak flow rate from the proposed development. Neighboring residents north of Evans Avenue have reported trees growing within the regulated drain. It may be necessary for the applicant to perform some tree clearing along the ditch to ensure there is an adequate outlet for the proposed development. The downstream outlet should connect into the storm manhole rather than perpendicular to the stream. Some of the wetland areas shown within the proposed business park lots appear to encroach far within the buildable lots suggesting the lots can't be built on while still preserving the wetland areas. The applicant is encouraged to route storm water through the existing wetland area and make full use of the existing depressional storage on-site so long as this is not a detriment to the existing wetland areas. The proposed detention areas are shown as extended dry detention, but it is recommended the ponds be wet-bottom ponds with more naturalized landscape with prairie style grasses and possible aeration fountains. The drainage course to the east below Bartz Road is not a feasible outlet and the water should be sent to the south legal drain to the greatest extent possible.

**BURKMAN:** It is understood that a traffic study is currently underway for the intersections of the new collector street at both Vale Park Road at Evans Avenue, the intersection at Nick Drive and Bartz Road and the intersection of Silhavy Road and Evans Avenue. Based on those results, an engineering analysis will need to be performed to determine appropriate intersection treatments, lengths of accel/decel lanes, passing blisters, etc. Results of the SR 49 Corridor Study have indicated that the north/south collector street (Memorial Drive extended) should be a 4-lane boulevard style roadway with a 100 ft. right-of-way. Drive cuts accessing the boulevard through the Business Park should be eliminated or minimized. Consider a roundabout at the south end of the business park or roadway realignment to better accommodate the north/south primary traffic flow. The street serving Lots 1-3 should be looped to extend to the public street to the south. As currently shown, there is no way to turn around (emergency access/maintenance vehicles) except through private property (Lot 3). The pavement width (20') shown on the typical section for the boulevard off Bartz Road is too big for one lane and too narrow for two lanes. The traffic study should determine the number of lanes necessary and the pavement width adjusted accordingly. As indicated on the plan, the north/south collector street must have a pathway on one side of the road and a sidewalk on the other. Sidewalks should be installed on both sides of the extension of Nick Drive. Roadway lighting along the public streets must be LED and night-sky friendly. Involving the city with selection of the light standards is necessary. Parking spaces within the development must be 9' x 20' with drive aisle widths and turn radii acceptable to the fire department for emergency access. In areas where vehicles can overhang grass, the lengths of the spaces may be reduced from 20' to 18'. Wetland delineation reports and jurisdictional determination letters must be provided when available. Providing detailed drainage reports is required. The culvert crossing under Bartz Road is not an acceptable outlet alternative. Since the discharge point will be to a county regulated drain (Hotter) and will drain immediately into adjacent property within the county, coordination with the county surveyor and potentially the county drainage board will be required. A detention basin is shown between Lots 7 and 8; however no easement is shown on the proposed plat. Burkman asked for clarification on the outlet for this basin. Peterson indicated it drains to a box culvert. The condition of the culvert beneath Vale Park Road that is being utilized as a detention basin outlet needs to be evaluated and may need to be replaced. The lift station will need to be evaluated to determine what pump upgrades are

necessary to handle the additional flow. A reimbursable district was created on August 24, 2001 for the Pine Creek Estates sewer extension, with amendments made on June 14, 2002 and November 13, 2003. This district is valid for a period of 15 years. A Rule 5 Permit and a Site Permit covering the local erosion control permit, right-of-way cut permits and sanitary sewer permit will be necessary. Additional comments will be provided as plans are developed further.

**KENT:** A PUD ordinance will be required and needs to include all standards of the PUD. Referencing the UDO will not be acceptable. Weiss indicated more discussion is needed concerning this issue. Submitting a Development Plan is necessary. The PUD/Development Plan needs to provide definitions. Portions of the property are located within 600 ft. of SR49 Overlay and some uses are not permitted within the district. Further discussions concerning allowable uses will be necessary. The PUD will need to reflect the SR49 Overlay separating permitted uses from non-permitted uses. The PUD needs to provide the lots located within the SR49 overlay and reflect the standards of the overlay. Sign standards need to be included for the Business Park District and directional signage. The PUD indicates it is acceptable to locate signs within the right-of-way; however, this is not acceptable. Signs must be 5 ft. from all rights-of-way, property lines, etc. Signs cannot be located within vision triangles. The sign standard must include the height of proposed signs. Sign standards, including sign easement, for the Urban Residential District must be provided. Kent indicated that allowable size for subdivision signs is 50 sq. ft. Elevations for these signs will be necessary. Sign easements must be shown on the subdivision plat. Proposed commercial buildings facing 400 North will required separate design standards from the Business Park District. These standards should be residential in character. There had been a discussion of possibly locating a gas station in one of the lots on the northern portion of the development. Should this happen, Kent requested that the pumps face the first east/west roadway. Discussion concerning the drive-thru's on proposed parcels is required. Standards will need to be created for drive-thru's. The northern roadway needs to loop around to the other road rather than end at the lot. All roadways must be named. Providing a name for the subdivision will be necessary. Details for standards regarding outdoor storage, fencing and landscaping are necessary. Landscaping standards need to be called out, i.e. on lot, open space, street trees, parking lot, dumpster enclosure, landscape ratio. Landscape plans should provide the type of material identified within the development, the number of trees and the calculation of each. Separate design standards need to be created for the multi-family, business park, industrial and commercial uses. The details for the streets and boulevard roadway within the development plan need to be included. Cul-de-sacs are not permitted, unless there is a hardship. This will require discussion. Roof equipment should be hidden from rights-of-way, including SR49. Design standards for building elevations will need to call out standards. Building elevations are required and should show material used. All building types (Business Park, multi-family and commercial) need to be included. This is called out in the Standards of the Development Plan. Kent asked why vinyl siding is being used on the multi-family buildings. Weiss indicated this material holds up much better than other materials that could be used. Phase II of the Business Park will need to start prior to 2016. This should begin when the commercial section begins. A Table of Contents for the PUD and Development Plan is required. Details for lighting poles will be necessary. Section 8 of the PUD does not mention a buffer yard for the business park or the light industrial district. Weiss indicated this issue needs to be discusses. A tree survey will be required to determine the number of trees removed and the number of trees to be replaced on the site. The tree survey and number of trees replaced should be included in the PUD. Section 4 (iii) of the PUD Ordinance needs to include the lot coverage. The PUD references 4.5 acres of light industrial use. Where will this be located? At this time the location for this light industrial area is unknown. Why was 4.5 acres specified? Weiss indicated the light industrial issue needs to be discussed further. The parking for the businesses on the boulevard parkway should be located in the rear. Weiss indicated that this would hinder the marketability of the property. This issue will require further discussion. The number of cuts on the

boulevard roadway needs to be minimized. There is no mention of bicycle parking requirements. Traffic counts are needed. Park impact fees and payment in lieu of are mentioned in the PUD. Has there been any discussion with John Siebert or the Park Board. Weiss mentioned this is still an issue. Kent indicated this issue needs to be resolved prior to the Plan Commission recommendation to the City Council. Kent asked for clarification concerning the reduction of the side yard setback for the Business Park. This is due to some of the lots being narrow. Kent suggested putting buildings on these lots and then within the PUD call out the lots that need different standards. The PUD calls for the City and the developer to share the cost for roadway improvements. Kent stated this will need to be discussed. Information concerning the total cost of the infrastructure will be required. Sidewalks must be located on both sides of the roadways, unless the 8' pathway on the east side of the road is considered part of the sidewalk. This will require discussions with the Parks Department and Engineering. Connections from the multi-family to the pathway must be shown. Parking standards for the uses as proposed within the development must be provided. Kent asked for clarification concerning sidewalks on Bartz Road for Lots 35, 36 and 37. At this point, there are no sidewalks. Kent said these need to be shown and a Sidewalk Waiver can be provided when permits are pulled for these lots. There will no access from Bartz Road to Lots 35, 36 and 37. These lots will front the new north/south collector street. Kent said a no access easement should be shown on the plans. Kent is aware there is an architectural board to review all the plans prior to submittal to the City. The approval process for permits must be provided in the PUD or Development Plan. Kent asked about deviation concerning the 5 ft. berm. Weiss stated they did not want to take down trees to put in a berm and they do not want to create a drainage issue. This needs to be re-evaluated. Kent asked that more photos be taken for presentation to the Plan Commission and City Council. The proposed setbacks for the Business Park, Light Industrial and Commercial Districts must be provided. Providing lot coverage for the Business Park, Light Industrial and Commercial General Districts will be necessary. The Development Plan shall include all 19 items as listed in the UDO. Details for the connection between Nick Drive and the emergency access need to be provided. This will require further discussions with the Fire Department. The height standards for multi-family, Business Park and commercial uses are needed. The landscaping along residential properties abutting the north/south boulevard needs to be increased. Additional comments will be provided as the PUD ordinance and development plan are created.

**COMMENTS FROM STEVE MARTINSON:** The landscape plan has one invasive species on it and Stella d'oro daylilies. There are two varieties of invasive species Pennesitum grass.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Landscaping Plan (with Tree Survey)            | Road Names                             |
| Erosion Control Plan                           | Subdivision Name                       |
| Rule 5 Permit                                  | Landscaping Standards                  |
| Right-of-way                                   | Drive-thru Standards                   |
| Detailed Site Plan                             | Outdoor Storage Standards              |
| Site Improvement Permit                        | Fencing Standards                      |
| Zoning Clearance                               | Table of Contents-PUD/Development Plan |
| Hydrants                                       | Sidewalks/Pathway                      |
| Delineation Reports and Jurisdictional Letters | Development Plan                       |
| Detailed Drainage Reports                      | Permitted Uses                         |
| Coordination with County Surveyor              | Sign Standards                         |