

chambers. There are elevation issues on the site that they need to deal with. They were unable to coordinate the parking lot process with Horizon. Their parking is too high in relation to where the building and parking lot elevations need to be. Moving the detention to the south and to the east in order to raise the elevations of the parking on that side is a favorable transition. The placement of a separate detention in front of Building 4 is likely, as this was recommended by Kras. Gough conveyed they are in the process of completing the Rule 5 permit application. McIntire stated they will complete a flow test this week and will forward the information to Gough.

Since paving isn't planned this fall, the timeline on eliminating one of the entrances is probably May, 2009. A fully functioning parking lot is anticipated for May / June, 2009. Pilz expressed concern regarding the parking spaces along LaPorte Avenue. Clarification is critical and a firm commitment is necessary before the City issues permits. Gough added that he's had conversation with Stu Summers and the Redevelopment Commission is committed although he's unclear as to whether it's gone beyond that level. Phillips said making sure it's budgeted and scheduled is important. Further conversation with Summers is recommended. Gough said \$100,000 was committed towards the cost of spaces in the second phase. This was part of the commitment made to the Redevelopment Commission and it was also reiterated in front of the Plan Commission or City Council when the parking variance was granted. Pilz stated Lincolnway and LaPorte Avenue call for right-of-way dedication. There may be a small dedication required on Roosevelt Road. Pilz will check into this. Connecting into the sewer itself rather than into the existing manhole in the street is advised since the line will be a service line. This is also the utility policy. Pilz said he will go over the current plans and make comments. Some recommendations have been complete regarding the sewer between Buildings 2, 1, and 3. The 8" sewer will be a public sewer and will become the property of the utility. This is basically to have control over what's happening into the collection system. In addition to the plans, profile sheets must be provided since it requires an IDEM construction permit. Utility approval is necessary therefore; information is needed such as manhole details, service connection details, trench details etc. Before any certificates of occupancy are granted to any of the 3 buildings, an easement must be provided for access as this will allow for the maintenance. Ferngren said that going before the Utility Board on August 26th is anticipated. Pilz stated that pavement information is needed for the parking and drives. Tentative addressing is as follows: Building 1 is 1300 Lincolnway. Building 2 is 1400 Lincolnway. Building 4 is 1205 LaPorte Avenue. Building 3 is 1305 LaPorte Avenue. These addresses are being reviewed by the Post Office.

Thrasher stated the permit application has been submitted however, address clarification is needed. The correct address is needed on the application for each of the permits that are submitted for as well. A State Design Release for 1310 Roosevelt Road has come through however; there isn't an address for this. The State Design Release will need to be amended with the correct address. Since there are multiple buildings within this project, accuracy is critical. The site improvement isn't going to be in place before the foundation release can be issued. Thrasher said she has already received a permit for a foundation release however; the site improvement needs to be in place before that permit can be issued. The Engineering Department has to review and approve before the permit is issued.

Kras explained that the Sewer Collections Department verified that the storm sewer on LaPorte Avenue is 24" diameter rather than the 42" that was indicated on the plans. On the north side along Lincolnway from proposed structure #110 heading west, is an 18" storm sewer, and a 24" storm sewer to the east. Kras believes there shouldn't be any issues tying into LaPorte Avenue's storm sewer as long as the connection can be made and is not in conflict with the other sanitary lines coming across. Steege conveyed that at this time it's pending as to whether the line is in good shape. Davies explained the roof drainage from Buildings 1 and 2 is considered clean water and will tie directly into the storm sewer line after the storm tech. On Building 2 the roof drains will be along the west side and more than likely on the south side of Building 1. Kras commented that the roof drains should be connected before the detention so that the water is detained and not directly released into the storm sewers. Drainage calculations are needed indicating the detention for the entire site including the complete underground detention, the parking lot detention that was originally proposed, and the additional parking lot detention that was created north of Building 4. The Rule 5 Permit is also needed for review and can then be forwarded to IDEM.

Pilarski deferred comment for the connection points from the buildings into the sanitary sewers to Pilz and Steege. There is concern as to what's being discharged into the sanitary sewers. Pilarski inquired whether Buildings 1, 3, and 4 are strictly residential and if Building 2 is going to be retail, leasing, and also

residential. Gough clarified that Building 1 is a mixed use with the entire first floor being commercial. The front of Building 2 is commercial and the southern portion is leasing. Pilarski said it's important to know exactly what types of businesses are going into the buildings in order to determine what would be discharged from the facility. Restaurants will require interceptors, grease traps etc. Phillips pointed out that a future site review will not be necessary regarding this; however, directly contacting Pilarski is essential. If a year or more goes by, then an additional site review will be needed.

Phillips stated that when submitting for the zoning clearance approval, technical information needs to be indicated on the drawings. Gough said the square footage for the retail is 11,200 and the residential square footage is 107,000 for the first 2 buildings. Phillips explained that when submitting for zoning approval, which is after the foundation release, building dimensions, square footage, and overall square footage, need to be provided on the drawings. Indication is necessary on the architectural drawings as well as the site plans. Before the zoning approval, it's essential to go through a final parking calculation. All the information about the project needs to be noted somewhere on the drawing. Arriving at the parking calculation will be based on the approvals granted. The maximum lot coverage is 80% of impervious surface. Building setback information is needed as well. Setbacks from the property lines must be shown on the drawing for the actual buildings. When submitting for zoning approval, floor plans for the building are needed. The number of stories within each building should be indicated on the plans. Based on the Eastgate Standards, the setbacks are 15' to 27' from the curb line. Phillips said this presents a problem if it's measured from the parking curb line on the north end. He prefers it's done based on drive lane since there are other areas on LaPorte Avenue and Lincolnway that are not going to have parking in the front. The purpose is to avoid a jagged effect to the building placement along Lincolnway. Phillips made it clear that in order to remain consistent along Lincolnway this must be done based on drive lane. In response to some preferred landscaping in front of the buildings, Phillips said he's not going to affect the rest of Lincolnway for the sake of this project in terms of setbacks. Phillips pointed out that in an urban setting, especially in a retail setting, the building should be exactly on the right-of-way line. This issue will need to be resolved. As part of the zoning clearance, two copies of a detailed landscape plan based on the Eastgate Standards are needed. One copy will be forwarded to the Parks Department for Steve Martinson to review. Eastgate Standards apply to signage as well and must be approved separately. The parking requirements are based on a standard of 2 spaces per dwelling unit, 1 to 300 square feet for offices, 1 to 200 square feet for retail, and 1 to 75 square feet for restaurant, as dictated by the Eastgate Standards. Approvals that have been granted will be factored in for parking since the inception of the project review. Going over this in detail is an important part of the zoning clearance step for this project although this isn't a requirement for foundation release. Clear commitment from the Redevelopment Commission is critical. Current parking calculation is needed and a set number must be determined when coming for the actual zoning clearance. The zoning clearance needs to be accompanied with architecture, lighting, site plan, landscaping, floor plans, and anything else that's needed to convey the zoning aspects of the project. Dumpsters have to be treated according to the Eastgate Standards as well. An opaque buffer around the dumpster enclosure has to be the same primary material that is used on the buildings. A dumpster needs to be shown for Phase 1. Lighting is also per the Eastgate Standards.

Johnson stated that in order for the Fire Department to approve this project, designated fire lanes for the buildings are required. The fire lanes need to be in regards to the placement of the Fire Department connection. The Fire Department reserves the right for the final placement of the connection as well as for hydrants. Knox Boxes will be required for all structures.

McIntire said an easement is necessary for the additional fire hydrant that will be placed. This can either be 20' ingress and egress attached to the water main or a blanket utility easement. Backflow protection will be required at the water meter and the fire service. This complex will be served with one master meter which has specific bypass requirements that are available at www.valpo.us.

Steege stated that Pilz explained the details involving the sewer manholes etc.

Walstra requested future conversation in regards to access points etc. and preplanning is recommended.

Pilz clarified that the IDEM application needs to be complete in order to start the foundation release. Normally a site permit is necessary in order to get the foundation release. It more than likely is allowable to go ahead with the foundation release with the understanding that the full building permit would not be issued until you have the utility approval. Kras added that the Rule 5 Permit should be approved before the

foundation release. Thrasher stated a foundation release is essential before working on the foundation. Using the existing site plan is not acceptable. Filling in and bringing to grade is allowable. Kras said the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan has to be approved by the Engineering Department before you send in the application to IDEM. Once the application is sent to IDEM, approval before starting isn't needed however, a copy of the NOI must be sent to the Engineering Department. Completed plans are required before going before the Utility Board. Pilz said that Engineering should approve the plans in order to receive the foundation permit. Phillips mentioned that the setback issue must be resolved out before the foundation release. Urban scale landscaping can be placed in the front of the buildings. The parking area landscaping is subject to the Eastgate Standards. Phillips said there are options regarding the landscaping for the parking area.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping plan (with Tree Survey)
- Erosion control plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Right-of-way
- Detailed Site Plan
- Sanitary/Sewer
- Backflow Prevention
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release
- Foundation Release
- Building Permit
- Signage / Fencing Permit
- Zoning Clearance
- Drainage Calculations
- Parking Calculations
- Knox Boxes