



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT Pepper Cove Subdivision
ADDRESS: 153 W 375 N
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW
IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Planning Director	(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	

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: February 28, 2017

PRESENTERS:

Joe Lenehan, Olthof Homes
 (219) 712-0658 / joe@olthofhomes.com
 Ed Recktenwall, Olthof Home
 (219) 728-8122 / erecktenwall@olthofhomes.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 Pepper Cove Subdivision. 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: This is a proposed new community located at the northwest corner of CR 375 N and Froberg Road and also at the southwest corner of Vale Park Road and Froberg Road. Vale Park Road and 375 N are on the northern and southern boundaries of the property. To the west there is a recently primary approved community called Pepper Ridge. Pepper Cove is within the City limits and is zoned a mixture of primarily General Residential and a small portion on the northeast corner is zoned Commercial Neighborhood. Lenehan said they have submitted for three approvals. One will be the rezone of the Commercial Neighborhood zoning to General Residential so that the entire community can be a General Residential community. They have submitted for primary plat. Lenehan mentioned that other plans have been provided today, i.e. another site plan, preliminary landscape plan, sanitary/utility, basic grading layout. A request has been submitted to the BZA for approval of an exception from the development standards. General Residential has a permitted use for duplexes, but only on certain lots. It is on double frontage lots, which will be all the lots along Vale Park Road, Froberg Road and 375 N, as well as any corner lots. There are a few lots in the site plan that are not either of these. Pepper Cove will have two product types; one is a single family villa and the other is a paired villa. These homes are traditionally marketed primarily to active adults and empty nesters. Some level of exterior maintenance (grounds care) will be provided. The lots requiring a variance for paired villas are 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 32. The reason for the variance request is to keep the paired villas on the east side of the community and the villas on the west side. The paired villas are lots 1 through 33 and the villas are lots 34 through 87, for a total of 120 units. In the very northwest corner of the project in Outlot D there is a wooded section with a portion of Pepper Creek running through. A trail path will be run through this area. The storm water basin will be in Outlot C in the southwest corner. There will be another storm water basin at the entrance from

Kerry Drive on Froberg Road. Trails will be included through the open spaces. A sitting area with a gazebo will be located in the southeast corner, Outlot B. This should work well with the 8 ft. concrete path to be installed along the north side of CR 375 N. This will tie-in to a path shown on the Pepper Ridge plans. The path will work up through Outlot B and it will be brought up to the entrance at Kerry Drive and Froberg Road. Lenehan said Mistwood will pick the trail up and connect it to the bike trail that runs through Mistwood. Lenehan said the long term plan is for the City to connect the trail in Mistwood with the new trail that was installed along the future Vale Park Road extension. The storm water will be detained through the City of Valparaiso ordinance. Currently, the water shed goes to the northwest and southwest and it will continue to do so. There is a storm sewer along 375 N that should have sufficient capacity. A portion of the discharge will flow that way and a portion will go to the Pepper Creek leg in the northwest corner. A full storm water report will be submitted. The sanitary sewer is along Froberg Road. The intent is to connect to this. Lenehan stated they have been working with Valparaiso City Utilities for a lift station in the area. The water will come from the extension of Mistwood. The drawings will be finalized soon. As the water main gets extended through the future phase of Mistwood, it will be picked up and run through Pepper Cove.

STAFF COMMENTS:

BURKMAN: Burkman requested that an electronic copy in CAD be sent to Will Rose for addressing purposes. Rose did check the street names and there appears to be a conflict with possibly three street names, Sugar Creek Lane, Flat Rock Way and White Water. Burkman requested that alternates be submitted. Burkman noted that there is a pathway component requirement; however, what has been provided and described looks good. Burkman asked if there is any parkway room left between the curb and the front of the sidewalk where the pathway crosses in front of Lots 5, 6 and 7. Lenehan said it will probably be a couple of feet. Burkman mentioned that there are three very long frontages on the parcel. There are frontage improvement requirements associated with development, other than accel/decel lanes at the entrances. Burkman noted that in this area, a lot of the properties were originally developed in the County. Curb and gutter, pavement widening and sidewalks along the entire length of all of the frontages is a standard requirement for development. Lenehan asked how much pavement widening is required. Burkman conveyed it must be widened so that the end result is 15 ft. from back of curb. The right-of-way requirements along 375 N is 30 ft. and 40 ft. on Froberg Road and Vale Park Road. This is shown on the plat. Burkman noted that the coordination of the lift station with the adjacent development to the west and Valparaiso City Utilities is necessary. Burkman said the language used by Manhard makes it seem like the City would be owning and maintaining the detention basins. The ownership and maintenance of the basins will be the responsibility of the POA. However, the City does like to have access and rights to the basins if there is an issue. Burkman indicated the standard language can be found in our UDO or it can be provided to them. This needs to be addressed. Similarly, the public utility and drainage easement section mentions Mistwood. Burkman assumes this is a carryover from the last one Manhard did. Any rear yard storm sewers, if planned, will also be owned and maintained by the POA. Burkman noted there is an electrical easement running through that is to be vacated. Burkman asked if there are lines that need to be relocated. Lenehan conveyed that he has had a couple of meetings with NIPSCO and they have a couple different plans on what they may do, but ultimately the lines will be moved. Burkman mentioned we still need to look at accel/decel lanes and/or tapers. More comments will be offered as more detailed plans are developed. Burkman said the standard for sidewalks is 5 ft. and this is what is shown along the street frontages. There are also some supplemental walk paths around the outlots. These are shown as 4 ft. Burkman suggested they consider making the walk paths 5 ft. Burkman said the pathway should be in the right-of-way or an easement so the City can handle maintenance. However, the meandering narrower paths in the outlots should be the responsibility of the POA. A Rule 5 Permit and a Site Permit from the Engineering Department

will be required.

EVANS: Evans asked for clarification on road widths. Lenehan said the roads will be 30 ft. back of curb to back of curb. Evans indicated the parkway widths for locals is 5-1/2 ft. Evans asked if the sidewalk will be taken along 375 N. It appears that part of it may be on private property and part of it is on public property. Lenehan said his plan will be to have it be within the right-of-way or within an outlot within the community. He further explained that the sidewalks will be in the 375 right-of-way, the White Water (which will change) right-of-way or Outlots C and B with an easement. Lenehan does not want to see the sidewalk on any of the actual home lots. Evans said it appears that what goes on Outlot B connects into the main portion and then there is another 4 ft. walking path out of Detention Basin B. Evans asked how much of this sidewalk Lenehan expects the City to be responsible for? Lenehan indicated he will seek our direction concerning this issue. Lenehan said he did not realize before today that he would be responsible for sidewalks along all of the frontages. Lenehan needs to know that if the City requires the sidewalk be within the right-of-way, then the 8 ft. sidewalk will replace what would most likely be a 5 ft. walk and he would actually look at changing it. Evans conveyed the design is good and can see why it is of value. The trick is public and private and zig-zagging through and who is responsible for maintenance. This needs to be made clear. Evans indicated that plans do not show any delineation of ADA ramps and how they are installed. Evans conveyed that Federal Highway wants perpendicular ramps as near to the intersection as possible. Evans said there is a website that gives multiple designs. Evans said it would be good to sit together and go through the designs. Evans mentioned Public Works is getting a lot of feedback from duplex owners who have no place to store the 96-gallon trash and recycle receptacles. Lenehan indicated the garages will be two-car. Evans agreed that this should provide adequate storage space.

MCALPINE: McAlpine conveyed that he needs more time to review the engineering plans. McAlpine asked about their timeline as far as the drainage report and the next round of designs. Lenehan said within the next 60-90 days. McAlpine indicated he has no comments at this point in time. He needs more time to review the plans and compare them with the calculations. Lenehan indicated a full drainage report will not be submitted for the primary plat. This will be a construction drawing approval. McAlpine conveyed that it is important to confirm that the drainage report and footprint of the ponds is accurate. We don't want anything geometrically that would change the primary plat and if there is some sort of error with the ponds it could impact the lot configuration. Burkman interjected that we often get these before primary plat to confirm that they are in the right range for the open spaces to handle the storm water management. McAlpine said ideally we would have complete access around the perimeter; however, this is not always reasonable when lots are placed around the perimeter of the ponds. There should be some access provided from a roadway, but then more particularly access to the outlet structure with an easement. Maintenance will be the responsibility of the home owner's association, but there needs to be an access between lots to get to the structure. McAlpine recommended they relocate the storm sewer pipes to the road with branch lines to the rear yard areas. Any storm sewers located outside the road right-of-way will be under the ownership of the POA, so relocating the pipes to the road will minimize how much is required of the future owners.

ON BEHALF OF THRASHER: No comments were provided.

KENT: Lenehan had mentioned that the northeast corner of this property is zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and Olthof Homes is requesting this be rezoned to General Residential (GR). The plans will need to include the calculations for density. Referring to Table 3.301A is necessary. The minimum open space requirement is 10%; Gross Density is 3.797; Net Density is 5.140. The minimum parcel size is 6,000 sq. ft. Referring to Table 3.501 for single family zoned lots is necessary. The minimum lot size is 6,000 sq. ft. The required lot width is 60 ft. The street yard setback is 20 ft.; side yard setback is 6 ft., totaling 12 ft.; rear yard setback is 25 ft. The maximum height of the structure is 28 ft. Building coverage is .44 and the total lot coverage for each parcel is

50%. The minimum lot area for single family attached is 4,500 sq. ft. The minimum lot width per unit is 45 ft. The minimum street yard setback is 20 ft.; the minimum building separation is 15 ft.; minimum rear yard setback is 25 ft. The maximum building height is 28 ft. The maximum building coverage is 45% and maximum lot coverage is 60%. Kent said the diameter on lots 75 and 63 will make it difficult for residents to install a pool or any type of accessory structure in the back yards since these backyards are a small triangle area. This always becomes an issue after the subdivision has been platted and the home owner wants to make improvements to the back side of their home. Lenehan said pools and sheds will not be allowed. The allowable signage is two 50 sq. ft. 6 ft. tall monument style signs for the subdivision. Variances will be requested for lots 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 32. Kent noted that typically on duplex lots the City wants them to be split now rather than bringing them back four at a time. Lenehan explained the duplex lots are sold fee simple and there is no way to know where the line is until the building is built. Burkman interjected that the County draws the lots into the GIS. Kent said this will require further discussion. Kent conveyed that it will be necessary to pay close to Article 6, Subdivision Design and Land Development. Under Section 6.304 there are standards for block lengths. A block length for single family cannot exceed 9 units. It appears that Sugar Creek Lane exceeds this standard. Kent asked if there might be some sort of traffic calming measure that can be used. Kent suggested the installation of a pathway between a couple of the lots so that someone from the subdivision to the east or within the Sugar Creek Lane block area can access Flat Rock or River Creek rather than having to walk the entire block. Kent asked if the subdivision will be developed in phases. Lenehan said phasing will be used. Kent said referring to Section 6.310 will be necessary. Identifying the phasing is required. The primary plat is good for 18 months and one 18-month extension is possible. The parking requirement for a model home is 4 spaces. The parking requirement for a sales office is 10 spaces. Referring to Section 10.202 for subdivision landscaping requirements is necessary. There are specific guidelines for residential landscaping and these standards need to be included in the covenants and restrictions. Front-loaded garages will require one small tree or medium to large shrub that is at least six feet in height at the time of planting in the front yard of a residential lot for each 10 linear feet of width of the front-load garage door. Side-loaded garages will require one small tree and four shrubs, herbaceous perennials, or clumps of ornamental grasses planted along the street side of any side-load front garage that is closer than ten feet to the front property line. Per Table 10.301 the requirement for on-lot landscaping for single family detached is 1 large tree and 1 small tree per lot. The requirement for single family attached is 1 large tree, 1 small tree and 10 shrubs per dwelling unit. The landscaping requirement for open space is 10 large trees, 15 small trees and 40 shrubs per acre. Referring to Section 10.305 for the standards for street trees is necessary. Kent recommended they work with Public Works concerning the type of plant material to be located within the rights-of-way. There are requirements that you cannot exceed certain percentages for the types of material used within the subdivision. Kent said the buffer yard requirements appear to be shown on the landscape plan. The Class B Buffer on 375 N will require 2 large trees, 4 small trees and 34 shrubs per 100 linear feet. A Class C Buffer needs to be 25 ft. in width and will include 5 large trees per 200 linear feet, 5 small trees per 100 linear feet and 45 shrubs per 100 linear feet with either a 6 ft. tall wall (brick, stone, or some other material) or a 5 ft. tall landscape berm. The submittals for the Plan Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals need to include elevations of the proposed structures for the duplexes and single family homes. Kent indicated they need to discuss how to get the pathway along Froberg Road north to Vale Park. Kent asked if the Outlot A Detention will be a wet bottom pond. Lenehan confirmed the plan is for a wet bottom pond. Kent asked if it will be necessary to remove some of the existing trees. Lenehan hopes they will be able to keep many of these trees, especially those around the homestead and the trees in Outlot B.

DALY: Daly indicated that the Fire Department will work with Utilities concerning hydrant locations. Daly asked about the width of the landscape area at Kerry Drive. Lenehan said he

believes they followed the standards in the UDO; however, he will verify the width. Daly requested that construction workers be notified to park on only one side of the street so that emergency vehicles are able to get through. Once roads are in, it will be helpful to have street signs installed as soon as possible. Daly asked about the number of phases. Lenehan said the original thought was to have two phases, but he is going to have to rethink this. Lenehan they will start in the south part of the subdivision.

PILARSKI: The Water Reclamation is interested in what is being discharged into the sanitary sewer. Pilarski asked about the Commercial Neighborhood. Lenehan said they are seeking rezoning of this area to General Residential. Lenehan clarified that there will be no commercial establishments in this subdivision. Pilarski asked if a community center is being considered. Lenehan said there are no plans for a clubhouse or community center. Pilarski presented no other comments.

GESKEY: Geskey provided the procedures for water main extension. Geskey requested a pdf copy of the of the utility plans be sent to him for review. Comments will be provided after review.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)

Erosion Control Plan

Rule 5 Permit

Frontage Improvements (curb and gutter, pavement widening, sidewalks)

Drainage Report

Detailed Site Plan

Site Improvement Permit

Signage/Fencing Permit

Zoning Clearance

Variances (lots 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31 & 32)