



MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: CVS Store
ADDRESS: 150 Morthland Drive

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: February 26, 2008

**PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW
IN ATTENDANCE:**

Craig Phillips, Planning Director	(219) 462-1161
Tyler Kent, Asst. Planner	(219) 462-1161
Dave Pilz, Engineering Director	(219) 462-1161
Jack Johnson, Fire Department	(219) 462-8325
Ed Pilarski, Water Reclamation Dept.	(219) 464-4973
Chuck McIntire, Water Dept.	(219) 462-6174
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner	(219) 462-1161
Rick Walstra, Comcast	(866) 594-1234
Steve Martinson, Parks Dept.	(219) 462-5144
Media	

PRESENTERS:

Richard Anderson, Attorney 219-769-1892
randerson@andersonward.com

Craig Forgey, Gershman Brown Crowley
317-819-0116
cforgey@gershmanbrowncrowley.com

Bryan Foxworthy, Gershman Brown Crowley
317-819-0132
bfoxworthy@gershmanbrowncrowley.com

John McGregor, American Structurepoint
317-547-5580
jmcgregor@structurepoint.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:

The Site Review Committee met to discuss a proposed CVS Store. Pilz 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.

Anderson explained that it's essential for CVS to be at a certain point in the process to ensure commitment. The date is still unclear as to when the project will begin. The detailed engineering drawings have been submitted. Drawings of the out lot are also available for review. The goal is to eliminate some of the issues to be resolved from the previous site review. The INDOT approval is in the process regarding the curb cut on US 30 and the Landscape Plan had been submitted. Martinson stated he briefly reviewed the Landscape Plan and plant materials had not been named. McGregor added there is a plant schedule. A copy of the Landscape Plan can be provided for Martinson's assessment.

Phillips clarified that an approval of a plan will not be possible at this point however; comments can be shared at this meeting. Aside from site review, a separate review can be done if necessary.

Forgey conveyed the lease with the bank expires in 2013 however; they are trying to work with the bank to get things started earlier. In order to close on the property, CVS needs some sort of approval indicating that this site can be built. Phillips explained this is not an approval and an approval cannot be given years in advance for this project. Site review is valid for 1 year therefore; coming before site review again will be required. Anderson explained that if the bank can distinguish that a plan is in place as well as a new location for them, this may perhaps help the process.

Pilz stated that the Erosion Control Plan has not been complete due to more information needed. McGregor said he received comments from Matt Kras and these comments will be addressed in the future. Pilz stated that the right-of-way for the frontage road along US 30 will need to be dedicated before any permits can be issued. McGregor said at the original site review a 22' wide frontage road was requested however; a 24' wide road is being provided instead. The plan indicates the frontage road being provided in the form of a 40' access easement. Phillips clarified that a 15' greenbelt will be required between the right-of-way on US 30 and the facility. Since this right-of-way has to be dedicated, it's preferred that the 15' be on the outside and this will then provide a maintained 15' planning area which is required by the ordinance. Variances shouldn't be approached as an entitlement and verification is critical indicating the need. Since the site is an awkward shape, caution needs to be taken to prevent it from being over developed. There is a possibility the parking can be reconfigured since 18 spaces are required and 25 are provided. Lot coverage also needs to be considered and cannot exceed 75% maximum. When the out lot is developed, this could present a problem if developed separately. Phillips reiterated that site review is not an approval and coming back again before site review is necessary when the project takes place. Rules could change therefore; this project will be subjected to the rules at the time it's built. Since the roadway must be dedicated, the 15' greenbelt is going to be a bit of a problem. Stronger emphasis will be placed along US 30 with higher standards in terms of signage, landscaping, and architecture therefore; toning down the buffer isn't a possibility. Phillips acknowledged if the landscape area tapers, becoming much larger in an area and then narrower in another, this would be considered as long as the average is sufficient. It appears CVS is favorable but the out lot is a concern. **Forgey** explained the intention is to build CVS and the out lot is to possibly create a space for the bank. This would then allow CVS to be build now as opposed to waiting until later. Phillips said if the bank facility isn't going to be Chase, modifying the parking lot may be possible. Currently there is a lot of excess pavement in that lot. The frontage road can go to the north as long as it connects properly and the greenbelt must avoid being in the dedication of the right-of-way, going across the property substantially. A Detailed Site Plan was submitted however the issues are still pending.

Pilz pointed out that creating 2 lots may require going through the subdivision process and Phillips confirmed it is necessary. The CVS store could be built now and subdividing the out lot at a later time is acceptable. The out lot is available for CVS to purchase and they are deciding whether or not they have a need for it. Phillips commented that the use of detention ponds in the front yard must be heavily landscaped according to drawing 9.5, or what's referred to as boulevard streets, in the ordinance. Using bio swales with native materials and grasses is recommended for improved infiltration. Signage for both projects is limited to a monument style sign that is 6' maximum in height. If there are any size issues or concerns, receiving a variance isn't likely unless it can be proven from the roadway that it's not visible. Changing the ordinance to base signage on speed or volume of roadway is a future possibility. The Landscape Plan and Tree Survey must be approved. The replacement ratio will far exceed the trees that need to be cleared because of grading. This calculation must be stated on the Landscape Plan. The enclosure indicates on the drawing that it's enclosed completely with masonry. The US 30 guidelines does require this and the public isn't supposed to notice this area at all. It's actually supposed to be considered as part of the building. Phillips repeated that the big concern with this project is the out lot.

Pilarski explained at the original site review that a Detailed Facility Plumbing Plan had been requested for approval and as of yet, it hasn't been received. The discharges from the facility must meet the Sewer Use Ordinance. A survey regarding medical wastes must also be completed. The Detailed Facility Plumbing Plan and the survey must be submitted and approved before occupancy. Pilarski will send a copy of the Sewer Use Ordinance and the survey. It's essential to contact the Engineering Department and Collections Divisions regarding the sanitary sewer connections.

Forgey added that in order for CVS to close, it's important to obtain the Site Permit. Phillips made it clear that this too will expire. Anderson inquired if an extension can be given concerning this. Pilz stated more than likely there are no provisions and generally the accepted length for the permit is one year. **See statements following minutes.** Phillips explained that the Zoning Clearance involves architecture and if there are any changes, this may need to be reissued at some point in the future. **Forgey** said he can provide the architectural elevations and renderings. The goal at this time is to obtain the Site Permit rather than the Building Permit. Phillips mentioned that drawings, architectural elevations, lighting, and landscape plans will be necessary if full site approval is required.

Martinson was pleased with the Landscape Plan. Planting native wildflowers in the bottom and up to the top of the detention basins is recommended. Maintaining a nice edging around the top will be appealing. Walstra didn't have any questions or comments.

Johnson stated that his comments from the previous site review are the same regarding the fire department connections. Contacting the Fire Department is necessary in reference to this and a Knox Box is also required. Johnson expressed concern in relation to the eastbound turn off of US 30. This is a high risk for accidents and is unfavorable from a safety standpoint.

McIntire stated according to the last site review minutes, contacting him was necessary and no one has contacted him as of yet. The retaining wall over the water main easement is a problem. Further discussion is needed regarding this. One of the requirements concerning the water is that it's tied in, and looped up at Washington Street with an additional fire hydrant placed in the corner area. Rather than the 12" that comes up to this fire hydrant, 8" will be required to come up and loop into Washington Street. McIntire requested a layout in order to get started to mark it up and get it done. A retaining wall close to the water main is going to be an issue. McGregor said there is a 30' easement but there is 10' to 12' between the right-of-way line and the proposed retaining wall that could easily plant the water main. McIntire acknowledged since it's not installed yet, it's workable. Keeping it at least 5' away from the retaining wall is imperative. McIntire stated this can go in the right-of-way rather than an easement. The reason for the easement is because of the water main on the south side of US 30 and running parallel water mains in the right-of-ways is not allowed. Information can be sent indicating how this is currently laid out.

Section 1225 PERMIT TERM AND VALIDITY FOR A SITE PERMIT:

- A) If the work is not started within three months of the date of issuance, the permit shall be null and void.**
- B) If there is a lull of 6 months or greater in the prosecution of the work, the City Engineer may declare the permit null and void.**

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping plan (with Tree Survey)
- Erosion control plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Right-of-way Dedication
- Detailed Site Plan
- Detailed Facility Plumbing Plan / Survey
- Sanitary/Sewer
- Backflow Prevention
- Knox Box
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release
- Building Permit
- Sign Permit
- Zoning Clearance