

**MEETING:** Site Review Committee  
**SUBJECT:** Cagle Industrial Addition  
**ADDRESS:** 2901 Bertholet Blvd.  
**PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW**

**LOCATION:** Zoom  
**DATE:** October 19, 2021

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Carley Lemmon, Asst. Planner  
(219) 462-1161 / [clemmon@valpo.us](mailto:clemmon@valpo.us)  
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner  
(219) 462-1161 / [vthrasher@valpo.us](mailto:vthrasher@valpo.us)  
Bill Laird, Engineering Dept.  
(219) 462-1161 / [blaird@valpo.us](mailto:blaird@valpo.us)  
Tim Stites, Fire Department  
(219) 462-8325 / [tstites@valpo.us](mailto:tstites@valpo.us)  
Matt Zurbriggen, Engineering Dept.,  
(219) 462-1161 / [mzurbriggen@valapo.us](mailto:mzurbriggen@valapo.us)  
Nate McGinley, Water Dept.  
(219) 462-6174 / [nmcginley@valpo.us](mailto:nmcginley@valpo.us)  
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.  
(219) 464-4973 / [tfahel@valpo.us](mailto:tfahel@valpo.us)

**PRESENTERS:**

Casey Great Lakes Engineering

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed addition to Cagle Industrial Maintenance Systems located at 2901 Bertholet Blvd. 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 addition of warehouse space for equipment. The addition will be approximately 7,600 sq. ft. The project will also include the addition of parking spaces and gravel. There will be grading on the site. No water is being added to the proposed building. The warehouse space will be used to store steel parts and spare equipment. Cagle does maintenance, repairs, and upgrades to industrial equipment.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**LAIRD:** Looking at the proposed storm sewer infrastructure on the south western part of the parcel there is a storm manhole with what appears to be a stub of a storm sewer. Are they proposing to extend this and what will it capture? Casey stated that as far as the survey information this is all they found. They could not find another inlet. They will not be extending or adding to it. Laird

asked if they know what areas this is collecting and draining? Casey said it is basically just the parking lot. As far as they can tell, there are no roof drains that drain to it. Laird stated that Engineering needs to see some storm water calculations, runoff numbers, and a curve number for the site to confirm that the drainage from the site, with the improvements, still works within the original subdivision drainage design and the regional detention basin originally built for the site. Laird mentioned the aggregate drive and parking area is not typically an allowable material. If Engineering were to decide to allow for it, it will still be considered, per City Standards, an impervious surface. We all know that after a couple years of driving on it, it packs up as tight as concrete. Engineering does have some concerns with the runoff rate within the proposed conditions. Engineering needs to verify that things are sized adequately. Casey asked if numbers could be provided for the original subdivision. Zurbriggen mentioned this information can be provided. Laird asked if there will be any additional sanitary sewer in the building addition. Casey said there will only be electric and gas. No additional sanitary sewer is being proposed. Laird asked if there will be any work on the entrance driveway or loading dock. Casey stated there will not be any changes to the site. Laird conveyed that Engineering requires a Site Permit covering the earth work and erosion control. They can apply for the Site Permit at the same time they apply for the Building Permit. The application will be submitted to the Building Department, but it will be approved by the Engineering Department.

**ZURBRIGGEN:** The drainage for the side yard is shown to sheet-off into the adjacent properties. Engineering would like to see this water captured and directed to the back of the lot. Casey said the existing conditions right at the side yard setback called out on the east side is where the water falls out. Does Engineering want them to go towards this point? Zurbriggen said maybe they could try to direct the water farther north rather than directly east. Casey said they can do this.

**MCGINLEY:** McGinley said the plan did not show any changes to the existing water or sanitary sewer services to the building. Will there be any changes to either of these services? Casey advised no changes are being proposed. McGinley provided no comments on this project.

**STITES:** Stites asked for clarification concerning what will be stored in the addition. Casey believes it will be steel equipment; however, he is unsure. Casey can provide an update. Stites asked if it will be pallet storage or pallet racks. Casey is not aware of their layout. Stites advised that high-pile storage can create issues with building codes. Once more detailed plans are provided, Stites may have more comments. Stites stated that 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. Stites asked what the length of the east side of the building is from north to south. Casey said the length for the total east side (existing building and proposed addition) is 203 feet. Stites said the fire department needs to be able to access 150 feet of the building so this may be okay.

**FAHEL:** Since there will not be any plumbing in the addition, Fahel provided no comments on the project.

**THRASHER:** The information provided on the plan was very sparse. Thrasher asked if there is a sprinkler system in the existing building. Casey indicated he is unsure. Thrasher stated that with the addition they may be over what is allowed for a building without a sprinkler system. Thrasher said the plans did not indicate how they are accommodating the addition i.e., with a fire wall or whether they are installing a sprinkler system. This information would be helpful. Thrasher said there are a lot of unknowns and not a lot of comments can be offered because of this. However, in general, a Construction Design Release from the State of Indiana will be required prior to issuance of a local Building Permit. All contractors must be registered with the City prior to issuance of permits. Casey believes they are removing the north wall and moving it up 100 feet. Thrasher said without any type of detailed information she cannot comment on what type of fire safety components need to be added to the building. Thrasher conveyed a full set of plans (civil and building – paper and pdf copies) will be required for permit submittal.

**LEMMON:** The property is zoned INH, Heavy Industrial and it is located within the SR 49 Signature Corridor. The district intensity standards can be found in Table 3.301B. For this site the landscape surface ratio is 30%. The plans will need to show the landscape percentage. The Gross FAR is .431 and the maximum Net FAR is .615. These calculations need to be shown on the plans submitted for the Building Permit. It will be necessary to refer to Table 3.505 for the nonresidential bulk standards. This table will list all of the minimum/maximum lot widths and height. Lemmon asked about the height of the building addition. Casey said the height of the addition will match the existing building. Lemmon conveyed that the minimum rear yard setback is 30 ft. and should not cause an issue for this lot. The side yard setback is 15 ft. The front yard setback is 25 ft. This is not being adjust and it should be fine. Lemmon asked if additional signage is being proposed. Casey said there will be no changes to signage. Lemmon stated it will be necessary to refer to Article 5, if they decide to do anything with signage. Is any parking being removed for the proposed addition? Casey stated that parking is being added. Lemmon conveyed that the parking requirements for heavy industrial general land use is

2.5 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. and 1 space per company vehicle. The parking for loading is 1 space per 15,000 sq. ft. or 1.25 spaces per bay. Because no detailed floor plan was included for site review, it is difficult to calculate the required parking. There are certain areas (restroom and dedicated store rooms) that are not included in the square footage calculation. This can be looked at when plans are submitted for the permitting process or more detailed information can be provided prior to permit submittal. It will be necessary to verify that all parking requirements are being met. If the parking requirements cannot be met it may be necessary to apply for a variance. As noted earlier, with the gravel, there are surfacing requirements and these requirements can be found in Article 9, Section 9.305. This section speaks to off-street parking areas and what is required. Lemmon asked if any new exterior lighting is being considered. Casey does not believe new exterior lighting is part of this project. Lemmon advised that if there is any new exterior lighting, submittal of a Photometric Plan will be necessary to ensure it meets the City's allowances for overspill. The nonresidential lighting standards can be found in 9.501. Lemmon asked if any landscaping will be removed in the rear. Casey said the grass area will be removed. Lemmon advised that the substantial improvement to the site triggers our landscape requirements. There are two sets of landscaping requirements that will be relevant to this site. On-lot landscaping (Table 10.301 – All uses – Heavy Industrial) requires 4 large trees, 8 small trees, and 25 shrubs per acre. The parking lot landscaping for Heavy Industrial requires 1 large tree per 4 spaces and 1 shrub, perennial, or ornamental grass per 2 spaces. If there is a parking row that exceeds 16 spaces, then there is a requirement for a parking island. All pertinent information is in Article 10. If necessary, Planning can further discuss the parking and required landscaping. Lemmon asked if there will be additional loading berths. Casey said no new berths are being added. Lemmon advised that because this project is located in the SR 49 corridor, no outdoor storage or enclosed storage on the exterior of the building, or refuse is permitted. Will there be any changes to dumpster enclosures? Casey said there is no dumpster enclosure on the site. There is just a dumpster and it is probably non-conforming. Lemmon directed them to Article 2, Section 2.406 for dumpster enclosure locations and dumpster enclosure requirements. The maximum lot coverage for the SR 49 Corridor is 75% and the minimum Landscape Surface Ratio is 25%. Lemmon said the previously mentioned 30% LSR does not apply because the project is in the SR 49 Corridor. Lemmon asked if the exterior materials will match the existing or will they change. Casey said he is unsure. Lemmon stated information on building material and building colors will be needed. Some of the things Planning needs will be a Zoning Clearance, colored building elevations, dumpster enclosure details, more detailed information on the

### Our City...Our Values

floor plan to calculate parking, and a more detailed site plan showing ratios, necessary calculations, and density requirements.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

- Show Landscaping Percentage on Plans
- Erosion Control Plan
- Detailed Site Plan
- Site Improvement Permit
- Provide Storm Water Calculations, Runoff Numbers and Curve Number
- State Design Release
- Building Permit
- Submit Full Set of Plans (paper and pdf) (civil and building)
- Contractors Registered with the City
- Provide Building Material and Building Colors
- Submit Colored Elevations
- Provide Detailed Floor Plan
- Zoning Clearance