



**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Meijer Store & Gas Station**  
**ADDRESS: 405/115 Porters Vale Road**

**LOCATION: City Hall**  
**DATE: July 14, 2015**

## PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

### IN ATTENDANCE:

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

Media

Email addresses for the above City of Valparaiso Departments can be found at [www.valpo.us](http://www.valpo.us).

### PRESENTERS:

Lee VanderMeulen, Progressive AE  
(616) 262-9958 / [vandermeulenl@progressiveae.com](mailto:vandermeulenl@progressiveae.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting:

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Meijer Store and Gas Station. 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:** VanderMeulen indicated the plans reviewed for the first Site Review in April were very preliminary. The drawings have been updated. VanderMeulen feels the plans are fairly complete at this time. However, the project is being reviewed for any final comments before continuing on with the project.

### STAFF COMMENTS:

**MCALPINE:** The drainage report for Porters Vale will need to be updated to include the proposed Meijer development. The previous report was prepared by Schneider in 2006 and some of the drainage patterns within the development may contradict from the actual conditions. The wetland delineation report will need to be completed for this project. The property contains a network of man-made ditches to convey storm water north into the retention pond. It will be necessary to determine the regulations governing the filling and closing of these ditches within a piped system. The retention pond appears to be 3 ft. higher than originally intended because the outlet pipe is submerged and the pond forebay is completely full. Additional investigation is needed concerning the actual normal water level of the pond. The retention pond does not have an outlet pipe which was the intent of the original report, but an overflow structure into the Hotter legal drain is warranted. McAlpine believes this has been researched by Lauth in the past and should be done now. In the past years, the water level has risen up the retaining wall and this is not believed to be the original intention of the design and certainly not the intent of the retaining wall. It will be necessary to coordinate with the Porter County Drainage Board for any overflow connections made to the adjacent channel as this a County regulated drain. There is a 15" diameter corrugated metal pipe north of the pond that drains into the retention pond, but this was not shown

in the original drainage report. This pipe needs to be removed so the northern watershed does not contribute to the flow rate into the pond. McAlpine conveyed the City has updated its drainage standards. However, for the most part, the 2006 requirements will be followed because this is the original drainage intent for this subdivision. McAlpine indicated he will discuss these items with the project engineer. Most of these comments are not related to Meijer. McAlpine mentioned he has received various correspondence from Lauth's legal counsel clarifying what is being requested; however, he has heard nothing beyond this. Kent asked if these requirements will cover any other development by Lauth. McAlpine said the new drainage report will cover everything and the undeveloped pads will need to be included in the report. McAlpine requested a copy of the soil boring report. The BMP manholes at the gas station need to be sized for a 10-year rain storm rather than the structure configuration shown. It appears there are additional structures shown and some form of routing with an overflow wier in this area. McAlpine suggested installation of one structure at the north and south ends to capture the flow. Providing a copy of the permit from IDEM or USACE for the existing wetland areas proposed to be filled is necessary. The storm sewer system on the west side of the store needs to be sized to convey a 100-year storm both from the culvert under SR49 and all of the off-site land areas from the east side of SR49. The grading plan for the site needs to show flood routing for a 100-year storm assuming the storm sewer system is plugged. The carrying capacity of the 36" storm sewer draining the parking lot needs to be analyzed further north to the detention pond outfall. Submitting flow capacity calculations for the storm sewer castings within the parking lot will be necessary. McAlpine conveyed that all storm sewer pipe needs to be reinforced concrete pipe. A drainage report, in addition to the spreadsheet calculations showing how the drainage areas and runoff coefficients were determined needs to be provided. The ditch grading work to the north should be graded as a two-stage ditch for water quality rather than just making it deeper. Some suggestions include a meandering stream, low vegetation and tree planting along the bank. Additional guidance on two-stage ditches is available within the storm water technical standards manual. The catch basin at the loading dock (CB-B2-1) needs to be modified as a BMP manhole. The storm sewer between CO-A2-2 and MH-A2-1 needs to be increased to a minimum pipe size of 12" diameter. Additional information is needed on the proposed retaining wall west of the building with regard to the tie-backs, toe anchoring and block type and color. A Rule 5 permit is required.

**BURKMAN:** Burkman indicated he reviewed the Traffic Impact Study prepared by GAI and has comments regarding this study. The bottom of page 7 concerns the trips being generated to the overall development through Porters Vale Blvd. The study states the amount of traffic using each access point to the development was selected based on the original report which has approximately 63% of total traffic using the Porters Vale Blvd. entrance. Burkman feels this is very low and expected the number to be much higher. Porters Vale Blvd. is the primary entrance, and much more heavily used especially with the population base coming from within the City. This drives a lot of the rest of the study results and output data. Burkman reiterated it seems this number should be much greater. Some of the recommendations did make sense. The study spoke to prohibiting left turns from the gas station and this is shown on the plans with the right-out pork chop island. Burkman requested this be exaggerated more so that it skews the right-turn traffic out to go south on Porters Vale. This will pull it south of the curbed median to avoid anybody trying to shortcut this intended system. The study references removing some trees north of this area to improve visibility as well as leveling the area. Burkman is unsure if this is shown on the plans; however, tree removal and where they might be replaced in the landscape plan must be coordinated with the Planning Department. The study also mentions making the center lane south bound a through right combination lane. Burkman said this does make some sense. However, Lauth or whoever takes this on needs to coordinate this with INDOT since this is SR2. It is not a City street to the north and therefore the City probably would not have much of a role in this. Burkman said if INDOT allows this, skipped lines should be added for the dual right turn lanes onto

west bound SR2. Burkman said that Outlot A is the ideal location if and when Porters Vale Blvd. is realigned to go west around the movie theater and extend north to Evans Avenue. Burkman believes that during the original site review it was said there is no current plan for building on Outlot A. This would be a great connection and extension for the City as a whole, but also for the development bringing access in from the north. Burkman said the heavily landscaped islands might provide an opportunity to direct some storm water to them and utilize a best management practice of some sort. The grading plan shows a low area that seems to touch these islands. This will go towards meeting some of the intent of the City's storm water standards and objectives as well as helping to irrigate the islands. Burkman mentioned there is an existing sanitary sewer line that is approximately 20 ft. deep that runs along the frontage of the store, very near to the front door. If there is ever an issue that requires a repair, there could be considerable disruption to the main entrance. Consideration should be given to relocation of this line while all of the other work is being done to avoid a potential interruption. Burkman reiterated a Rule 5 permit and Site Permit are required.

**THRASHER:** Each building will require a Construction Design Release from the State of Indiana prior to Building Permits being issued. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City prior to issuance of permits. All signage will require a permit.

**SOUDERS:** Souders indicated that all requests from the Fire Department concerning fire hydrants have been met. Souders presented no other comments.

**KENT:** Kent is aware there is a message center on the sign for the gas station. There will be no monument sign for the store. Providing the dumpster enclosure details on the final plans per the UDO is necessary. The maximum pole height for the signs is 25 ft. Bike racks are required. Referring to Article 9, Section 9.206 will be necessary. The final plans must indicate the location for the bike racks. Bike racks must be located within 50 ft. of the building entrances. Wave racks are recommended. The required number of bicycle parking spaces is ten. VanderMeulen asked if a bike rack will be required for the gas station. Kent suggested installation of a small rack. The final plans for the elevations need to show the measurement between the building offsets. The maximum is 80 ft. Kent said when the scale of the building with the measurements is provided, they will be reviewed to see if any variances are needed. Kent conveyed that the addition of the decorative fence for the brick material meets the standard. Kent said once these additional comments are included on the plans, the revised plans can be sent to him and he will distribute them to the departments. Kent asked about the project time-line. VanderMeulen stated they want to get the primary plat started and submit for any variances this year. They will work on construction documents over the winter and pull permits in the spring.

**EVANS:** Evans asked for clarification on sidewalk installation. VanderMeulen stated that at the last site review there was a discussion about an 8 ft. wide pathway all along the frontage. VanderMeulen said they brought the pathway all the way out to SR2; however, they are unsure how they will get to the frontage of the gas station. Evans said there are some existing crosswalks along Porters Vale Blvd. The detail does not show receiving ramps. Evans pointed out various examples. The current crosswalks at the boulevard appear to be some type of stamped, colored concrete in the asphalt. Assuming there will be a future dedication of the boulevard, Evans is requesting this style of crosswalk not be used. VanderMeulen stated they typically will use striping. Evans said this is the City's preference. Evans conveyed that inspections are required through Public Works. Given there is the potential for the future dedication of the roadways, it will be necessary to adhere to an inspection of the sub-grade after shaping and compacting. This applies to rebuilt approaches as well as to the installation of the sidewalks. Public Works will inspect after the aggregate has been placed for the sidewalks. The City requires a minimum of 4" of B-borrow underneath the sidewalks and sidewalks must be 4" thick. Under the roadways, because this is a non-residential area the requirement is 12" of #53 limestone virgin aggregate. The designs for the approaches require a minimum of 12" of crushed limestone. An inspection will be required after

the limestone has been compacted. An inspection is also required for the hot mix. The hot mix should be 3" of binder and 1-1/4" of surface; however, Evans stated that it is more ideal to work with and 1-1/2" of surface. Evans said that on some of the pavement sections show 8". This is a little light for this area. This needs to be at least 12". VanderMeulen said they have 1-1/2" on surface, 3-1/2" on the binder and 8" of stone. Evans said he knows there is a replacement value in asphalt, but the City's specifications do not indicate the replacement value with more binder and how much stone can be given up. Evans asked if the three ingress/egress areas are being rebuilt. VanderMeulen confirmed all three will be rebuilt. Evans conveyed Public Works will want to be a part of this process. VanderMeulen stated they did get a couple of cores of the existing pavement and will share this information. Evans stated in a commercial area for a collector street the distance between the front edge of the sidewalk and the back edge of the curb is 7-1/2 ft. VanderMeulen said this may be a problem at the gas station. Evans said this issue can be discussed further.

**PILARSKI:** Pilarski said after review of the plans submitted for this site review the Water Reclamation comments have not changed from the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. The April 28<sup>th</sup> comments need to be reviewed for compliance. Pilarski stated it will be necessary to complete a survey for the Pharmacy concerning the disposal of medical waste. Pilarski provided the necessary survey.

**GESKEY:** Geskey indicated that all the comments presented on April 28<sup>th</sup> have been addressed. However, Geskey stated there are a couple of additional comments that need to be addressed. The extended 10" water main requires a 2" blow-off in lieu of a plug. Geskey indicated another 10" water main has been moved and assumes it was moved to feed the lot. VanderMeulen stated they looked at the design and the grade where the main was installed was only about 1ft. below their proposed elevations so they realigned the north half. Geskey indicated this was fine. However, Geskey needs a 10" valve in the middle of this run preferably at the hydrant tee.

## **ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

### **April 28, 2015 Meeting:**

- Landscaping Plan
- Erosion Control Plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Right-of-way
- Detailed Site Plan
- Backflow Prevention
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release (for each building)
- Building Permit (for each building)
- Signage/Fencing Permit
- Zoning Clearance (for each building)
- Variance for Garden Center
- Possible Variance for Propane Tank Storage in Front of Store
- Updated Drainage Report
- Pharmaceutical Disposal Plan
- Internal Plumbing Plan (for each building)
- Knox Boxes
- All Contractors Must Be Registered With the City
- Pathway
- Easement for Property North of Store
- Photometric Plan
- Screen Wall to Hide Vehicles and Trailers
- Landscape Buffer on North Side to Block View of Trucks
- Include Percentages for Lot Coverage and Landscape Ratio on Plans

Contact Kyle Kuebler, Porter County Airport

Building Offsets

Bicycle Parking

**July 14, 2015 Meeting:**

Include Dumpster Enclosure Details on Final Plans

Provide Soil Boring Report

Provide Copy of Permit from IDEM/USACE for Filling in Wetlands

Provide Flow Capacity Calculations for Storm Sewer Castings in Parking Lot

Public Works Inspections for Sidewalks and Roadways