

MEETING: Site Review Committee **LOCATION:** Zoom
SUBJECT: Valpo Medical Office Building **DATE:** December 9, 2021
ADDRESS: 2505 Calumet Avenue
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

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@valpo.us
Nate McGinley, Water Dept.
(219) 462-6174 / nmcginley@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, Water Reclamation Dept.
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Jessica Vargas, Holladay Properties
(219) 613-1236
JVargas@holladayproperties.com
Matt Keiser, Abonmarche
(219) 850-4624 / mkeiser@abonmarche.com
Mike Micka, Holladay Properties
(219) 406-1228
mmicka@holladayproperties.com

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Valpo Medical Office Building to be located at 2505 Calumet Avenue. 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 located on the old Urschel property in the new Viking Place Business Park, Lot 5. The project will be a single-story 20,000 sq. ft. medical office building. It will be a primary care office. There will be no specialties, x-ray, ambulatory services, or urgent care. It will be family practices and internal medicine. The lot is 3.3 acres. There is an existing retaining wall to the west of this site. There is a significant grade difference between the existing parking lot along Cumberland Drive and Lot 5. There will be some retaining wall work that needs to happen to the west of the property. Overall, it is a very simple building. It will be a medical office building with three sides of parking. Keiser said the site is pretty basic. A retaining wall will need to be placed along the western edge. They are still working with the client on the design. It will hold back the western parking lot from the overflow parking that

Urschel had before. There is about 66% impervious on this site. There is quite a bit of landscaping because of the signature corridor requirements.

STAFF COMMENTS:

ZURBRIGGEN: Zurbruggen mentioned that he has had some discussion with Keiser concerning this project. There is a drainage report for the entire subdivision that requires anything less than 85% of impervious area for any of the lots to be developed, so the lot appears to be okay. Zurbruggen said anything they want to go above and beyond for water quality will be very much appreciated. After speaking with Will Rose about the addressing it does appear that the building will be addressed off of Calumet. All of the interior drives are private. Vargas asked how they will go about addressing the building. The building will be set back pretty far from Calumet. The covenants and restrictions do not allow for signage on Calumet Avenue. Zurbruggen said he was told that when this subdivision was platted for redevelopment the interior drives were all going to be private drives without street names. This may need some further discussion. At this point this is the only information Zurbruggen has. Shrader interjected that the secondary plat provides the addressing for all of the lots. It also identifies that they are accessed via private drives without names as Zurbruggen explained. Shrader said this may be able to be changed but it will require participation from all of the land-owners in the subdivision. Shrader asked if they have already purchased the land. Vargas said it is still owned by FE. Shrader asked Vargas if she had any idea about the possibility of changing. Shrader believes the City would be open from changing how it was set up in the platting process. Shrader mentioned that she would prefer it and emergency services would too; however, she does not feel that we can force it at this point but would certainly be able to assist through the process if the land-owners wanted to go through it. Vargas said they did bring up the address and they were told the address was 2505 Calumet Avenue. Vargas said they could try to bring it up again. Vargas stated since they are going to own part of the private drive if they do not want to participate would they be allowed to name their portion of the private drive. Stites said if there was a sign out front and the address was on the building this would alleviate the problem, but as mentioned, there is language in the covenants and restrictions that prohibit this. Vargas clarified that the covenants state that you are allowed signage on your frontage and the private drive is considered their frontage. Monument signs are not allowed on Calumet Avenue. Shrader stated the Viking Place sign is not very useful for any of the tenants. It would be a better use of that space if it were divided up for all of the property owners within the development. Shrader feels the reason they got the sign is because we determined it met the definition of a shopping center. Shrader thinks it is appropriate to have signage on Calumet.

However, we cannot force this but would be available to assist. Vargas conveyed that they have proposed a couple different sign changes but none of them have been met with any kind of approval or agreement. Shrader interjected that there is an address off Calumet Avenue. Shrader understands that from their perspective this is not ideal, but this is much like what is seen on Silhavy with the large shopping centers and thinks this is what was in mind when the area was developed. Shrader asked if they intend to pursue any changes to this with the property owner. Vargas stated she would refer back to the Fire Department and what they would like to see, and the requirements for putting an address on the building. What will the implications be for having the address on the building? Stites stated that the address needs to be plainly legible from the road. Zurbruggen asked Keiser to run a pathway for a fire truck throughout the site to ensure they can navigate around the building. Keiser agreed that this can be done.

MCGINLEY: McGinley stated that he and Keiser had a good discussion yesterday. There is an existing 2" copper service coming off of Vale Park Road; however, Keiser notified McGinley that this 2" service will not be large enough to service the facility. In their discussions yesterday, McGinley conveyed that the 14" water main on Vale Park Road or the 16" water main on Calumet Avenue would be the two lines that he could drag water service to the facility. This entire parcel is private so the valves for shutoffs for the water will need to be within 2 ft. of our right-of-way on either Vale Park Road or Calumet Avenue. McGinley stated that Keiser explained there is an existing 6" lateral that used to be the Urschel's sanitary sewer service that has been or will be extended to this property and it will be the sewer service for this property. McGinley said VCU does not have an issue with this. The sewer permit will be obtained through the Engineering Department. Once connected, the inspections will go through Collections and Distribution. McGinley will continue to work with Keiser once plans come together and they decide which side they want to pull water from.

FAHEL: Water Reclamation is concerned with what will be going into the sewer. Fahel requested submittal of anything that will be kept in bulk (over 5 gallons). Fahel conveyed it will be necessary to have a plan or protocol on hand for dealing with expired or unused pharmaceuticals, so they do not end up in the sanitary sewer. Submittal of a detailed internal plumbing plan will be necessary. Fahel conveyed that a Medical and Mercury Waste Survey will be required. Fahel will provide the necessary form for completion.

STITES: All inspections required during the construction phase must be schedule and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy has been obtained, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. All contractors dealing with fire protection systems will need to contact Stites prior to

beginning work. Stites reiterated that addressing for this building needs further discussion.

THRASHER: It will be necessary to submit this project to the State of Indiana for plan review to obtain a Construction Design Release. A local Building Permit will be required. Thrasher does not know if Engineering mentioned that a Site Permit will be required. Thrasher conveyed that when they submit the Building Permit application, they can also submit the Site Permit application and Zoning Clearance application along with their plans to the Building Department. Submittal of one paper set of plans and one pdf set of plans is required. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City. Signage will require a separate permit. Thrasher conveyed that the addressing issue needs to be sorted out before they apply for permits.

SHRADER: Shrader mentioned that Lemmon has done the detailed analysis. What we all understand that this is an unusual site with the private drives included. What we are looking at is a trip to the Board of Zoning Appeals. It will be necessary to determine what will be the simplest request. Shrader said in terms of site layout and the planting plan, they are making the best use of the site that can be made. In terms of staff support, Planning will continue to work with them and expects we will be able to support variances going forward.

LEMMON: The property is zoned Commercial General (CG) and is within the Calumet Avenue Signature Corridor. A medical office is a permitted use within this zoning district. Section 2.406 covers information on loading, truck access, and solid waste. Dumpster enclosures are to be located behind the principal building or in a side or rear yard. The dumpster location for this site is appropriately located. The dumpster enclosure is to be fully enclosed by an opaque wall one foot taller than the container and constructed of finished masonry painted the same color as building and/or stone or brick or the option of an earthen berm. Under district intensity and bulk standards for this site the LSR requirement for office is 35%. Lemmon indicated the percentage for LSR appears to be 33%. Gross FAR and Net FAR are listed in Table 3.301B. Gross FAR is .353 and Net FAR is a maximum of .543. Shrader interjected that compliance for this will depend on whether we offset the calculations from the private drive or whether we include the private drive. A variance will be required either way. When the variance request is drafted, Planning will work with them to ensure we are going in the direction that makes the most sense. Lemmon asked if the calculation for total impervious included the building, pavement, and private drive. Keiser confirmed that the building, pavement, and private drive were included in the impervious calculation. Lemmon stated that she did some rough calculations on the Gross and Net FAR and they appear to be under the maximum by quite a bit. Table 3.505 shows the non-residential bulk

requirements. The front yard setback is 20 ft.; however, since the project is in a signature corridor there is a slightly different requirement. The side yard setback is 10 ft., which is met by quite a bit. The rear yard setback is 10 ft. The maximum height of the building 50 ft. The allowance for signage in the Commercial General Zoning is 3 sq. ft. of signage for each linear foot of building frontage. Planning will work with them about possible signage on either corner to provide visibility. The parking requirement for medical office/clinic is 5 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of useable floor area and loading is 1 space for 33,000 sq. ft. Lemmon mentioned that the total spaces required is 101. Once the storage areas, restrooms, and utility rooms are taken out of the calculation, they should easily be able to meet the parking requirement. The requirement for accessible spaces is being met. Anything over 100 parking spaces requires 4 accessible spaces and 1 van accessible space. Lemmon asked if there is any bicycle parking proposed for the site. Vargas said they have not provided bicycle parking. Lemmon conveyed that the requirement for surface parking lots is one bicycle parking space for 10 regular parking spaces and the maximum required is 10 bicycle spaces. Lemmon mentioned that bicycle parking would be helpful because the site is quite accessible via pedestrian paths. Article 9, Section 9.300 show the parking and loading design standards. Lemmon said when she reviewed the Photometric Plan it appeared there are some points in the southwest corner that hit 1.2-, 1.5- and 1.9-foot candles. Is there a light fixture in this area or something from another lot? Keiser said it is theirs and he believes it has something to do with the retaining wall. Lemmon advised that this will need to be added to the variance request. The maximum foot candle overage at the property line is .5 for a commercial lot. It should not be an issue to add this because the retaining wall adjusts the lighting oddly. All fixture types, parking lot illumination, and maximum illumination can be found in Section 9.501. Article 10 is all of our landscaping standards. The landscaping requirement for Commercial General is 9 large trees, 18 small trees, and 50 shrubs per acre. For parking it is 1 large tree per 8 spaces and 1 shrub, perennial, or ornamental grass per 4 spaces. One planting island for each 16 spaces is required. Everything appears to be compliant. In the northwestern corner it does meet BP zoning, and this will require a Class AB buffer. The plans do show the adjustment for this bufferyard. Lemmon mentioned the plans also show open space landscaping; however, this landscape standard is not required. This project only needs to follow on-lot landscaping. The landscaping shown for open space can be included in a different landscape standard. Article 11 has all of the design standards. As mentioned previously, the incorrect minimum landscape yard was provided. For a lot within the Calumet corridor, the minimum building setback for an office is 30 ft. with a 50 ft. maximum. The minimum landscape yard along the right-of-way is

Our City...Our Values

equal to the building setback. The landscape requirements per a 100 linear foot frontage for shade trees, evergreens, etc., are also listed. Some of the other requirements associated with this are screening service areas with dense planting of shrubs and evergreens. All parking areas should be placed behind buildings. No parking is allowed within the landscape yard. Once we go through the variance request, these may come into play as well. The non-residential design standards are in Section 11.500. this section covers all horizontal projections and recesses. Lemmon said that the way this building is designed there may not be any issues with architectural features and projections and recesses. It appears to be on-point with the requirements. We will check some of the spacing to ensure the distances meet the requirements. The requirements for transparency can be found in 11.506. the requirement for office buildings is 40% transparency along the primary façade and 30% along any other street frontage. Lemmon asked if the EFIS on the northeast side, along the front of the building is pushed back enough so that it is not along the sidewalk or is it along the landscape end right next to it? Vargas said the EFIS will be pushed back. A Zoning Clearance is required. Lemmon stated Holladay is pretty familiar with what is necessary for the Zoning Clearance. Shrader interjected that something that may be the simplest route for variances is to address the signature corridor because this seems to be the most in conflict with the way the site has already been developed with the private drives. Shrader suggested they look at the signature corridor requirements to see if it is eliminated or restructured so they are asking for the redevelopment standards for the 5 ft. or they are asking for the signature corridor in a different location than the first 5 ft. of the lot closest to the corridor, this may be a good way to take care of everything at one time. There can be more discussion concerning the variance request. Lemmon stated all her notes can be included with the minutes. Vargas mentioned that they want to move quickly on the required variances. Lemmon advised that a meeting can be setup to walk them through the process.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Erosion Control Permit
Erosion Control Plan
Rule 5 Permit
Detailed Site Plan
Submit List of Anything Kept in Bulk (over 5 gallons)
Plan/Protocol for Handling Expired or Unused Pharmaceuticals
Submit Detailed Internal Plumbing Plan
Submit Medical and Mercury Waste Survey (will be provided by Fahel)
Addressing

Site Improvement Permit
Submit One Paper Set and One PDF Set of Plans
State Design Release
Building Permit
Contractors Registered with the City
Signage/Fencing Permit
Zoning Clearance