



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Porters Vale South
ADDRESS: Porters Vale Blvd.

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: August 5, 2014

PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

IN ATTENDANCE:

Tyler Kent, Planning 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
Mark Geskey, Utilities	(219) 462-6174
Dave Souders, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Matt Evans, Public Works Director	(219) 462-4612
Media	

PRESENTERS:

Christopher Vensel, Lauth
 317-575-3183 / cvensel@lauth.net
 Matt Boone, CEC
 317-655-7777 / mboone@cecinc.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 new addition to the Porters Vale Retail Center to be located on Porters Vale Blvd. 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 an expansion of the Porters Vale Retail Center. The project consists of two separate buildings known as A1 and B1. Building A1 is a 7,000 sq. ft. building and will house three tenants. Building B1 is an in-line building with a maximum of six tenants. This is the first submittal for Building A1 in this configuration. This parcel was originally setup to have five outlots. It will be replatted. The project will require minor modifications along the entryway. Utilities will be relocated from the center roadway and reconfigured to feed the three retail sites from the rear. The one exception is sanitary that must come in the front for the center tenant. There will be a retaining wall on the east side of the site to get the building up to the correct finished floor elevation. Building B1 was designed in 2007. The civil engineering and architectural were completed; however, the building was never permitted. The sanitary, water and electrical were pre-planned and will be reused with minor modifications. Essentially the building is the same footprint as previously designed. Architecturally the design for the project is underway.

STAFF COMMENTS:

EVANS: Evans stated that Porters Vale Boulevard is a private right-of-way; therefore, Evans presented no comments on this. Kent interjected that the 2005 site review minutes mentioned the possibility of the City taking over Porters Vale Boulevard. Evans stated that if the City does take it over, then we will be interested in the landscaping and the right-of-way cuts. Kent said it makes sense for Public Works to review the trees and landscaping within the rights-of-way. Evans mentioned that Public Works reviewed the trees being proposed and finds the variety of trees acceptable. Evans mentioned in the event the private right-of-way is dedicated to the City plant material must have a two-year guarantee. Evans said Specification C-7 Point #13 states the landscaping contractor shall guarantee new plant material through one calendar year; however,

the UDO specifies two years. Evans indicated the right-of-way cuts at the entrance must meet the inspection requirements as they are placed. Public Works requires a 24-hour advanced notice. They inspect the sub-grade preparation, placement of the aggregate and the final material as it is placed.

THRASHER: Thrasher requested clarification concerning permitting. Vensel indicated it will be one construction project. Vensel stated the two large tenants in Building A-1 will be full turn-key build-outs. The center tenant will be a white-box build-out with some work being done by the tenant. Thrasher is aware the building will require a Construction Design Release, but questioned if there will be separate submittals for each tenant for the interiors. Vensel indicated it will be one set; however, the center tenant will be completed as a vanilla box, but will require a release for the build-out. Thrasher pointed out this will also be a separate permit. Thrasher asked if there are any tenants committed for the other building. Vensel stated at this point when they apply for a permit there will probably be one tenant taking half the building; however, they do not have a signed lease. Thrasher stated the permit will be for the entire building plus the tenant. Other tenants will be permitted separately later. Thrasher stated Construction Releases and Building Permits will be required for each portion of work not being done as one. All contractors must be registered with the City. All signage for the buildings and the development will require permits.

SOUDERS: Souders indicated the hydrant locations for the overall site for A1 are acceptable. However, there is no hydrant to the north for B1. This will require more discussion. Souders stated the fire department connections for the proposed retail space are located in the rear. All fire department connections in this location need to be in the front. The Fire Department reserves the right to place the FDC's in the front. Souders indicated there needs to be discussion concerning the placement of the fire panel and annunciator panels. Each space must have a Knox Box in the front and possibly one in the back. Vensel indicated the three spaces will all have separate sprinkler systems. Boone asked if the FDC is to be wall-mounted or free-standing. Souders confirmed they must be wall-mounted and should be 2-1/2" Siamese connections. Souders stated the access around the buildings is sufficient.

KENT: Kent stated the plans need to show total lot coverage as currently built. A variance was granted on May 16, 2006 to vary the interior landscaping from 15% to 13%. Since the time this development received approval the Zoning Ordinance has been amended and we now have a Unified Development Ordinance. Kent said it will be necessary to work with Lauth to blend the two to make the development consistent throughout. The plans need to show the required on-site parking for the overall development and this section of the development. A variance was approved to vary the required 5,124 spaces to allow for 2,881. Kent stated that as development occurs we need to keep track of the parking spaces on the overall site. Providing the parking calculations for the proposed site as well as for the existing as currently built-out for the overall tenants is necessary. Calculations for the interior landscaping are also needed. Kent conveyed the allowable signage will be 3 sq. ft. of signage per one linear foot of building frontage facing a public way. Per Article 9, Section 9.206 bicycle parking is required. The requirement for bicycle parking will be 10 spaces. Wave racks are permitted per Figure 9.206 and must be located within 50 ft. of the principal entrance. Bicycle parking location and details must be shown on the final plans. Kent mentioned a lighting plan was emailed; however, Kent did not have time to review the plan and will include comments in the minutes. Kent conveyed it will be necessary to review the architectural design standards of Article 11, Section 11.500, specifically architectural features, transparency and building materials with the architect. Kent said attention needs to be given to the amount of EIFS on the site. The requirement is 30% and it can be located above the first floor or 12 ft. The percentage of EIFS being used needs to be shown on the plans. Architectural features shall be included on the southeast corner of the Dick's building as shown on the south side of the building. Reviewing the parapets will be necessary. They should not exceed 15% of the height of the supporting wall and the maximum height should not exceed 33% of the height of the supporting

wall. Pursuant to Section 11.508, mechanical equipment shall be screened from adjacent properties or rights-of-way. The landscape plans will be reviewed by the City's horticulturist pertaining to plant materials and comments will be provided if necessary. Kent will review the landscaping detail and specifically along State Road 2. There is a requirement for a landscape island for every 15 parking spaces. Landscape islands may be needed along State Road 2 frontage. The conceptual plan shows these islands. Kent would like the façade facing State Road 2 wrapped around to the point of the enclosure. As part of the permitting process, Kent requested the pathway be installed along the frontage of State Road 2. Kent asked if the internal sidewalks will provide connectivity to the store fronts. Vensel confirmed they will connect. Kent would like to see landscaping applied to these store fronts so they are consistent with the existing store fronts. Kent indicated the Engineer's Office provided a copy of the addressing to this point. The Address for Building B-1 will be 300, with suites 100, 110, 120 and 130. Kent asked for an updated conceptual plan. Appropriate addressing can be applied to this plan and addressing can be provided for new buildings at future meetings. A Zoning Clearance will be required. Kent conveyed that landscaping will be required around three sides of the dumpster enclosures. The materials must match the building. The dumpster enclosure must have a steel gate. Wooden gates are not permitted. Kent will provide information from the UDO on the dumpster enclosures. Kent stated the compactor must be screened.

ON BEHALF OF BURKMAN: Burkman reiterated that Porters Vale Boulevard is incorrectly labeled as a "Public Right-of-Way" on the drawings. This is a private street labeled as "Common Area 'A'" on the plat. Burkman asked if there was a potential for the proposed retail to the north becoming a restaurant. If this is a possibility, installation of a grease trap should be planned accordingly. Burkman pointed out that the lengths of the parking stalls that overhang the grass area along the perimeter of the parking lot may be reduced to 18 ft. The parking lot drive aisle widths shown are 24 ft. or greater. They may be reduced to 22 ft. for the perpendicular parking spaces to reduce impervious areas. All sanitary and storm sewer lines proposed to be installed will be privately owned and maintained. Geskey interjected that sanitary and water are both public. Going forward an easement will be necessary. The following conditions are from the June 11, 2013 Plan Commission approval of the replat for Porters Vale and must be followed as a condition of permit issuance: a) The execution of a sidewalk waiver for the entire State Road 2 frontage of the Porters Vale Subdivision; b) The renewal of the IDEM Rule 5 Permit for the subdivision that expired in August 2011; c) Enhanced landscaping and buffering along the rear of the buildings viewable from State Road 2 to be approved by the City Planner. Submitting the final construction drawings electronically in PDF format is requested.

MCALPINE: It appears the school is encroaching on Lauth property on the northwest end. With the retaining wall coming through this area, McAlpine wants to ensure the land between the wall and back of curb is graded to the west toward the drive aisle to make sure all runoff is captured. Boone stated this is a garage and not a school building. McAlpine needs to see the type of wall being proposed on the eastern side as well as design calculations showing tie-backs and a cross section view. Vensel indicated he has this information. Boone mentioned it will be a keystone block retaining wall with geo-grid. The sewer connections for the Dick's Sporting Goods and Ross are shown tapping directly into a sewer manhole; however, the connections need to be made into the main line sewer. A cut-in Wye connection is preferred. The plans show concrete pipe, but a note indicates HDPE is allowed. Boone explained they do this to give the owner the option. McAlpine stated it is the City's recommendation to use concrete pipe. We have not had a great deal of success with HDPE in the area and this is all under hard surface. At the north proposed retail where the downspouts are shown connecting into the storm sewer the minimum pipe size should be 12". Boone questioned this pipe size for roof drain connections. McAlpine explained there are three roof drains coming together, and in some cases they are coming together with junctions without any sort of structure or port. McAlpine suggested running a 12" storm sewer line

on the east side of the building, structure it at the south end where it connects in to the north and placing another structure and then connect into the side with the roof drain. Boone asked if the structures could be a Nyloplast 12" basin. McAlpine said this will be acceptable. The roof drain connecting to the main line can be a smaller pipe size. The pipe draining the grassy area north of Ross is shown as PVC and needs to be a minimum of 12". McAlpine indicated the drainage report is based upon the original Lauth drainage report from 2006. Plans were made for the southern/southeastern outlot area such that no detention would be required due to the manner in which water sheds have been modified so that they are in conformance with our standards, but they do not have to detain for the southern outlots because of the original drainage report. McAlpine commented that with regard to the storm sewer pipe size calculations, adjustments may have to be made to either pipe sizes or slopes to provide a little bit of additional design capacity. It appears it is right at capacity and generally we like to ensure there is an extra 15% to 20% carrying capacity within the pipes. McAlpine indicated the tie-in at the southeast corner indicates a 30" is being proposed. The State right-of-way shows a 24" storm connection. When the calculations are done it will have to taken down a little ways into the State storm sewer system to see what the carrying capacity of the system and to make sure the system can handle it.

PILARSKI: Pilarski stated the Water Reclamation Department is concerned about what is being discharged into the sanitary sewer. The plans presented do not provide enough information to make a determination. Providing internal plumbing plans for Buildings A1, A2, and A3 is necessary. Vensel stated that Building B-1 at this point is just a shell building. Pilarski stated that once they have tenants in B-1 internal plumbing plans must be provided before occupancy.

GESKEY: Geskey indicated he has discussed Buildings A-1, A-2 and A-3 with Boone. Geskey said manholes must be concrete flow lines with 2-coat epoxy. Where the new main ties into the existing manhole it will be necessary to core-drill and install a boot. Epoxy will have to be applied in the field on this manhole. Geskey conveyed that all new sanitary and manholes must be tested. Geskey mentioned a fire hydrant could be installed in the landscape island near Building B-1. Geskey provided a procedure sheet for sanitary and storm. Geskey stated there was already IDEM approval. Geskey is unsure if IDEM approval and Notice of Intent will be required for this. If this is necessary, Geskey will work with Lauth on this. Geskey provided a procedure sheet for water. Geskey stated Lauth will enter into a contract with City Utilities and then we will enter into contract with Lauth's contractor for water. Geskey provided his contact information.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping Plan	Lot Coverage Calculations
Erosion Control Plan	On-site Parking Calculations (existing & new)
Rule 5 Permit	Interior Landscaping Calculations
Right-of-way	Bicycle Parking
Detailed Site Plan	Architectural Design Review
Site Improvement Permit	Mechanical Equipment Screening
State Design Releases	Landscape Islands
Building Permits	Store Front Landscaping
Signage/Fencing Permit	Dumpster Enclosures
Zoning Clearance	Compactor Screening
Fire Hydrant (Building B-1)	Internal Plumbing Plans
FDC's – Placed in front of buildings	New Sanitary/Storm Sewers-Testing
Fire Panel/Annunciator Panels (Placement)	All contractors must be registered with City
Knox Boxes	