

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Cascade Place
ADDRESS: 604 Silhavy Road
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: City Hall
DATE: September 1, 2020

IN ATTENDANCE:

Beth Shrader, Planning Director
(219) 462-1161 / bshrader@valpo.us
Bill Laird, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / blaird@valpo.us
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us
Mark Geskey, Water Dept.
(219) 462-6174 / mgeskey@valpo.us
Paul Scott, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / pscott@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us
Brent Dickson, Public Works Dept.
(219) 462-4612 / bdickson@valpo.us
Mike Jessen, City Administrator
(219) 462-1161 / mjessen@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Russ Pozen, DVG Team, Inc.
(219) 281-4068 / rpozen@dvgtteam.com
David Soto, Atwater Group
(317) 446-7021 / soto@atwatergroup.com
George Grcevich, Ascend Real Estate Advisors
(219) 515-3437 / ggrcevich@AreaSold.com

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Cascade Place Develop to be located at 604 Silhavy Road. 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: Soto stated this is an approximate 10-acre light industrial parcel. There were early meetings with the Planning Department to discuss the site and what they wanted to accomplish. The proposed use for the front portion will be climate-controlled self-storage and will be approximately 90,000 sq. ft. The back area will light industrial. This will be a classic climate-controlled facility and fits the light industrial zoning. The building will be single-story with a 45,000 sq. ft. climate-controlled portion and the remainder of the storage will be not be climate-controlled. They are proposing a roadway to the north to connect the two properties. The back portion will be a 24,000 sq. ft. light industrial building. This portion is speculative, and no tenants have been identified for the use. Pozen said the 10-acre parcel will be divided into two lots. The intent now is that the access drive on the north part of the front building will

not be a public road. It will be an ingress/egress easement. The main utilities for both lots will be in this easement. The front yard setback is 25 ft. There is also an additional 36 or 37 ft. beyond the setback before the parking area. A sign is shown. Pozen mentioned they want to ensure that they are interpreting the rear and side yard setbacks correctly. Pozen said there was a lot of discussion concerning the driveway location. Pozen passed out an aerial to the committee. He stated that City staff mentioned they would like to have the driveway for this project be an "S" curve. Pozen indicated they have an in-house traffic engineering expert who performed an analysis. Pozen believes that Silhavy is a major collector street, Cascade is a minor collector and Beech is a minor collector. This is per the INDOT and City websites. Unified Development Ordinance Section 9.403(a) states that a driveway cannot be nearer than 75 feet to a collector. Pozen believes that the straight driveway they are showing is over 150 ft. from Cascade and it is slightly less from their driveway to the driveway to the north. Shrader asked if they are basing Silhavy Road on an INDOT classification. Pozen said the classification is based on INDOT and the City ordinance. Shrader conveyed that the Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Valparaiso classifies Silhavy as a minor arterial and this takes precedence. Pozen will recheck their information. Pozen asked if 200 ft. is the required width between a minor arterial and a driveway. Shrader confirmed this distance. Pozen said this may need a variance. Pozen advised that their traffic expert believes this is a much safer and better drive for this project. Pozen mentioned that making the driveway an "S" with the four-way intersection creates 32 points of potential conflict. A two-way will create 6 points. Pozen mentioned there will be detention in the back and it will meet the ordinance. Since this is light industrial, they want to have a dry basin. They want the basin to be approximately 7 ft. Pozen said they did look at open space and densities and he feels they meet the requirements. They have 35% LSR. They are low on the net FAR. Pozen believes that variances for these items will not be required; however, he will wait to hear from the City on these issues. Pozen believes the required front yard green space is 30 ft. Their plans show 37 ft. The minimum building setback is 60 ft. The building is setback farther than the required 60 ft. Shrader clarified that the landscape area is a requirement, but the setback can have parking. Shrader said what their plans show does appear to meet requirements for front yard green space and building setback. Pozen mentioned that he is concerned about the need for a variance for the side yard setback if the lots are divided. Shrader will research this issue.

STAFF COMMENTS:

SHRADER: Shrader said this is a very narrow, unique parcel that has not been developed for a long time. The frontage that is available is a small fraction of the

total depth of the property. The property fronts on a minor arterial with too many driveways. We are in the engineering phase for a redo of Silhavy Road. Bill Laird mentioned the Silhavy project is scheduled for 2020-2021. The project will include a dedicated left turn lane down the center of Silhavy from both directions. Shrader conveyed the geometry of the site and access to the site present challenges. There is light industrial zoning to the north and this does not present a conflict. However, there are two elements to the south. One is residential and buffering is required. Shrader indicated that she would not ever recommend a variance for a buffer. Soto asked if this is in the County. Shrader confirmed that it is in the County; however, it will be treated as the equivalent zoning in the City. Shrader conveyed a buffer is required on each side of a zone change. If one of the parties is not providing the buffer, then both buffers must be included on the side being developed. On this site there is a combination of Class A and Class B buffers. These can be built adjacent to each other or the property developer can opt to build the next most dense or opaque standard which in this case will be a Class E. Shrader said the A & B will be a 50 ft. wide buffer with a 5 ft. berm. The Class E is a 40 ft. wide buffer with a 6 ft. berm. The planting requirements are very dense. The buffers are required for appropriate transitioning between residential and light industrial. Shrader said Engineering and Planning feel that the buffer yards and the drive location are the two most important issues for this site. Shrader indicated that essentially a very good, sound documented argument from them will be needed, if a variance is to be considered for the location of the drive. Pozen asked if the City will require a traffic study or traffic analysis. Laird indicated they want to see trip generation and distribution values. Engineering wants a very valid, factual document that proves that offsetting the drive provides the same or better functional and operational characteristics of Silhavy as if the drive were aligned with Beech Street. Pozen said providing the requested information will not be a problem. Shrader understands that they did one analysis with Silhavy as a collector. The information she provided over the months was based on Silhavy as a minor arterial which is our classification in our UDO and Thoroughfare Plan. The driveway spacing for a minor arterial is more stringent. The requirement is 200 ft. between drives and includes driveways, not just roads. The spacing for drives across from a street must be 75 ft. Two locations were found that fit this requirement. A location right across from Beech meets all the standards, with enough width to install an adequate drive. The other location is like what is being shown on the drawing dated 5/18. The issue with this location is when you do the spacing you only get 7 ft. This is not enough, and a variance would be required. Pozen hopes the in-depth analysis will prove that their drive design is better and safer. Pozen thanked Shrader for explaining the buffer requirements. Shrader mentioned with only one access

point and the range of uses allowed in light industrial, a second emergency egress may be needed. A 60 ft. dedicated easement has been discussed. Also, there was a discussion about building a City road that connected from Cascade to Silhavy Road through the site. However, this was scaled back because it reduced the developable space and standards for a City road could not be met. Therefore, a private drive seems more appropriate. As a safety precaution, acting on the ability to use the easement, something could be constructed that could function as an emergency egress, but remain a side yard for the industrial use on Cascade. The easement goes right up to the building and would only be used for emergency purposes. There are examples throughout the City where we have done a grass pavers or something could be constructed that will meet the standards to allow an emergency vehicle to pass through. Tim Stites said this needs to be discussed further. Stites will also make a site visit. Pozen said from what he is hearing this will need to be a minimum section to provide fire truck access between Cascade and this site. Stites mentioned that if a pavement section is built it will have to be built to handle the largest fire truck. If grass pavers are used, it will have to be properly marked so that people do not landscape the area. It will also need to be plowed in the winter months. Shrader mentioned there will probably be a lot of coordination with the land owner. Shrader conveyed the easement is a legal document and unfortunately, they have built right up to the easement. Shrader realizes there are questions concerning Gross LSR, Gross FAR, etc. The minimum parcel size for development appears to meet requirements. The LSR is .3 for both uses and this is the minimum. The Gross FAR for the industrial use is .478 and warehousing is .903. Shrader does not believe the Net FAR will be different for the two uses. She will need to check if the detention basin is eliminated from the Net FAR. Pozen mentioned that his calculations for the FAR for both buildings is .26. Shrader said the Gross FAR's she mentioned are the maximums. Shrader said they can go through the BZA to get any variances that may be required first and then split the site or they can split it first, contingent on any sort of variances needed and then go to BZA. Shrader would prefer they go to the BZA first because this is more of an owner process and then to the split. The industrial site with the narrow drive coming through causes concern. The required width is 125 ft. Pozen believes it is only 60 ft. and may need a variance. Shrader will check this. She may be able to take the width at the rear and a variance may not be required; however, typically the requirement is the width at the right-of-way. Shrader mentioned that because there is an industrial zone there is some flexibility with what is considered off-premise signage. Shrader recommended they combine the signage for both locations. The height limit for signage in a signature corridor is 6 ft. Pozen asked about the possibility of a pole sign.

Our City...Our Values

Shrader conveyed that pole signs are not permitted but will check on wall signs. Signage will require a permit. There was discussion concerning setbacks. Shrader will need to check on the setbacks. All calculations will need to be shown on the plans when submitting for variances or permits. Shrader asked if the owner of both parcels will be the Atwater Group. Soto said for the time being the parcels will be owned by Atwater. Shrader indicated the proper legal easements are needed to allow cross-access for both parcels. The easements need to be recorded and this needs to be accomplished before final plat. Shrader noted that there were a lot of trees on this site and they were removed from the parcel without a required tree survey. A tree survey was required before removal to show the City the trees were non-exempt. Shrader said there is a \$500 fine* connected to this and the fine needs to be paid before proceeding with the project. (*See attached PDF from Unified Development Ordinance)

STITES: The Fire Department follows all adopted codes, standards and rules of the Indiana Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission, as well as 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 the Fire Department prior to beginning work. Any questions concerning the fire safety components of the building should be directed to Stites. Contact information is provided above. Access is an important issue. Stites will send information regarding the turning radius of their largest truck. Stites said a Knox key activation for the gate will be necessary. Based on the square footages of the large building in the front and the large building in the rear, these building will need to be sprinkled. Stites reiterated that fire protection contractors must contact him for FDC placement and equipment installation. Stites will make a site visit and further discussion concerning access, etc. will be needed.

GESKEY: Geskey said it will be necessary to run an 8" water main down to the end of the first parcel. It can be stubbed there with an auto flusher. When the back parcel is sold, the water main can be continued. The fire hydrant between the two buildings is acceptable. There is also a fire hydrant on Silhavy. Geskey said when the second building is built, another fire hydrant will be required. A minimum 15 ft. easement will be required for the water main; however, Geskey recommends a 20 ft. easement. Ductile iron pipe is required. Geskey said it will be acceptable if they want to put water on one side and sewer on the other side of a 20 ft. easement. Both the sewer and water main will be owned by the City. Geskey asked about service sizes for the buildings. Pozen said this is unknown at this time. Geskey said the sewer is 18 ft. deep. Pozen confirmed. Geskey

shared plans for the Silhavy Road reconstruction. Geskey pointed out the location a manhole in the area and said they could tie-into this manhole and put in an internal drop

LAIRD: A Rule 5 Permit will be required. A Site Permit covering erosion control, right-of-way cuts (especially with the connection for the sanitary) and sanitary connections is required. The Site Permit will be through the Engineering Department. Providing a SWPPP and Operation and Maintenance Manual is required. The conceptual level for the pond seems appropriate; however, Engineering will need to see all the storm water calculations and design. A lot of the pond contour lines don't go anywhere. Engineering needs to see all the grading. Laird asked if there is any depressional storage on site. Pozen said there is no depressional storage. Laird stated his concern was knowing there was an old, fairly mature wooded lot and often times you can stumble across depressional storage and if that reduces the runoff rate in the pre-developed condition, it would need to be taken into account in the post development. Laird mentioned that the current owner requested that the driveway be aligned with Beech Street as the Silhavy Road reconstruction project moved forward.

Grcevich said this is what the owner was looking at originally; however, he was also looking at putting in a road closer to the 40 ft. buffer that would not align with that. He was planning on using the Cascade access as a regular road. The plans he has setup would align on the opposite side and fits his purposes better. Laird mentioned that Chicago and Beech Streets are collectors that head to the west and will probably lend themselves to some future improvements or treatments. Laird reiterated that the traffic study needs to provide the proof that offsetting the driveway is a better, safer functional and operational alternative.

DICKSON: Dickson said turn lanes, curb cuts, two-way and four-way intersections have already been discussed. The only thing that has not been discussed is if there are any plans for a sidewalk on the outside on Silhavy running north and south. Soto said they do not show a sidewalk. Shrader said a sidewalk may be required, but she will have to clarify.

FAHEL: Fahel asked if there will be any plumbing in storage building A. Soto said there will probably be two bathrooms. Fahel requested the submittal of an internal plumbing plan.

ON BEHALF OF VICKI THRASHER, BUILDING COMMISSIONER: A Construction Design Release from the State of Indiana is required. The Building Permit application submittal needs to include a full set of plans (both paper and PDF). A list of contractors, including sub-contractors must be submitted. All contractors must be registered with the City.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping Plan
Fine for Tree Removal without a Tree Survey
Documented Traffic Information
Erosion Control Plan
Rule 5 Permit
Bufferyards
Variances
Provide Internal Plumbing Plan (Storage Building A)
Access (Fire Department)
Detailed Site Plan
Easement for Water Main/Sewer
Site Improvement Permit
State Design Release
Building Permit
All Contractors Registered with the City
Signage/Fencing Permit
Zoning Clearance



**Section 10.603-Tree
Installation, Remove**