

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: EJC Property Group
Restaurant
ADDRESS: 3712 Calumet Avenue
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: Zoom
DATE: July 13, 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
Matt Zurbruggen, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / mzurbruggen@valpo.us
Nate McGinley, Water Dept.
(219) 462-6174 / nmcginley@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Steve DeBold, Chester, Inc.
(219-465-7555 / sdebold@chesterinc.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed to be located at . Lemmon 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 the EJC Property Group, which will eventually be the LePeep Restaurant located at 3712 Calumet Avenue, in the southeast corner of Calumet Avenue and Finney Drive. It is also located on C2 within the North Hampstead PUD Subdivision. The parcel is 3.28 acres and is zoned PUD. The parcels to the north, west and east are also zoned PUD. The parcels to the south are zoned CG, Commercial General and UR, Urban Residential. The parcel is mostly dense grass with an existing mature tree line serving as a bufferyard along the south property line and a small parking lot accessed off of Finney Drive, located near the northwest corner of the parcel. The proposed building will be 5,300 sq. ft. restaurant building with an outdoor patio area in the northwest corner of the property. They are planning on re-

excavating the adjacent detention pond to clean it up. The existing detention pond is overgrown and needs of some beautification. They plan on regrading what is already there and slightly deepening the pond and creating a location for a future water feature at the south end of the pond. The detention pond will be seeded with a Cardinal Storm Water seed mix from elevations 833 to 830.5 and a Cardinal Economy Prairie seed mix from elevations 835 to 833. This will keep the pond at a natural look and provide low maintenance for the pond so that the overgrowth does not happen again. Access to the site will be gained at the existing curb cut off of Finney Drive. The restaurant is required to have 61 parking spaces and 6 bicycle spaces. They are providing 77 vehicle parking spaces and 7 bicycle parking spaces. A 5 ft. concrete sidewalk will be provided along Finney Drive connecting to the existing sidewalk at Calumet Avenue. They will be providing a sidewalk and striped crosswalk connecting to the existing commercial areas to the north. The fire and domestic services will leave the building on the north side. Backflow prevention will be provided for the domestic service. Connection to the existing water main will take place on the south side of Finney Drive. A 6" water service will be installed and extended to the south to provide a tap for the future development planned for the parcel. The sanitary service will leave the building in the northwest corner of the building. An exterior, 1,000-gallon grease and oil separator will be installed. There is an existing 8" sanitary stub located north of the entrance. They will be extending this 8" sanitary service line south for a future tie in for future development. Storm water will be directed to the existing detention pond and all parking lot areas will be directed to proposed storm catch basins that will convey storm water to the existing pond. All of the storm sewers and grates for the structures are oversized to handle an over 100-year storm and for any future development that happens on this parcel.

STAFF COMMENTS:

ZURBRIGGEN: The site plan looks good with the detail provided. As discussed, the runoff coefficient is going to be .52 for the whole section draining to the pond. Zurbrigggen asked if there is any information concerning the other three areas. DeBold stated there was kind of a concept put together for the future areas. The drive will wrap around the three areas to tie everything together, but they have not calculated what the runoff coefficient is. For this development alone they are at .4 and it is below the .52. Right now, they are planning on moving forward with what they have. When they have more of an idea of what the future development will be, they will zone into where they need to be and decide if any changes need to be made to storm water when that time arrives. Zurbrigggen conveyed that he has done a preliminary review of the drainage calculations provided. A full engineering review will be provided within the next week or so.

However, moving forward they need to be aware that the coefficient is .52 for the other sites. Zurbruggen said there was a calculation for the parking spaces required for the entire development, or at least for LaPeep itself. Was that calculation provided? DeBold explained that this calculation is provided on Sheet C4. Zurbruggen is aware the roads will be private. There is an intersection for all four parking lots. Will stop signs be installed on the internal circular area for traffic safety? DeBold stated they were not planning on doing anything even though three other buildings are being planned. It is a pretty small area and they didn't think stop signs would be necessary.

LAIRD: The Engineering Department will require a Site Plan for erosion control, Sanitary Sewer Permit, and a Right-of-Way Permit. These permits are approved through the Engineering Department but submitted with the Building Permit application. DeBold conveyed that a plan has been sent to Mingyan Zhou so that she can start the review for erosion control because the plans are pretty final at this point. Once comments are received, they will be submitting for a Building Permits and all other permits mentioned. Laird said the review is on-going and comments should be provided relatively quickly.

MCGINLEY: McGinley deals with the water and sanitary sewer services. The proposed fire suppression service will need to have a 6" valve off the tap so there is an area to shut the 6" down. As normal the Water Department will maintain from the 6" valve, from the valve to the building will be the private side. A curb stop needs to be shown on the 1-1/4". The Water Department will maintain from the main to the curb stop. Type K copper will be required from the main to the curb stop. Their side can be plastic, but the City side needs to be 1-1/4" copper. There is an 8" valve and stub off the 8" main at the gravel parking lot. There is an 8" main that runs east and west and there is a short stub of 8" and then there is an 8" valve that heads south. It was previously mentioned that they were going to extend 6" from that point. Will this be a private main into the development? DeBold confirmed it will be a 6" private service line for the other development of this property. McGinley said the only comment he has on this is that if any of the other three properties become delinquent on their account and they would need to be shut off that would be the valve the Water Department would go to for turn off. McGinley asked if they have any idea how they will setup the agreement for the other three facilities for water service. This would be the only access for City-owned shutoff. DeBold said there have been some discussion about how this will be handled and believes it will be under one owner and they will pay the bill for the whole site. McGinley stated they can continue to discuss this off line as we move forward. DeBold said he was aware of the tap on the north side of the drive, but it is pretty crowded there with the sanitary. He feels the south side of the drive is a better location to provide for the future

services. McGinley said the 8" main is on the south side of Finney Drive and there is a water valve at the northwest corner of the existing parking lot. McGinley asked if DeBold was talking about extending the 6" from this point or from a different point. DeBold said there is a water main that runs adjacent to Finney Drive. He is talking about another connection south of the proposed drive, just south of the hydrant. McGinley said he got that mixed up with the edge of the parking lot. The 6" tap and valve will be installed there and extended from that point. McGinley stated the Water Department has televised the sanitary sewer in the manhole in the island. There is approximately 64 ft. of PVC, stubbed directly south. Are they proposing that the system within the development be a private system? DeBold confirmed it will be a private system. If this will be the case, the easiest point for the City to break ownership would be the manhole in the island because from that point on it is 8" but then there is a connection to a cleanout. McGinley advised there are two ways to do this. We either break ownership at this manhole and it would be a private lateral from the manhole south into the development, or we would need to setup another City spec manhole where the cleanout is and an easement would be required so the City could maintain to that manhole. It will be necessary to decide if we treat this as a private lateral from the existing manhole in the island or if we want to discuss the possibility of setting another 4 ft. manhole at the 840-contour line. McGinley feels the easiest thing is to treat it as a private lateral from the manhole in the island south. DeBold stated this is what was discussed with the owner and DeBold thinks this will be fine. McGinley mentioned that it will be necessary to contact Shaun Shifflett from the Metering Department for meter sizing. Backflow will be required as mentioned, and this also needs to be discussed with Shifflett. Shifflett can be reached at 219-462-6174, Ext. 1322, or ssifflett@Wvalpo.us.
FAHEL: The plumbing plan looks good. Fahel is aware that a grease/oil interceptor is being installed. Fahel asked that they submit a floor plan for the kitchen.

STITES: All initial inspections required through the construction phase must be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. Contractors working on fire systems and life safety systems must contact Stites prior to any installation work.

THRASHER: A Construction Design Release for the building, hood system, sprinkler system, and fire alarm system will be required from the State of Indiana. A local Building Permit is required. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City. It will be necessary to work through the processes required by the Porter County Health Department. Signage will require a separate permit. Thrasher asked about what will be done with the old restaurant

building. DeBold said at this point they do not know. Thrasher said if the building is repurposed, it may require a site review.

SHRADER: Shrader mentioned that some early coordination was done on the project and some items have been updated. It is good to see the sidewalk along Finney. We do have the pedestrian connection across Finney that gets you from the parking on the north side to the new LePeep on the south. This is good because the intent for this area in the PUD is that the parking will be shared between all of the uses in the commercial area. Shrader stated that the parking is clearly sufficient for the proposed LePeep. We will need to keep an eye on it going forward with the future development. As discussed before, the PUD states the commercial area shall have 248 spaces. If this is fully built out parking, clearly there is less than that and there is also less commercial area by acreage and less square footage than proposed in the original PUD. Shrader said that because there is a mix of uses, we need to look at the shared parking table to understand the parking needs for site as a whole. For now, we are good with the parking as proposed. We have discussed before that the standards in the PUD are finite, there is not a whole lot there, so we will take guidance from the PUD as much as it allows us to. For the character of the buildings, there are a couple things in the PUD that Shrader wants to touch on. Shrader is aware that they disagree with the City's understanding about when the PUD is silent what takes over. Shrader knows that they would prefer to interpret it that the previous Zoning Ordinance that was in place when the PUD was established would be the underlying code which, of course, has no standards at all for commercial buildings of this size. Our interpretation is that unless the PUD specifically calls out an underlying Zoning Code and a date for when that is tied to the PUD the underlying code evolves as amendments are made to the code. The underlying code as Shrader understands it is our UDO. She is aware that they disagree with this, but she thinks there is a way through this, and everything can be kept on track and above board and have a successful project. Specific in the PUD it does talk about buildings addressing the street differently in a pleasant manner and the character of the commercial area being consistent with Chandana Point and other commercial areas in the general neighborhood and designed to look like a traditional downtown area with buildings close to the street with uniformity and consistency along Calumet. Some of these things are met. Shrader thinks that what may need a little work is how the buildings address the street. This is a particular challenge for this site because it is on a corner lot on Finney and it is on Calumet. It is a Signature Corridor and they also have the main pedestrian entrance from the east where the parking lot is and the patio to the south which also is an important façade for the development. Essentially there is 360 degrees of façade to concern themselves with. They need someplace for a back

Our City...Our Values

of house. There is no discussion about transparency in the PUD, but the standards we have in the UDO are based on the design principles of development that is pedestrian friendly and is consistent with the vision for the PUD. If there is an opportunity to use some spandrel glass along the Finney façade so that there is a framed-in window to create a little bit of that more traditional feel instead of having a completely blank façade along Finney it would be more consistent with the PUD language and it would bring us closer to what the underlying code has as far as requirements. Shrader feels that some sort of glazing there, even if it is in an area where transparency isn't appropriate will be a benefit to the project as a whole. With that, there is an inconsistency between the proposed and standards. In our nonresidential building standards, the goal is 60% on a primary facade and 30% along all other street frontages. Shrader knows they have not planned to provide these percentages. It appears they are under them on both. Shrader said there is some leniency we can use with the staff level PUD amendment process that is laid out in our UDO. We can adjust it and make sure we are following all the standards and keep the project on track schedule-wise. This is the main concern with the building design. DeBold asked what will be proposed if they cannot meet the standards. The side that faces Finney Drive is the kitchen side and loading areas for the facility. Shrader understands there has to be a back of house somewhere and understands why they put it on Finney Drive. They don't want to put it on Calumet, and they can't have it where they have the pedestrian entrance. Shrader stated that the solution she worked through with other commercial buildings, particularly restaurants with similar situations is having windows, they are a true window, but they are not transparent. Essentially a wall can be put in front of them, or they can put whatever they needed in front of them. They could use a different type of glass that does not allow transparency or some type coating over it, but still have it so it is not a blank façade against the street. The project architect asked if there is a size or square footage of spandrel window that Shrader would like to see on Finney Drive. Shrader said we have the goals that are set for us in the UDO. The primary façade is where the entrance is taken. This could be adjusted in the PUD because there is no specific language about that. We could assign a primary façade and set a goal based on what they can accomplish and what is the standard based on some of the other structures that are in North Hampstead. Shrader suggested they try to do something similar to what is across the street. If this can't be accomplished, they need to come as close as they can. We will look at the percentages and adjust the PUD to allow for this specifically so that there is no BZA process required. The architect will do some work on this and send revised elevations. Shrader mentioned that she spoke briefly with the owner about this and he is prepared a little bit for this. We can

Our City...Our Values

talk off line about how to adjust the PUD. Shrader is very enthusiastic about helping them through this. It is a staff level process and feels we can have a successful outcome by using the staff level PUD amendment because everything they are suggesting is not a major amendment and it is not something that is increasing density or changing the use. They are just development standards and they can be adjusted between us as long as we understand that in general they are meeting the spirit of the PUD. Shrader stated that she wanted to know a little bit more about the aluminum siding. The PUD states a variety of materials that are encouraged, and this does fall within that. For the UDO, we did just add as a permitted material for a predominant material, which based on the elevations she considers the metal panels predominant. Architectural composite metal siding is specifically called out as permitted. The architect stated that the owner has seen samples of the product. The product has a wood look. It replicates the look of a butt-jointed cedar board siding, and it has grain and color to it. The panels come out at six different prints of grain. As it is mixed up by the carpenters putting it up, it has a much more random look to it and does not look as uniform as a traditional metal panel and the wood grain itself is pretty convincing. The architect does have a sample, if Shrader would like to see it. The product is made by a company called Quality Edge and this line is called Vesta. Shrader wants to understand the durability of the product. They did look at several products and the architect could not remember if this has a limited lifetime warranty or guaranteed for 30-40 years. They have used Quality Edge products on other projects, but none in Valparaiso. The products are very durable, and they look great when they are put up. Shrader said she would like to see the sample. Shrader asked for the width of the sidewalk being proposed along Finney. DeBold stated it is 5 ft. wide. Shrader conveyed that they have done a good job with the shrubs and perennials around the building. One thing that is missing and that is important for the PUD as she looks at the development as a whole at how it has been built-out is street trees. Typically, we see 50 ft. on center street trees. Across the street at the old LePeep, the north side of Finney Drive, there are just two. There is limited space at the site. They chose a columnar maple tree. There is an existing tree on the south side of Finney and is assuming that will be removed. Shrader feels there is an opportunity to choose a species that plays more nicely with concrete than a shallow rooted maple. Some other columnar species and just in this area probably two trees would be enough to create the balance along Finney Drive. In order to keep the rhythm of the street trees coming in, it will be important to have a few in there. Shrader is interested in knowing a little more about the seed mixes and the height of the perennials and grasses that are part of the Cardinal mixes in the retention pond because it is essentially serving as the Signature Corridor bufferyard for this

Our City...Our Values

development. Shrader's preference is to have a few trees somewhere along there because there are a few trees north of Finney Drive. She is aware that they have to be choosy about the species, but she would really like to see a few street trees. It will be necessary to ensure they are not covering up signage on the building but feels there is enough room for them to have a few trees. DeBold asked if she meant street trees along Calumet Avenue. Shrader stated along both Calumet and Finney. She believes there is enough room for a couple up next to LaPeep and some further east along Finney as you approach the residential area just to keep up the rhythm of the pattern that is already established. She would like to see a few trees somewhere in that outlot, whether it is on the slope right next to LaPeep's property line or closer to the sidewalk along Calumet Avenue. DeBold asked if the trees need to be in the right-of-way or on LaPeep's property. He is asking because there is a lot of utilities there, especially south, of the entry drive. DeBold said he will be hesitant to place any trees south because of the utilities simply because he does not want to have to take them out when they develop. Eventually, there will probably be a building right there and does not want to have to take them out to regrade the area. Shrader conveyed that right now, the trees are in the right-of-way and the maple tree she mentioned earlier is in the right-of-way just east of the light pole. Along Finney, if they fit, they belong in the right-of-way and if they don't, they could be accommodated at the edge of the site. It will be necessary to work around the utilities to do what will work best. Shrader said she knows there are some ideas percolating about the balance of the site and recognizes that we may have to come back and look at or amend the PUD once there is clearer vision of what the development looks like, she feels we can do a "surgical;" amendment to address the things that are silent and not conforming with the UDO pretty quickly and easily. It will not require any public hearings or meetings. It will just require staff level approval and rerecording the document. DeBold ask if this needs to be done now. As discussed in earlier meetings, what they are trying to do is get this project started and then amend the PUD after that. Shrader stated that in order for a Zoning Clearance to be issued we would want the amendment done. The parking doesn't need to be amended at this time. As the site further develops, the parking probably needs to be amended. The expectations for the commercial development also need to be amended, but because the site is not fully built out, we do not necessarily have to deal with this right now. We do need to address specifically the lack of architectural standards. A few more will have to written into the PUD to cover the concerns we have where the building does not meet the standards of the UDO. This can be addressed in a PUD amendment at the staff level and leave the rest of the PUD alone. DeBold mentioned street trees again and wanted to clarify that Shrader wants street trees along Calumet.

Our City...Our Values

Shrader confirmed. We will need to be careful with all the utilities coming through in that location, and she is unsure with the NIPSCO easement if they have any rules about what can be planted under neath and knows there are concerns about the visibility of the restaurant, but still feels there needs to be some vertical element, even if they are clustered. If you look north at Finney Drive, there are no street trees 50 ft. on center like there is downtown or other parts of the City. DeBold said the reason he is bring this up again is that their lot does not front on Calumet, the outlot does. DeBold said responsibility for providing street trees is something that should have been done at the subdivision level at that time, and not the responsibility of this parcel. DeBold stated that he will discuss this with the owner to see how the owner feels about this, but these street trees potentially block visibility of the businesses that are planned for the area. DeBold's thought on the issue is that it is not this parcels responsibility to provide street trees along Calumet, when they do not front Calumet Avenue. Shrader understands where they are coming from; however, Outlot A is part of the PUD, and we are looking at this as a whole. Whether it is on the parcel that is being developed or it is on the outlot, Shrader thinks some street trees are needed between the development and Calumet Avenue. DeBold asked if he could receive a copy of the meeting recording. Shrader said it can be provided. **JABO:** Asked how pedestrians are supposed to circulate back and forth. It appears on the plans that pedestrians are forced to walk in the aisles. Is there a plan for sidewalks on the perimeter for pedestrian circulation? DeBold said that the blank areas that surround the cross-shaped parking lot will all eventually have building locations and sidewalks that will line the parking spaces and extend to connect to one another.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Landscaping Plan | Sign Permit |
| Street Trees | Zoning Clearance |
| Erosion Control Plan | |
| Right-of-Way Permit | |
| Detailed Site Plan | |
| Backflow Prevention-Contact Shaun Shifflett | |
| Site Improvement Permit | |
| State Design Release (building, hood system, sprinkler system, fire alarm system) | |
| Building Permit | |
| Contractors Registered with the City | |
| Contact Porter County Health Department | |
| Submit Kitchen Floor Plan | |

Our City...Our Values