

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Valparaiso Boys & Girls Club
ADDRESS: 708 Evans Avenue
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: Zoom Meeting
DATE: February 16, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE:

Beth Shrader, Planning Director
(219) 462-1161 / bshrader@valpo.us
Carley Lemmon, Asst. Planner
(219) 462-1161 / clemmon@valpo.us
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner
(219) 462-1161 / vthrasher@valpo.us
Bill Laird, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / blaird@valpo.us
Mike Jabo, Director of Engineering
(219) 46201161 / mjabo@valpo.us
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us
Matt Zurbriggen, Engineering Dept.,
(219) 462-1161 / mzurbriggen@valpo.us
Mark Geskey, Water Dept.
(219) 462-6174 / mgeskey@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us
Mike Jessen, City Administrator
(219) 462-1161 / mjessen@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Russ Pozen, DVG Team
(219) 281-4068 / rpozen@dvgtteam.com

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Valparaiso Boys & Girls to be located at 708 Evans Avenue. Shrader 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: Smiley mentioned that they have closed on the property exchange with the current building in Valparaiso and the property on Evans Avenue. This is being privately funded through contributions and they are currently in the midst of a 9-million-dollar capital campaign to construct a new facility on site. A public announcement will be made in mid-March to let the public know where they stand with their fund-raising efforts. Pozen said the building is approximately 37,000 sq. ft. The future senior center will be

approximately 15,000 sq. ft. They are planning from an engineering standpoint for the entire development to be built out to ensure that everything works from a stormwater and utility perspective. The game plan is to have two entrances because of the use of the busses. The entrances are spaced for the ease of ingress/egress. The busses can loop around to the main drop off in the north. Pozen said they will be seeking variances. A traffic study is in the works to show that what is being done will be safe for the community. The parking lot is to the east and there is heavy duty and standard duty type pavements. There are existing wetlands on site, and they will be handled separately. This is a large, sprinkled building. The fire department connection is shown on the northwest side. The nearest utilities that they can connect to are to the northwest. The sanitary is in the road on Evans. Pozen said it is his understanding that the existing stub is to the auto-zone and they cannot tie-in to it so they will be tapping into the existing manhole in the road, extending it to their property limits and getting it on site. Pozen said his assumption is that the extension will all be public and then it will become private. They will core in above the bench and they will be less than two feet so nothing drastic will have to happen. The plans show the extension to serve the future senior center. Pozen explained his plans for the water service. Currently they have a 2" service and a 6" fire protection main coming into the building. Posen said he believes they will not be required to loop the water main. There is access around the entire building for fire trucks. The distances are pretty close to the access points. Pozen said he has already checked the route and the radii with auto turn movements for the fire trucks to get around. During previous conversations with Engineering it was decided that on site detention may not be necessary. However, it will be necessary to provide BMP's and stormwater quality. Wolf stated the useable floor area is approximately 27,600 sq. ft. The main entry is to the north. It serves Evans to the north, but it also serves the canopy protection to the east. Wolf explained the procedure for children to enter the facility. It is a controlled entry point. Everyone entering the facility will have to check in with reception. No one is allowed free run of the building. The facility will have two large gymnasiums. Other amenities include a rock-climbing wall, small café, concession area, game rooms, homework rooms and administrative offices for staff who oversee the game rooms. There will be a conference room that can be utilized not only by the club, but by outside groups. There will be separate areas setup for older teens. The facility will also have a cafeteria, warming kitchen and storage areas. This is a precast insulated load bearing wall facility. The highest wall will be the gymnasium at 29 ft. to top of the precast. All the one-story spaces are at a precast height of 14 ft. above the finished floor. Wolf presented the renderings and explained the types of materials being used.

Our City...Our Values

STAFF COMMENTS:

GESKEY: Geskey mentioned that there have been back-and-forth discussions and he believes they arrived at a pretty good plan. However, Geskey feels they need to change the location of the fire hydrant. The hydrant needs to be located out by the road. That way it is on the part that is owned and maintained by Valparaiso City Utilities. Pozen said this will be approximately 136 ft. from the FDC. Pozen asked if code isn't 100 ft. maximum from a fire hydrant to the FDC. Stites asked what the distance is from the road to the southwest corner of the building. Pozen said it is approximately 270 ft. Stites said he does not see a problem with moving the hydrant out to the road. His main concern is fire flow, but he will include this in his comments. Geskey explained that VCU will own from where they took off on Evans to the curb box and valve box everything after that will be private. The first leg will have a contract with the developer and a contract with the excavating company. Geskey mentioned that the plans did not show a cleanout. Pozen said there are no cleanouts. They are using manholes. Geskey indicated that a cleanout within 5 ft. of the building is required.

STITES: Stites asked if they have done anything with fire flow to ensure the required fire flow is available. Will the 6" main supply the required fire flow for the building? Pozen said this calculation needs to be coordinated and checked. They did get the fire flows in the area. Stites asked if the main is a 6" or an 8". Pozen confirmed the main is 8" that is public the private is 6". Pozen said they did get a flow test that shows the static as 51 and the residual at 48 with 1,100 gpm. The MEP personnel will be working with DVG to confirm that the fire flow protection is adequate. Stites stated that the Fire Department follows all adopted codes, standards and rules of the Indiana Fire Prevention Bureau and Building Commission and all local ordinances that apply. All initial inspections required through the construction phase must be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy has been issued, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. All contractors installing fire alarms, sprinkler systems, hood systems, etc. must contact Stites prior to beginning work. Stites main concern is ensuring there is proper fire flow for this facility. Stites mentioned that he has information concerning active shooters and requested they contact him. Contact information is included that the beginning of these minutes.

FAHEL: The Water Reclamation Department is interested in what is being discharged into the sewer. Fahel asked for confirmation that there will not be any actual food preparation in the kitchen area. Pozen said this is just a warming kitchen and they do not feel there is a need for a grease interceptor. Fahel requested a floor plan showing the type of equipment that will be used in the kitchen. Submittal of a detailed plumbing plan is required.

THRASHER: It will be necessary to submit this project to the State of Indiana for Construction Design Releases. A local Building Permit is required. Providing a list of all contractors on the job is necessary. All contractors must be registered with the City prior to issuance of any permits. Any signage will require a permit. Thrasher stated it will be necessary to work with the Health Department concerning their requirements for the kitchen.

JABO: There have been discussions concerning water detention. Engineering is not holding DVG to detaining all water on site. However, the wetlands cannot be starved. Engineering is suggesting that you work with your wetland consultant to determine how much water should be going to the wetlands. The plans do show rain gardens, etc. Jabo would like to see more detail on the rain gardens and other BMP's. Jabo said it is not a given that everything can be dumped into the 60" sewer. Engineering will be very interested in seeing the computations. Jabo stated that water quality will be premier. Jabo said Engineering is very interested in what can be done on site. Pozen said his vision of the rain gardens is two-fold. It is a little surface volume and underground volume. The pipe will be a perforated pipe with an aggregate trench and part of the aggregate cross section with a good infiltration soil above it, so you get volume and underground with aggregate and infiltrating soil. Jabo said it will be important to show all calculations. The driveway mentioned during the discussion on utilities is the second driveway for the dentist. Jabo said the driveways are not connected. Engineering would be interested in some type of maintenance plan in cooperation with this neighbor. They will be putting him out of business as they cut through them and restore them. They are both concrete driveways. Engineering will need to see a detail because this will not be a simple patch. It will need to be tidied up possibly to the next joint. Engineering will be interested in the traffic study and the impacts to Calumet and Evans and the proper location of the crosswalk. Jabo asked if they have coordinated the crossing with the Parks Department. Pozen said not yet. They want to be a little more sound in their internal coordination first, but Pozen will make a note that this needs to be coordinated with Parks.

LAIRD: The following permits must be obtained through the Engineering Department: 1) Site Permit; 2) Erosion Control Permit; 3) Right-of-Way Permit; 4) Sanitary Sewer Permit.

SHRADER: This property is zoned Light Industrial (INL). The City is anticipating a rezone to Commercial Neighborhood (CN). These timelines do not align. DVG will want to seek Building Permits prior to the rezone being complete, which at this point will be late spring. With Light Industrial Zoning there is one set of standards to meet. Overall, what they should be doing is figuring out what is best for this site and then requesting whatever variances will be needed to make this

the best possible project. One thing to have in mind is when the zoning changes to Commercial Neighborhood will the property still be in compliance or will certain things about the site be legal non-conforming. They may want to weigh that against the cost and benefits of changing the site plan to meet the Commercial Neighborhood zone. The site may already be meeting these, but they may want to double check both to provide maximum coverage going forward. Whatever they have will carry through and because of the timeline we are assuming they are all based on the Light Industrial Zone. The impact of this is first of all a use variance. A private club requires a use variance to be in Light Industrial. For district intensity bulk standards, we will want calculations for the landscape ratio (LSR) and the gross and net FAR. Referring to Table 3.301(b) for the LSR and FAR's is recommended. Table 3.505, **All Other Uses**, will provide required setbacks. Pozen said that according to the table, the front yard setback is 25 ft., but the bufferyard requirement jumps the front yard setback to 40 ft. Shrader said the bufferyards will exceed the setbacks in this case and the bufferyard is what they must build to. Pozen asked if a variance will be required to put the drive aisle in the front yard setback. Shrader said not in the front yard setback, but a buffer yard is supposed to be landscaped. On Evans there is a street buffer yard required in the Light Industrial zone and the required bufferyard is a Class D. Pozen said they will probably seek a variance for the street bufferyard requirement. Shrader said we have street bufferyards and they change based on the zoning of the proposed development. Under CN (the proposed new zoning) there is no bufferyard requirement. Shrader suggested they do a cross reference to Commercial Neighborhood. Shrader understands from previous discussions they may be building on in the future. It will make it easier if they meet the standards and if it is no big deal to meet them because it works with the site and it will be a good way to go forward. Shrader suggested they refer to Section 9.202(f). There is some guidance on doing a study if there are reduced parking demands. The useable floor area is 27,600 sq. ft. The private club category requires 8 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of useable floor area which requires 221 spaces but only 130 spaces have been provided. Our standards are standards. If actual needs can be communicated, we can take that into consideration. Shrader is hoping this will include some use data from comparable Boys and Girls Clubs. There are some new clubs in the region. Shrader said they may have data that reflects real parking needs and have this rolled into the information being provided on the access points. Shrader suggested the use of bike lockers for kids as well as staff. This could reduce the amount of required parking. Pozen asked if there is a calculation associated with this. Shrader suggested they review Section 9.202(g). Shrader mentioned that she can authorize a 10% reduction in the number of required off-street parking spaces, if

Our City...Our Values

they provide the required outdoor bicycle parking, or if there are enclosed bicycle lockers, employee shower facilities, lockers or dressing areas or if there are any meaningful financial incentives for employees to bicycle to work. The bicycle parking requirement is one (1) bicycle parking space per 10 vehicle parking spaces up to a maximum of 10 spaces. Shrader asked if they expect to have many kids bicycling to the facility. This is something we will want to be aware of when planning improvements to intersections and prioritizing non-motorized improvements in the vicinity. Smiley interjected that they do expect traffic flow from kids on bicycles as well as kids walking to the location. Smiley asked if parking is influenced if there is a public bus stop. Shrader said there is no parking reduction as a result, but it is something that can be brought up in the BZA application and it should be rolled into the study for both the access, traffic generation and parking. It will be necessary to ensure that all the layers required for landscaping are looked at. The Light Industrial standards need to be used. Shrader conveyed that if they want to design to the Commercial Neighborhood standards in anticipation of a zone change it may be a good strategy for the BZA application. Shrader suggested they work backwards starting with bufferyard requirements. A Class D bufferyard is required along Evans and there are bufferyards that right now to the south is zoned Heavy Industrial which is a combination of an A and B bufferyard, which is a Class C if they are providing the bufferyard on their own property. To the west, there is a CG zone, and this will require a Class C bufferyard. Shrader mentioned there seems to be a lot of vegetation on site right now, especially at the property line. Providing a tree survey was mentioned. The City will need to understand if any trees are being taken down. If they intend to keep them, which is recommended, because they provide a more coverage and value than new vegetation, they can help count towards the bufferyard requirements. It may be a good idea to design to what the zoning will be rather than what it is right now, especially if they are planning on making an application for a variance for landscape requirements. Shrader suggested further conversation with whoever will be taking the lead on the landscaping because there is a lot to consider. There are the bufferyards and the parking lot landscape standards which for Light Industrial is one (1) large tree per eight (8) spaces and one (1) shrub, perennial, or ornamental grasses per four (4) spaces. Referring to Table 10.304 is recommended. Once the bufferyard and parking lot standards are taken care of, it will be necessary to consider the on-lot landscape standards. Pozen mentioned that the Heavy Industrial property to the south appears to have built to their standard which is the Class B. Shrader conveyed that it will be necessary to provide the 10 ft. bufferyard on their side. The non-residential standards in Section 11 will apply to the building. The main thing to note is what type of building materials are allowed and the articulation of

Our City...Our Values

the building façade. It will be helpful if they make it very clear that the building meets the standards. Pozen asked if it will be necessary to provide a “jog” every 60 ft. Shrader said this is a non-residential, non-industrial building and the standards for architectural features along the primary façade do require some sort of features to break things up. Shrader suggested they refer to Section 11.503. It can be done with offsets; however, there are other features that can be used to break things up. The predominant exterior building materials cannot be prefab metal siding, smooth face concrete block, vinyl, composite or metal siding, wood or composite wood, or glass curtain walls. Shrader asked for confirmation that the building is mainly poured concrete. Wolf confirmed. Shrader suggested they checkout the roof guidelines in Section 11.508. All mechanical equipment must be concealed. There appears to be no problem with building colors. A Zoning Clearance will be required before Building Permits are issued. A Use Variance and a number of development standard variances will be required. Shrader wants them to try to provide the number of variances they think they may need. She will review the list closely and then determine if this hits the mark or if there may be more variances that need to be included to ensure they do not have to come back to the BZA. There are three parcels that are part of this site. Shrader recognizes that the eastern most parcel is reserved for future use. However, the way that is laid out on site appears that it is developed as one parcel. Shrader thinks the parcels should be combined. This can be accomplished through the Plan Commission in one meeting without any notice to neighbors. Pozen said the current intent is to subdivide this into two lots. This has not been confirmed nor has the dividing line between one lot and another been determined. Pozen asked if they combine three parcels into one lot will it still be a Plan Commission meeting without notification to neighbors. If they subdivide into two lots is this a primary and secondary and will neighbors need to be notified. Shrader said all of this falls under a minor subdivision and does not require notification to neighbors. Shrader said the senior center appears to be on an existing lot line. It will be necessary to make sure they are not putting up a lot line that will require extra steps to address in the future. Shrader asked if they want two parcels because there will be a transfer of property, or the expectation they will seek a different zone. What is the thinking behind having two parcels versus having more of a campus on one parcel? Smiley said this is undecided at this time, but they would like to keep the conversation moving so they can evaluate what is in the best interest of both for the future should this come to fruition. Pozen asked if there is a variance for campus, two buildings on one property. Shrader stated there is a campus zone that will not be applied here. This requires providing a campus master plan. This is not a zone we will be considering. It is possible to have multiple buildings on a

Our City...Our Values

property. By keeping it all on one lot, the open space is averaged out which may be an issue especially as they build on in the future. Shrader said it may behoove them to have it all in one so there will be more flexibility in using the open space they are conserving towards the requirement. Pozen said it is his understanding that they can take this process through the site design review and the BZA before they have to finalize lots and the subdivision process. Shrader commented to an extent, but the variances are based on lot lines in many cases and this would be at their own risk. The processes can be run parallel. The Plan Commission meets the second Tuesday of the month. The next application deadline is March 12th for the April 13th meeting. Applications are on-line. The deadlines and meeting dates are on the first page of the application. The BZA meets on the third Wednesday of the month. The next deadline for the BZA is March 19th for the April 21st meeting. If they can pull everything together and feel comfortable moving forward, especially with the plat, it will be ideal if they did the April meeting for both the BZA and Plan Commission. This project is in the signature overlay district for Calumet. Shrader said the way she interprets this is that it does not have any impact on setbacks or landscaping because those apply only when you actually are fronting a signature corridor. The sign standards will apply which is a 6 ft. maximum sign. If they are anticipating needing a sign that is taller and 6 ft. a variance will be needed, and they should consider rolling it into the BZA application. Wolf said during the preliminary site review on the parking numbers his comment was consideration of sharing the parking across the street with the park area. Is this something that might be possible. Shrader said this could certainly be taken into consideration and would be part of the whole evaluation of the total parking needs. We would want at least a draft of a Parking Agreement between the Park Department and the Boys and Girls Club, with the intent that the agreement would be recorded at some point. It does not necessarily need to be recorded before the BZA meeting, but it would be good to have a preliminary blessing from the Park Department. This can be something that is considered of all of the parking needs versus the requirement. Having the pedestrian connection between the Boys and Girls Club and the park fleshed out and having the Park Board be comfortable with it and having the City feeling good about the location and how getting people across the street will be important to comfortably count spaces across the street.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)
Erosion Control Permit
Right-of-Way Permit
Detailed Site Plan

Cleanout Within 5 ft. of Building
Submit Floor Plan of Kitchen Showing Equipment
Submit Detailed Plumbing Plan
Site Improvement Permit
Sanitary Sewer Permit
State Design Releases
Building Permit
Submit List of Contractors
Contractors Registered with the City
Contact Porter County Health Department (kitchen)
Signage/Fencing Permit
Provide Calculations for Landscape Ratio, Gross FAR and Net FAR
Use Variance
Street Buffer Yard Variance
Other Variances as Required or Needed
Provide Parking Data
Zoning Clearance