

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Poettinger U.S. Inc.
ADDRESS: 2855 Montdale Drive
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: Zoom
DATE: December 9, 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
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us
Matt Zurbriggen, Engineering Dept.,
(219) 462-1161 / mzurbriggen@valapo.us
Nate McGinley, Water Dept.
(219) 462-6174 / nmcginley@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Andrew Brown, Poettinger U.S. Inc.
(219) 252-0259 / andrew.brown@poettinger.us

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed warehouse and headquarters for Poettinger U.S. Inc. to be located at 2855 Montdale Drive. 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: Poettinger U.S. is a subsidiary of Poettinger Land Technique. Poettinger Land Technique has been in business for 150 years. Their manufacturing operations are based out of Europe. They deal with John Deere, Case, and New Holland. The machines are brought over in containers. The machines are uploaded and distributed to dealerships throughout the US and Canada. Poettinger has been in the US since 2008 and originally shared a building with another company in Michigan City. They moved to their current location in 2011. Brown said they also have a parts warehouse. The building they want to build will be approximately 12,000 to 15,000 sq. ft. of warehouse space and approximately 4,500 sq. ft. of office space. Brown said they would like to double their current outside storage to 100,000 sq. ft. Brown

stated that the property they are looking to purchase is not ideal but at the price it is listed for it is worth trying to “shoe horn” in their operation. Their operations right now are logistics and warehousing. Brown continues to ask his board about manufacturing. As the U.S. sales continue to grow, they will not be able to ignore the fact that they need to consider manufacturing in North America. This is another reason they are looking at this parcel. It gives them ability to add onto the building. If manufacturing were to be added, it would be mostly assembly. Manufacturing is not in the scope now but could possibly be added down the road.

STAFF COMMENTS:

ZURBRIGGEN: Zurbruggen said more details are needed concerning the site, especially regarding drainage. Engineering will need to know how storm water will be handled for the site. The site is close to the County, and Engineering will be interested in how they will outlet the storm water detention. The City’s outlet rate is 0.5 CFS an acre. However, depending on where the outlet is it could go into the County’s release rate. Zurbruggen cautioned they be mindful of this since the County is directly south of this site. Zurbruggen asked how the site will be separated. His understanding is that it will be separated in the southeasterly direction. However, getting access to the site to the east (other side of the ditch) causes some concerns for Engineering. Brown said in speaking with Tim Bruski, Transpoint Intermodal basically owns everything between 325 and 400. The little piece they are splitting off was not needed by Transpoint Intermodal and his understanding is that they are trying to sell off the entire 93-acre parcel. Brown stated that the border on the northeast side is the ditch. They will access it from 325. Zurbruggen said more conversation will be needed concerning this issue. Brown stated they are not planning to acquire the property on the other side of the ditch. They are only acquiring the property on the west side. Shrader interjected that the minimum lot width is 100 ft. This needs to be taken into consideration when the lot is split. They could provide a little 100 ft. minimum tab along the northern property edge that would provide the connection to the back triangle parcel. The likelihood of Transpoint Intermodal ever using that parcel is unknown. Shrader said it is unlikely that anyone would ever access the parcel in this manner because it would be necessary to build a bridge. However, with the right kind of development on the rest of the Transpoint parcels, they may want the back access. Shrader mentioned that she received a message from Dave Tiemens and she will follow-up with him. This may be one way to go about preserving access and meeting the lot standards. It doesn’t matter who owns the parcel, if you create an unacceptable lot it is a problem. Brown clarified that the purchase agreement with Transpoint is for the 20.11-acre parcel. Poettinger’s plan is to purchase the parcel for their own use. Their building will be positioned

on the southern portion. Down the road, there may be a desire to split off the 6-acres in the point of the triangle and sell it off to someone else. Right now, the plan is for Poettinger to maintain the 20.11-acres. Shrader said this may keep their purchase agreement going in the exact same direction that will create more steps on the backend in terms of City processes and actually getting the lot split. There are different ways to split the lots but if an inaccessible parcel is created, it can't be done the easiest way. It would have to go through the public process. It may require a variance. Brown asked if the lot should be split up front. Shrader advised that the parcel lines need to be set in a way that maintains access for both parcels. Brown conveyed that Transpoint is supposed to be creating new plans and as part of the purchase agreement Transpoint is subdividing the lot. As part of this step, is an easement needed to be able to get to parcel 2? Shrader stated that creating the parcel lines so that they would actually provide access would be better. Shrader will need to research if an easement will be sufficient. Brown asked Shrader to confirm that frontage on 325 needs to be 100 ft. Shrader confirmed it needs to be 100 ft. McGinley (Valpo City Utilities) interjected that the existing gravel drive is for their sanitary sewer and access to their main. It is the 20 ft. easement that is shown. The drive will need to be maintained for VCU to access the sewer main. Brown advised that they want to access the ditch for surface drainage. Laird asked if the ditch is county-regulated. Zurbriggen confirmed it is a county regulated ditch. Laird indicated that it will be necessary to bring the County in.

MCGINLEY: McGinley stated that the sewer for this project will be relatively easy. There is a 24" concrete main that comes across 325 from the west and heads due north parallel with 325 then turns and heads east where the easement is located along the north side of the parcel. Sewer will connect to the 24" RPC. They can core in and do an insert tap. Brown asked if this is in front of where their building will go. McGinley explained that it is where Montdale Drive was extended to 325 a couple of years ago. The sewer comes across 325 approximately 240 ft. south of there and the connection point at the closest point will be 100-150 ft. away from the building. McGinley advised that the water is going to be somewhat more complicated. We do not allow wells within City limits. However, our code does state that if a parcel is not within 300 ft. of the nearest water it is possible to have a well. This parcel is 1,100 ft. away. Considering that Transpoint Intermodal will require water at some point in time, this needs to be a conversation that needs to continue with the Utility Director. There is the code, but also future planning. McGinley feels that now is the time to discuss if water will be extended or if the VCU Board/Utility Director will allow a well on this property. For the record, our code states that since the property is 300 ft. away per code a well is possible; however, with future planning now is the time to

Our City...Our Values

discuss how water will be gotten to the rest of the area. McGinley asked if fire suppression will be required for this facility. Brown said this seems to be a subjective topic, depending on who he speaks with. One construction company says fire suppression is not required because of the use, but another construction company says yes, it is required because the facility is over 12,000 sq. ft. McGinley conveyed that it is pretty much impossible to get fire suppression from a well. Since the nearest water is 1,100 ft. away this could be a substantial cost. As stated before, this will require more in-depth conversations moving forward. Brown asked where the nearest water is located. McGinley explained that it is located at the property line for the MAC building (fire and police training facility). Stites interjected that a fire system is possible on a well; however, there are other requirements that must be met. This information is all in the code for fire protection, and their design professional should be able to assist them with this issue.

FAHEL: Fahel asked about the type of equipment that will be warehoused. Brown explained they manufacture farm equipment. Brown said it is basically palleted equipment that needs to be assembled when it gets to the dealer. Fahel asked if there is any type of maintenance at the facility. Brown said there is no maintenance. Fahel said the possibility of manufacturing was mentioned for the future. Could this facility be retrofitted for manufacturing? Brown explained that the way it is laid out now is that this building will be filled with pallet racks. If they did want to do some manufacturing, it would be necessary to add on to the building. Fahel asked if there will be any chemical storage. Brown said they will have some spray paint cans for touching up machines and diesel fuel to run forklifts. Fahel asked if there will be cooking equipment in the office kitchen area. Brown said they were planning on installing a stove. Right now, they only have a refrigerator, toaster oven, and coffee maker. Fahel requested submittal of a detailed internal plumbing plan for the office area as well as a list of anything being kept in bulk (over 5 gallons). Fahel stated there should not be any floor drains connected to the sewer in the warehouse area.

STITES: Stites questioned the Montdale Drive addressing. The signs say 325E. Does the City own this road? Shrader interjected that the City does own portions of the road. The portion between Murvihill Road and the tracks is totally within the City. It is a bit of ridiculous situation in this area. We have what sometimes shows up as Montdale Drive but is actually Montdale Park Drive that goes east/west through the industrial park. According to Will Rose, somehow over time at least four addresses in the County have taken the name Montdale Drive for this segment of road. It is recognized by the postal service and emergency services. This will be the first development we have permitted off of this road. We do not have anything of record within the City with any address on this road.

Our City...Our Values

It is a County Road, 325E, and it is also within the City. Typically, when it is within the City, we do not use the County Road name. The path of least resistance is to retain kind of a colloquial of Montdale Drive. Stites said he called dispatch and they do not have it down as Montdale Drive. They call it 325E. If the Fire Department got dispatched there, they would not know where it is. It isn't on any of their maps. Stites believes this needs to be more of an internal discussion for later. Stites conveyed that all initial inspections will need to be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. If fire protection systems are installed, the contractor will need to contact Stites prior to beginning work. After occupancy is obtained, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. Stites said with the drawings as basic as they are, he does not know what type of occupancy this facility would come under. More detailed information is required. The code states whether a sprinkler system will be needed.

THRASHER: A Construction Design Release from the State of Indiana will be required before issuance of a local Building Permit. All work must be performed by contractors who are registered with the City. Submittal of a paper copy and a pdf copy of plans is required. Any signage will require a separate permit.

Thrasher stated that the address issue will need to be worked out before they submit for permits. The requirement for a Site Permit was not mentioned by the Engineering Department. Thrasher indicated the Building Permit Application, Site Permit, and Zoning Clearance along with the plans should be submitted to the Building Department. Concerning a fire sprinkler system, the State has one code, and the project architect should be familiar with the Indiana State codes. The code is very clear about when and where a sprinkler system is necessary. Any questions concerning this issue should be directed to Thrasher.

SHRADER: Depending on how the lots are configured, the lot split can take different routes. With the lot split as it is shown, it would need to be taken through a public process before Plat Committee or Plan Commission. If the 100 ft. minimum lot width is provided to the eastern triangle, then a section of the code could potentially be used for a simple lot split that is different. Shrader indicated that she will talk with the surveyor to continue the discussion about the best course of action to take. Shrader asked if Tiemens was the surveyor for Poettinger or Transpoint. Brown believes he works with Transpoint. Shrader stated she will coordinate with Transpoint and Tim Brusk should keep him in the loop. Shrader is aware that these are early and very preliminary drawings. If we were to take these and try to determine if variances are required, it looks like they would be required. Shrader feels there are some tweaks that can be made to avoid this, possibly with the lot configuration. Also, minor changes to site layout ,i.e., location of the parking lot. The height is actually taken from the mid-point of the slope of the roof, not the bottom. Looking at the front elevation, it appears

Our City...Our Values

Honestly Accountable Surprisingly Responsive Boldly Proactive Creatively Frugal Respectfully Compassionate

there is a minor slope. We need to ensure that the 35 ft. height limit is not exceeded. If the project goes through the variance process to address items, Shrader wants to provide a level of comfort. We do recognize that this is an industrial area, and it is setback fairly far from Morthland Drive that is driving some of the design standards. We are reasonable and if it is necessary to go through the variance process, the Planning Department wants to help them through the process. Shrader said they will probably not get a lot of push back for minor development standards. Shrader mentioned that all of the storage appears to be on gravel. Is this what is being proposed for the outdoor storage? Brown confirmed that this is what they will start with. Shrader conveyed that coordination with Engineering will be required. The City standard is pavement everywhere and this would be a lot of pavement. This will be up to Engineering and it will be necessary to consult with them in terms of materials. The biggest thing is the potential use variance for the outdoor storage because of the Morthland Drive Overlay. Shrader is aware that they are over 1,000 feet from U.S. 30. The way the code is written makes it still apply unless there is a slight configuration difference in the lot but that might complicate some of the acquisition processes. Shrader wants to talk with people from Transpoint and Poettinger and go over process options a little bit more. Brown mentioned that NIPSCO has a lot of equipment sitting out on gravel lots with concrete pads. Shrader stated site review is not the place to make this argument and the City does understand this. There are lots of other conditions such as when they moved in. Was it prior to the code? Did they seek a variance and was it granted? All of these are within the realm of possibility. Shrader is just letting Poettinger know there is a process that needs to be followed.

LEMMON: This site is zoned Heavy Industrial (INH), and it is within the U.S. 30 Signature Corridor Overlay. Warehousing is a permitted use and light industry is a limited use. Information concerning light industry can be found in Section 2.545. Lemmon asked if there will be a dumpster enclosure on the site. Brown stated if a dumpster enclosure is required, it can be added to the site. Lemmon conveyed that dumpster enclosures are to be located behind the principal building or in a side or rear yard and are to be fully enclosed with an opaque wall or earthen berm. Referring to Section 2.406 for other requirements will be necessary. Front loading is allowed in INH, if the frontage street is not an arterial street and the other side of the street is also zoned INH, which it is. District intensity and bulk standards are located in Section 3.301 and this section also lists Gross FAR, Net FAR, and the minimum Landscape Ratio. However, since this is in a corridor it will follow a set of different Landscape Ratio requirements. This building is roughly at a Gross FAR of .022 and a Net FAR of .032. These are both under our maximums for Gross and Net FAR for Heavy Industrial. The front

Our City...Our Values

yard setback is 25 ft.; the side yard setback is 15 ft.; the rear yard setback is 30 ft. It appears that these requirements can all be met. As previously mentioned, any signage will require a permit. Article 5 has all signage allowances. Article 9 has all parking requirements. Table 9.201 shows parking for warehousing at 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. of useable floor area. The requirement for loading is 1.5 spaces per bay. It appears the site is under the parking requirement. The calculation for parking is based on useable floor area. Therefore, restrooms, utility areas and areas used exclusively for storage are not included in the calculation. The requirement for accessible parking is one accessible space for each 25 regular spaces. Referring to Article 9, Section 9.300 for parking and loading design standards will be necessary. Lemmon asked if there are any plans for lighting. Brown stated they have not discussed this detail. Lemmon suggested they refer Section 9.501 for the non-residential design standards, and the section notes the acceptable foot candles at property lines. Allowable lighting is also called out. Article 10 covers all landscaping requirements. On-lot landscaping will apply to this site and will need to include 4 large trees, 8 small trees and 25 shrubs per acre. Parking lot landscaping will also apply and will need to include 1 large tree for 4 spaces and 1 shrub, perennial, or ornamental grass for 2 spaces. Lemon asked if there are any trees that will be removed. Brown said he is not sure but there may be some trees along the ditch that will need to be removed. Planning will continue to work with Brown concerning tree removal and replacement ratios. Article 11 covers all design standards, including the U.S. 30/Morthland Drive standards. Lemmon mentioned that outdoor storage, enclosed storage, or refuse (whether or not in containers) or display of merchandize shall not be permitted on any lot within the corridor. All refuse shall be contained completely within the principle or accessory buildings. This issue can be discussed further as the project moves forward. Loading berths should be configured or screened so they are not visible from street views of the U.S. 30 right-of-way. A Class B bufferyard along the property line of the corridor along the right-of-way is necessary. Hopefully this will only affect the tiny sliver to the north, depending on how the lot is split. Parking is to be located behind the principal building with respect to the corridor wherever practical. It will be necessary to be mindful of the building height because the site is close to the airport. For all commercial and industrial buildings located east of the intersection of State Road 49 and U.S. 30 (Morthland Drive) the following setbacks apply:

Yard abutting corridor:

- a. Buildings that are 36 feet in height or less: 65 feet
- b. Buildings that are 36 feet or more in height: 75 feet

With this building being towards the south of the property, this does not appear to be an issue. The minimum lot size for U.S. 30 is one-half acre and the minimum lot width is 100 ft. The maximum lot coverage for commercial and industrial buildings is 75% and the minimum LSR is 25%. Buildings cannot exceed three-stories or 35 ft., unless the building is sprinkled for fire protection, and complies with the Porter County Airport height restrictions. The signage restriction for the U.S. 30 corridor is 6 ft. for a monument-style sign. Lemmon mentioned if they are working with a local company, they should be familiar with the City's design standards. If, however, they work with an outside company, Planning will work with them to help them understand the standards. Design standards are found in Section 11.500. This Section will include information on building materials, roof structure and materials, colors, recesses, and projections. Further discussions will be necessary so that we understand what Poettinger is going for and to make sure requirements are being met and if any variances will be required. Lemmon asked if they are working on updated plans, site plans, elevation, etc. Brown stated his timeline starts with acquiring the ground. Once he acquires the ground, he has some quotes from construction companies and will decide which company he wants to work with. If they have engineering, he will have them start work on site and drainage. If they do not have their own engineering, he will have to have a separate company. He is hoping to have the land purchased the first part of 2022, develop the construction plans the first two quarters of 2022, and possibly prepare to break ground in the fall of 2022. Brown asked who he needs to speak with about the City developing infrastructure east of 325. Lemmon said he should speak with McGinley or Valparaiso City Utilities.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)
- Erosion Control Plan
- Rule 5 Permit
- Detailed Site Plan
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release
- Building Permit
- Contractors Registered with the City
- Submit Paper and PDF Copy of Plans
- Signage/Fencing Permit
- Submit Detailed Internal Plumbing Plan for Office Area
- Provide a List of Items Kept in Bulk (over 5 gallons)
- Zoning Clearance