



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT Monticello Park Dr. Duplexes
ADDRESS: Regent St./Monticello Park Drive
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: October 18, 2016

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:

Todd Martin, Todd Martin Rentals LLC
 (219) 405-8531 / toddmartinconstruction@gmail.com

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 Monticello Park Drive Duplex Extension. 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: Martin indicated that he has owned a 2 acre parcel, which is 100 ft. x 900 ft. and includes Monticello Park Drive and to the east. At some point, Surben is supposed to connect to Regent going south. Recently an acre of ground to the west was put up for sale. Martin said there are sewer stubs to the existing parcel. He is proposing to build the same type of buildings that exist going the north and south on Monticello Park Drive. Martin is unsure if the retention pond will need to be extended.

STAFF COMMENTS:

EVANS: This segment of Monticello Park Drive is private. Evans said private roads can be quite expensive for those who have to maintain them. The City's municipal standards for improvements require that all private roads be built to the specifications of the City. Unfortunately Monticello Park Drive in this area is very narrow. A secondary question is would the City entertain accepting this as a City street, and the answer is not until it is improved to City standards, which means it needs to be widened. Evans recommendation is that in order for the improvement to occur it would require widening the road. The concerns are it is a private road, it's too narrow and more density is being added to the road. It is not going to meet City standards and there is no way for the City to accept the road.

BURKMAN: Burkman asked if the intent is to continue this northward along the west so that it might be the next phase and eventually reach up to Evans with a similar concept as what exists on the east side? Martin said the only piece that is for sale is the one acre he acquired. The current owner wants to maintain his ownership of the property as it is now. Martin said it not possible to buy the piece to widen the road. Burkman reiterated that private roads need to be built to City standards, which should account for a 50 ft. right-of-way corridor with a 30 ft. back-of-curb to back-

of curb roadway section, and a 5 ft. sidewalk. The current width is 20 ft. Burkman said several years ago Surben was looking at their next phase and obviously this has not happened. The overall width for Surben is about 200 ft. and the overall width for this project is 230 ft. from the eastern property line today to the western line. Burkman said Surben was able to make it work in terms of their proposed unit placements. Burkman said achieving the 50 ft. right-of-way corridor and the 30 ft. roadway is feasible, at least in the portion being discussed today. However, it does not seem to be an option for the stretch north to Evans at this time. Martin said he is proposing to widen the section of Monticello Park Drive in front of the new buildings and Regent matches whatever Regent is on the other end and it was done 15 years ago. Martin said this section was done at 25 ft. back-of-curb to back-of curb because that is what Regent is as it goes towards the east. Burkman believes this is correct; however, Surben being in between this and where Regent is had it shown as 30 ft. and we want to stick with that just for the sake of these units wanting to utilize on-street parking from time to time. Burkman said there is the flexibility to do this with the three units as far as being able to push them to the west and south somewhat to create the space. However, with what Martin has it will be a challenge unless he is able to acquire an additional easement or strip from the existing property owner on the west side of Monticello Park Drive. Burkman said there are two options. One is upgrading just the areas he is working and the other is upgrading the whole thing. Burkman said at this time he does not have an answer. Several options were discussed; however, the issue was not resolved. Burkman said this will need more internal discussions as well as further discussions with Martin. Burkman mentioned their file on the previous development made reference to a right-of-way dedication along Evans Avenue and also a sidewalk; however, it appears the right-of-way dedication was never done. The GIS shows the property going to the center line of the road. The dedication document can be prepared, but this needs to be cleaned up at least for the portion owned by Martin. Martin indicated the dedication has already been done. The dedication happened when 1010 and 1012 Monticello Park Drive were done. Burkman said he will have to research this issue. Burkman asked if there is an existing public access easement over Monticello Park Drive. Martin said there is no public access easement because it is a private road; however, if it is needed he is willing to provide the easement. Burkman conveyed that the current UDO standards require that a distance of 20 ft. be provided between the garage and back of the sidewalk to prevent vehicles from overhanging into the sidewalk zone. This should be taken into account for the new units. Kent interjected that if the sidewalk is not a public sidewalk the requirement is 30 ft. Burkman thought this was a requirement if there was no sidewalk at all. Burkman said this needs some clarification. Burkman asked how drainage will be handled. It appears the intent is to route drainage to the existing basin. The basin is covered with a shared drainage easement with the property owner to the east. Burkman is unsure if the document allows for additional volume to be stored, or if additional work needs to be done. Burkman indicated that more comments will be provided as plans for this project are developed further.

THRASHER: Building permits will be required for each building. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City.

KENT: The existing development was approved under the old Ordinance and standards of the Unified Development Ordinance have since changed. The property today is zoned General Residential (GR). The following information needs to be shown on the plans. The minimum open space requirement is 10%. The gross density is 3.797 and the net density is 5.140. The required minimum lot area per unit is 4,500 sq. ft. The required lot width is 45 ft. per unit. The street yard setback (front yard) is 20 ft.. The required building separation is 15 ft. between the buildings. The rear yard setback is 25 ft. The maximum height for the buildings is 28 ft. The building coverage is 45% of the lot. The total lot coverage is 60%. It will be necessary to decide if this project will go through the minor subdivision plat or the subdivision plat process through the Plan Commission. If the project does not open a new public way, it can go through the Plat Committee; however, if a

new public way is opened it will be necessary to go through the Plan Commission. Kent asked if there are covenants and restrictions for the subdivision. Martin stated he has no covenants and restrictions because he will retain ownership. Kent conveyed that the plans from the mid-90's show a 5 ft. buffer yard on the entire length of the west side of Monticello Park Drive. Kent asked what this is for. Martin said this is not his property. Kent said it is shown on the plat. Kent said this needs to be clarified. Martin said there is 5 ft. of landscaping, but this belongs to the neighbor to the west. Kent said there are requirements that the City can impose regarding easements which are related to drainage, public utilities, fire protection, police protection, solid waste removal, pedestrian access and conservation. We will need to look at these since this is a private drive. It may be necessary to provide access to utilities, fire department and the police department in case of emergencies. Referring to Divisions 11.201 through 11.205 for design standards for residential development will be necessary. Kent indicated it will be necessary to pay close attention to 11.203; attached single family units shall not use front loaded access, unless the width of the garage is less than 50% of the lot width of the lot itself. We do not want to have garage-dominant structures. As mentioned by Tim Burkman consideration must be given to the setback of either 20 or 30 ft. for the drive between the back of the property line and the front of the drive. Two parking spaces are required per dwelling unit on each site. It will be necessary to refer to Section 6.305 – Lots: lots shall front on an improved public street. Currently, this is a private street; therefore, a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow for the construction of these lots will be necessary. It will be necessary to investigate private streets in general, as they are not currently permitted within the Unified Development Ordinance. The requirement for on-lot landscaping is one large tree, one small tree and ten shrubs per dwelling unit. Referring to Table 10.301 will be necessary. The requirement for open space landscaping is 10 large trees, 15 small trees and 40 shrubs per acre. The open space landscaping requirements can be found in Table 10.303. Kent asked if there will be a parking lot. Martin said there will not be a parking lot. Kent said he has driven through the area and there are people parking on the sidewalk. Martin said that his leases state there is no parking on the street. Street trees are to be placed 60 ft. on center and should be 2" in caliper at the time of planting. It will be necessary to submit a tree survey as part of the landscape plan. Referring to Article 10.603 for the tree survey guidelines is necessary. Anything over 10" in caliper removed from the site must be shown on a plan. The removal of three trees per acre is allowed. Single family attached homes are only allowed on through lots that back up to an arterial street, but do not have access to it; on corner lots of minor streets and collector streets; or cul-de-sacs or loop streets. Paying special attention to Section 2.500 will be necessary. A possible variance may be necessary for this as well. It will be necessary to refer to Section 8.206 for private streets. There is a two page section specific to private streets. Kent conveyed that he had mentioned the requirement for frontage on lots under Section 6.305. Kent mentioned there is a requirement within the UDO that the street sign must indicate the street is a private street. Martin said there is a street sign for Regent, but there is no street sign for Monticello Park Drive. Kent asked Evans if a street sign for Monticello makes sense from the public safety standpoint. Evans agrees that the sign does make sense and indicated that Public Works will work with Martin concerning this sign. Evan said that instead of the City logo, the sign will have the street name and the word "private" in a circle. Kent indicated that the unit located at the corner of Regent Street and Monticello Park Drive has two front yards and the 25 ft. setback will have to be met for both front yards. Kent indicated another site review will be required for this project.

DALY: The hydrant location is acceptable. Daly indicated the Fire Department already serves this area. The tee at Regent and Monticello Park Drive will help the Fire Department as a turn-around area. Daly asked if snow removal is done since this is a private street. Martin confirmed he does the snow removal.

MCALPINE: McAlpine requested more information on grades. Will there be a culvert installed under Regent Street to carry the water down to the south. Martin said he will probably do the

same thing he has at the east edge of the property. There is a pipe that goes under the road and goes back to the retention pond. Martin said he will probably use Davies Surveying. Davies actually did topo work on this piece just to see what was going on when the original development was done is 2000. McAlpine said Martin will have to work with the surveyor on the ponds and the need to expand and enlarge them. McAlpine conveyed that Martin has reached the acre threshold that requires him to look at the ponds and bring them up to today's standards. Martin will have to look at not only what he is proposing to do, but also the existing development to see what the storage volume needs to be. McAlpine mentioned the area has some issues downstream. He did reach out to a contractor and got a cost of \$250,000 to bring it all the way to the southern street and install a new culvert. The City has identified the project and prioritized it with respect to all other projects. The City will work to get to it eventually. Martin indicated that he hasn't had any problems this year because he repaired the drain that comes out of his pond. McAlpine suggested slowing down the flow from the pipe that drains the pond. Martin said the pipe was originally 12" and is now an 8" pipe. This can be discussed further.

GESKEY: The sanitary sewer laterals are private and will remain private due to the fact that there are two units at each duplex and there is only one lateral. The water main is on the east side under the sidewalk. A total of six services will be required. Geskey is assuming Martin will want to put four between the two units facing Monticello Park Drive and two services will have to come from the northeast corner of Regent and Monticello Park Drive all the way over to the duplex on the south side of Regent Street. Geskey will be the contact for the water services. Contact information was provided. Geskey conveyed there must be a cleanout for the sanitary sewer within 5 ft. of the building. Martin indicated the water line is not under the sidewalk. He believes it runs beside the sidewalk. Martin said the two hydrants on the street are 5 ft. behind the sidewalk.

PILARSKI: Pilarski advised that if there are floor drains in the garages, they cannot be attached to the sanitary sewer. Since this is a residential development and not a commercial establishment or industrial project, Pilarski provided no further comments.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)
- Right-of-Way
- Detailed Site Plan
- Building Permit (for each building)
- All Contractors Must Be Registered With The City
- Zoning Clearance
- Road Widening
- Pond Expansion/Enlarging
- Information on Grades
- Variances (as needed)
- Second Site Review