

**MEETING: Site Review Committee**  
**SUBJECT: Bluejay II**  
**ADDRESS: 2650 Barley Road**  
**PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW**

**LOCATION: Zoom**  
**DATE: January 6, 2022**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Beth Shrader, Planning Director  
(219) 462-1161 / [bshrader@valpo.us](mailto:bshrader@valpo.us)  
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner  
(219) 462-1161 / [vthrasher@valpo.us](mailto:vthrasher@valpo.us)  
Mike Jabo, Engineering Director  
(219) 462-1161 / [mjabo@valpo.us](mailto:mjabo@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@valpo.us](mailto:mzurbriggen@valpo.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)  
Hannah Seats, Water Reclamation  
(219) 464-4972 / [hseats@valpo.us](mailto:hseats@valpo.us)  
Mike Jessen, City Administrator  
(219) 462-1161 / [mjessen@valpo.us](mailto:mjessen@valpo.us)

**PRESENTERS:**

Terry Larson  
Larson-Danielson Construction Co., Inc.  
(219) 362-2127  
[tal@ldconstruction.com](mailto:tal@ldconstruction.com)  
Todd Slack,  
Bluejay I, LLC/Indiana Beverage  
(219) 464-2337  
[todd.slack@indianabev.com](mailto:todd.slack@indianabev.com)  
Jeff Leetz  
Bluejay I, LLC/Indiana Beverage  
(219) 464-2337  
[jeff.leetz@indianabev.com](mailto:jeff.leetz@indianabev.com)  
Nathan Witte  
Larson-Danielson Construction Co., Inc.  
(219) 362-2127  
[naw@ldconstruction.com](mailto:naw@ldconstruction.com)  
Tara Boyanski, Abonmarche  
[tboyanski@abonmarche.com](mailto:tboyanski@abonmarche.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Bluejay II to be located at 2650 Barley 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:** Witte explained that this project is a new 115,000 sq. ft. spec warehouse. The new warehouse will be located behind the existing Bluejay I building and north of the existing Indiana Beverage building. Tenant entrances are located on the north side. There are loading docks located on the south side. Boyanski stated the lot split will be between Bluejay I and Bluejay II. Storm water will drain into the network of storm structures located north and west of Bluejay II in the parking lot, starting at Structure 104, sloping

west to Structure 107. The network continues south until Outfall Structure 112 and drains into the forebay. The water drains south from Bluejay II into a network of storm structures, then flows west into the forebay. The forebay ultimately discharges into the pond west of the site. Shrader asked how they are anticipating circulation for the site. Part of the reason this project needs to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals before the lot can be split is because it does not have any access to a public road. Shrader is aware there are some easements being proposed and requested an explanation on how this will work. Boyanski said they are still working on the easements. Shrader believes the major route for trucks will be the south drive and they will also exit out of the south drive. Boyanski confirmed this will be the truck route. Shrader said the trucks will come through the south edge of Bluejay I to get to Barley Road. There is a shared parking agreement for the parking that is between Bluejay I and Bluejay II

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**ZURBRIGGEN:** Zurbriggen mentioned that he has been working with Randy Peterson from Abonmarche and Tony Oss from Larson-Danielson regarding the drainage. They provided the Drainage Report for Indiana Beverage to the south and some calculations for the large pond to the west. Zurbriggen will be interested to look at a Drainage Report for this site, including calculations for water quality for the forebay in the southwest quadrant of the site. This forebay should meet the required water quality based on the requirements in the Engineering technical standards. Zurbriggen conveyed that he thought the forebay would be on this property as a whole; however, it appears it is going across the property line to the south. Some type of shared access agreement for the drainage for the forebay between properties will be necessary. Zurbriggen asked if both properties are owned by the same owner. Slack confirmed they do own both properties and a shared easement is in the works. Slack is not sure this is the initial design. He thought this was more of a long-term potential design. However, this could have changed over the last few weeks. Zurbriggen asked if they are phasing this in. Slack stated it was all based on potential Indiana Beverage growth to the north and how the existing forebay layout that is there today would impede on growth to the north with the Indiana Beverage building. Boyanski said this layout is based on the calculations that have been done. Slack said they have planned on this potential and planned for the shared use easement. Zurbriggen stated he will need to see the drainage calculations, areas, exhibits, etc. showing what it is sized for, and the shared access for the pond. It sounds like this forebay area is the current layout before it gets to the western detention. Zurbriggen said this may affect any potential increases overtime to Indiana Beverage or anything else in this area. Zurbriggen stated

that it will be necessary to submit a copy of the shared parking easement to the east for the Indiana Beverage site just off of Barley Road.

**ROSE:** Rose conveyed that he is struggling on how to address this site and is wondering whether to use 2750 or 2550. This may be more dependent on how others (911 and other emergency services) feel about the access. If there is a way to make a simple drawing showing where traffic is to come into the site it would be helpful to pass along to others. Rose asked if the building will have multiple tenants. Slack confirmed it is the intent to have multiple tenants. Rose indicated it will be necessary to have some type of suite numbers. This may require further discussion. Rose asked if they have an idea about the number of suites that will be required. This is always tricky. You always need to make sure that there are enough available numbers and to assign them in a logical fashion. Rose would like to know at least the intent of how many initial suite numbers there will be. Shrader interjected that we will probably want this information on the plat. Can this information be finalized by the time this is brought to Plan Commission next week? Larson said from their end they can probably do whatever is necessary. Jabo asked where they intended to put the crossing easements—north/south or east/west. They will be at the south of Bluejay I. Jabo asked if they will straddle the parcel boundary between Bluejay I and Bluejay II going north with another crossing easement or will they all be on Bluejay II. Larson stated that he will need to speak with Oss regarding this issue. Jabo asked if there is asphalt between the two buildings. Witte confirmed it is all asphalt. There are 11 docks on the back of Bluejay I, then there is asphalt, car parking, sidewalk, and some green space up to the building. Jabo said for the sake of clarity for next week's meeting and to assist Rose with addressing, could the drawings reflect where crossing easements may be visually. This can absolutely be provided. Rose asked how signage will be done to assist people getting into the site. There is not a lot of space at the very extreme far southeast corner. This still needs to be worked out. Shrader stated that in industrial-zoned districts there is a little flexibility in terms of signage. There could be something similar to what has been done for Bluejay I that would not necessarily have to be on the parcel that Bluejay II is on. The signage could be on Bluejay I's parcel. There is also wayfinding throughout the site that is going to be important. This can be worked out later. Information concerning signage is in Article 9. Rose commented that there is quite a bit of impervious on the site. Rose would like calculations for impervious either for each parcel or the site as a whole.

**LAIRD:** There are some permits that will be required from the Engineering Department, and they can be applied for at the same time they apply for Building Permits. An Erosion Control Permit will be required. A Rule 5 Permit through

IDEM will be required. A Sanitary Sewer Permit will also be required. These permits will be part of the Building Permit submittal package

**MCGINLEY:** It appears that on Sheet C4.0 the 8" water main will be extended to the west for the domestic and fire for this facility. It states an 8x8x8 tee will be used. McGinley asked if there is a plan to extend the water main further to the west in the future. McGinley said there is some confusion as to why this is a tee instead of a 90 or two (2) 45's to service the building. Boyanski will need to check on this issue. McGinley was wondering if they were going to use this as a blowoff point for testing when the existing service is extended. McGinley said it is okay if the tee is there. He was just curious if there was any future intent to extend further to the west. Slack stated there is no intent to extend the main further west. There is no building they could build there. McGinley asked about the sizing for the domestic and fire that will be taken to the building. The plan shows an 8x8x6 tee by the building, and then shows an 8" and then another 8". Witte believes that 8" is correct for the fire line, but domestic only needs to be 4". McGinley conveyed that Bluejay I is 4" domestic and an 8" fire. Witte said they will get this coordinated. McGinley stated that similar to Bluejay I, Utilities prefers the shutoffs to be within their easement, not up by the building, so off the 8" main extension Utilities wants to see a designated 4" domestic to the building with a valve off the 8", then a valve within the easement to service the fire. The City will own the 8" extension, but then the 8" fire and the 4" domestic will be the owner's service line from the valve to the building. Witte asked if the easement being referred to is down by the tee they discussed. McGinley confirmed. In the western point, the City will own and maintain that portion of water main as it does with Bluejay I, and from the 4" valve and the 8" valve will be considered the service line owned by the property. McGinley asked if they have any idea what the single meter size will be for the domestic. McGinley believes there is a 2" for Bluejay I. The meter sizing is unknown at this point. McGinley conveyed that as soon as they know the meter sizing required it will be necessary to contact the Metering Department so they can secure the meter. McGinley asked if they are planning for a designated irrigation service for this building. Slack stated that depending on how the landscaping lays out, he would definitely want to consider an irrigation service. McGinley stated that domestic will require and RPZ backflow, and if they proceed with the irrigation an RPZ will be required for the irrigation. McGinley asked if the 8" main extension from the existing manhole is being perceived as their private sewer lateral or is the expectation that the City will own and maintain that. Typically, this would be considered a private sewer lateral. McGinley didn't know if there is any plan to extend this in the future or tie anything else on to this outside of this building. This is the only reason the City would consider owning it, but if we do own it, an easement will be required.

### Our City...Our Values

Shrader asked if McGinley is referring to the north/south service. McGinley confirmed he is talking about the north/south service. Shrader said everything north is not in the City and this is on the table in terms of if the land owner wants to annex. It has been the desire in the past to have the ability to develop that site should it come into the City. We also have Barley Road as an option where utilities can be extended. McGinley said both water and sewer stop at the turn-around. Shrader said we may want to give this a little thought in terms of what the City prefers in terms of easements. McGinley indicated Utilities prefers the extension be made within the right-of-way of Barley Road. Then the 8" sewer line is treated as a private service to Bluejay II. This can be discussed further. Witte interjected that they would probably run out of fall if they tried to extend the 8" to the property to the north. McGinley conveyed that sewer permits will go through Engineering and the inspections of the sewer will go through Collections and Distribution.

**FAHEL:** Is the plumbing that appears on drawing G003, the extent to which they intend to buildout the plumbing at this point? Slack confirmed this and stated that the restrooms in any of the buildouts will be by the tenants. There is no intent to install the triple basin separator. Fahel asked if there is a tenant for the spec warehouse. Slack indicated that have talked to a butter manufacturer, but it seems like it may not go through. Fahel stated that at this point, Water Reclamation does not have any other comments.

**THRASHER:** Will this building be built as a shell? Witte confirmed. Thrasher said this is how it will be submitted for permits and to the State for a Construction Design Release. Thrasher conveyed that each future buildout will require a Building Permit and Construction Design Release. Submittal of a full set of plans, paper and PDF (civil and building) will be required for the Building Permit. The same set of plans will need to be submitted to the State of Indiana for the Construction Design Release. All contractors must be registered with the City and listed on the permit application before permits will be issued. Any signage will require a separate permit.

**ON BEHALF OF TIM STITES (FIRE DEPARTMENT):** All sprinkler and fire protection contractors must contact Stites before beginning any work. Inspections required during 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. Contact information for Stites is shown on the first page.

**SHRADER:** The Planning Department has been reviewing this project for the necessary replat going before the January Plan Commission meeting, as well as for some variances going before the BZA in January. There are easements represented on the plat. Shrader asked when the easements will be solidified.



Will all of the easement locations, widths, and language be prepared for the meeting by next Tuesday? Boyanski will check with Randy Peterson, but she believes they are pretty close to completion. Shrader mentioned that information packets have gone out and staff reports will go out on Friday. It would be very helpful to have the easement information before staff reports are issued. Calling out any changes to what was originally presented will be helpful to do at the Plan Commission meeting. There are a number of variances for the BZA. Oss sent updated plant count information that appears to show that the existing vegetation around the edges of the property that border the County is sufficient for the Class B bufferyard. Shrader stated that originally there was a variance submitted for this bufferyard and notice was submitted to the paper. Shrader cautioned that they will need to be clear in the BZA meeting that the request for this variance was done preliminarily because it was unsure if this was needed or not, but as it turns out, the variance for the bufferyard will not be needed. The rest of the landscape plan submitted appears to meet standards. The landscape surface ratio is one of the main issues, as well as lack of access to a public right-of-way. These are the two issues that the BZA will be reviewing. We will be leaning heavily on comments in the Drainage Report because landscape surface ratio is reflective of the ability of the site to handle the storm water. Any updates to the earlier conversations about the sizing of the forebay need to be pointed out during the discussion about landscape surface ratio. Shrader is aware that they are not to the point to discuss signage. The fact that this building has no frontage on a public right-of-way will create some interesting issues to interpreting our sign code. Thought will need to be given to this, but Shrader assumes they will be planning to have a minimal amount of signage up in the north face of the building. Slack said they will have some type of tenant identification signage. Shrader mentioned that typically this is based on the building frontage. However, it will probably be based along the north side even though this is not a frontage. This is all owned by the same property owner. We have to setup everything as if it will be sold off. Are there any immediate transfers or near future transfers anticipated or is this intended to function all together? Slack state there will not be any transfers in the future. Shrader asked if the parking shown on the site plan, south of Bluejay I, on the Indiana Beverage property will be constructed now. Slack said this parking will be considered for construction in the future. It is a backup plan in case it is ever needed. Shrader advised that the last thing required for the file is a draft of the letter that needs to be sent to the property owners within 300 ft. of this site. A Zoning Clearance will be required and will be part of the Building Permit package.

### Our City...Our Values

Honestly Accountable Surprisingly Responsive Boldly Proactive Creatively Frugal Respectfully Compassionate

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

Erosion Control Plan  
Erosion Control Permit  
Rule 5 Permit  
Provide Calculations for Impervious Space  
Detailed Site Plan  
Backflow Prevention (domestic and irrigation)  
Site Improvement Permit  
Submit Full Set of Plans (paper and PDF) (civil and building)  
Submit Shared Parking Easement  
State Design Release  
Building Permit  
Contractors Registered with the City  
Signage/Fencing Permit  
Zoning Clearance