



INDIANA 46383

TELEPHONE: 462-1161

**MEETING:** Site Review Committee  
**SUBJECT:** Airport Business & Industrial Park  
**ADDRESS:** Loudermilk Lane & Bowman Drive

**LOCATION:** City Hall  
**DATE:** October 1, 2013

### PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, 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
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Dave Souders, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Matt Evans, Public Works	(219) 462-4612

Media

#### PRESENTERS:

Steve DeBold, Chester, Inc.  
219-465-7555 / [steved@chesterinc.com](mailto:steved@chesterinc.com)  
Tony Pequet, Chester, Inc.  
219-465-7555 / [tpequet@chesterinc.com](mailto:tpequet@chesterinc.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 14-lot industrial subdivision to be located at Loudermilk Lane and Bowman Drive. 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 project is approximately 38.5 acres. The project is in between Eastport Center and the airport property. The property will continue from Bowman Drive and Loudermilk Lane. The drainage will be from the northwest to the southeast corner into a regulated drain. The sewers will be extended from Eastport Center to approximately half-way to the property, taking the majority of the parcels gravity into the Eastport Center system. The remaining portion will go into a lift station to be located along the south property line on Outlot A. A 12" water line is being proposed to be a continuation from Eastport Center and where the Loudermilk property stopped with their development. The system will be looped. Five hydrants will be located on the property. DeBold indicated that 14 parcels are being proposed and are all about 2 acres with the exception of Lot 11 which will be approximately 5 acres. There is a large detention area on Outlot A that will be released into the regulated drain. Obtaining permission from the county will be necessary. Drainage will be held back at 5.95 CFS. DeBold stated they are working with Gasvoda and Precision Systems concerning the type of lift station being used. The drawings will be updated once DeBold receives information. DeBold mentioned that E1 systems were considered; however, E1 was not interested in providing anything because their systems cannot handle the flows.

#### STAFF COMMENTS:

**BURKMAN:** Burkman indicated that sidewalks are typically installed by the lot builders; however, sidewalks in open areas such as along the frontage of the Outlot need to be installed up front by

the contractor doing the general improvements. Burkman suggested placing a manhole at 6+20 rather than the one shown with pipe running north and south. This would cut out approximately 300 ft. of pipe. By placing it at 620 it will still serve lots 4 and 14. Burkman stated that in earlier discussions a low pressure system was suggested and it appears this has been done with the lift station. The Redevelopment Commission needs to be made aware of the costs concerning this issue. Utility should also be made aware of this. The additional lift station would ultimately become theirs installed as a public improvement. Burkman mentioned that if a lift station must happen running force main back north to manhole 3 should be considered. This will be a shorter run by approximately 80 ft. Typically the two downstream manholes will be installed with a particular lining to combat corrosion from hydrogen sulfide. The two manholes can be installed downstream with the lining, rather than retrofitting the existing manholes at the other route. Burkman indicated the curbs are shown as rolled; however, the City standard is the chair back curb. This may cause a problem with driveways being installed after the fact, but developments usually find a way to handle this issue. Burkman noted that drainage must be coordinated with the County since it is being discharged into a regulated drain. Burkman provided a listing of preliminary addressing for the site. If the lots do not change, these addresses can be used for the plat. Burkman noted the storm water pollution prevention plan has been reviewed. There were no significant issues; however, since this is technically a City project it will be necessary to send the plan to Soil and Water Conservation for their review. A Technical Comment Form will be completed and should be submitted with the NOI for the Rule 5 submittal.

**THRASHER:** Thrasher had no comments. Thrasher pointed out that as the lots are developed they will require individual site review.

**SOUDERS:** Souders indicated that he did not have an updated set of plans showing the five hydrants. Souders requested clarification concerning any other changes that have been made. DeBold indicated the plans now show sidewalks; however, for the most part the changes are minor. Souders indicated a meeting will be setup with the Fire Department to discuss the placement of hydrants. Souders mentioned the hydrants appear to be sufficient. After review of the updated plans, Souders stated that discussion is also needed concerning hydrants going into the lots. This will depend on lot size and will be an issue for the individual lot owners.

**KENT:** Kent asked about covenants and restrictions for the subdivision. DeBold indicated this is being worked on now. A copy will be submitted as soon as it is available. These properties are located within the Airport Master Plan which is currently going through the approval process. As part of this, there is a requirement that the detention/retention pond not be a wet bottom pond for more than 48 hours for the release of water collected on the site. This information may be found on page 190 of the master plan. DeBold indicated that the UDO requires a sediment holding cell. DeBold pointed out the Eastport Center has wet bottom ponds. There was discussion concerning this issue and possible options. Kent indicated a street lighting plan for the subdivision will be required. Street trees will be required and should be planted 60 ft. on center. Sidewalks will be required throughout the subdivision. Kent indicated that a sign will be allowed at either entrance and may not be more than 50 sq. ft. per sign. A tree survey will be required prior to removal of the existing tree line. Landscape buffers will be required throughout the subdivision and specifically at the Washington Meadows subdivision. If zoning is not compatible with other sites, a buffer will also be required for these areas. This issue can be discussed further. DeBold indicated a formal submittal will be made to the Plan Commission once the lift station has been designed and all the necessary changes are made.

**EVANS:** Evans conveyed that Public Works needs to be contacted prior to installation of street signs. Evans stated the collector street section detail shown on Sheet 13 lists the option of #8 or #9 binder. Our standard specification is #8 over a compacted and approved sub-grade. The aggregate must be placed in two lifts. Evans pointed out that inspections are required and notice must be received 24-hours prior to an inspection being scheduled. Evans will provide the

inspection procedure. Evans stated the road width does meet a minimum requirement of 36 ft. from back-to-back of curb. However, when looking at the minimum right-of-way of 60 ft. Evans arrived at 58'-5". The minimum must be 60 ft. Evans stated the telephone lines appear to run through the right-of-way and questioned if there was a way to put these lines on the backside of the curb outside of the right-of-way. This will make planting trees easier.

**PILARSKI:** Pilarski indicated his comments are minimal as a number of issues have already been addressed. However, for the Water Department, this subdivision is in a Well Head Protection area. Therefore, any fuels stored on site must have double containment. Any questions concerning this issue should be directed to Jim Pingatore. Contact information was provided. Pilarski stated that Mark Geskey did have a comment concerning the water line going through the development. On drawing 6, Geskey suggests a leg on various parts of the water line between Lots 8 and 9, 10 and 11, 12 and 13 and 14 and the pond. Pilarski stated discussions on this issue may have already taken place. Geskey indicated any changes to the plan must be submitted for his review. Pilarski indicated the concerns regarding the sewer lines have been addressed by Engineering. Pilarski will reserve comments on the waste water discharges that may be produced from the various parcels until individual site reviews.

**MCALPINE:** This subdivision will be draining into Hotter Ditch regulated drain. There is a portion of the existing pond situated over an arm of the regulated ditch. Hopefully, this portion can be vacated so that the pond can be located here. McAlpine stated the storm water drainage report must be reviewed; therefore, comments concerning drainage will be deferred until this review is completed. McAlpine requested the report be certified by a civil engineer. McAlpine said the grading plan indicates there will be some grading challenges. McAlpine indicated it may be a good idea to deal with some of the storm drainage now instead of waiting until businesses come in to occupy the lots so they are not lower than neighboring lots. Further discussion is suggested. McAlpine would like to see an overland routing for the entire site to ensure that all water is getting to the pond, mainly the areas on the north. McAlpine stated that further discussion concerning the detention/retention pond is needed.

#### **ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

- Erosion Control Plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Detailed Site Plan
- Site Improvement Permit
- Tree Survey
- Street Lighting Plan
- Street Trees
- Landscape Buffers
- Certified Drainage Report
- Grading Issues
- Retention/Detention Pond
- Hydrant Placements
- Zoning Clearance