

**MEETING:** Site Review Committee  
**SUBJECT:** CA Properties, LLC  
**ADDRESS:** 551 Eastport Centre Drive  
**PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW**

**LOCATION:** Zoom  
**DATE:** April 7, 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)  
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)  
Hannah Seats, Water Reclamation Dept.  
(219) 44-4973 / [hseats@valpol.us](mailto:hseats@valpol.us)

**PRESENTERS:**

Steve DeBold, Chester Inc.  
(219) 476-4424 / [sdebold@chesterinc.com](mailto:sdebold@chesterinc.com)  
Tony Peuquet, Chester, Inc.  
(219) 476-4404 / [tpeuquet@chesterinc.com](mailto:tpeuquet@chesterinc.com)

The following is a summary of discussion at this meeting.

**OPENING:** The Site Review Committee met to discuss the autism center proposed to be located at 551 Eastport Centre Drive. 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:** DeBold mentioned that the Chester, Inc. lot is being replatted. It is Lot 31 of Eastport Center Drive. The Chester parcel will be on the north side of Lot 31, and it will become Lot 31B. The parcel is 1.87 acres and currently zoned Business Park (BP). The properties to the northwest and south are zoned BP and the property to the east is zoned INH, Heavy Industrial. The property to the northeast is residential and is in the County. Along the north property line there is a large area of trees serving as a buffer between Chester and the residential parcels to the north. In the buffer area of mature trees there is an existing swale that carries stormwater to Eastport Center Drive. The remainder of the site is dense grass. The proposed project is an 8,300 sq. ft. autism therapy center. There will be a drive shared by Chester and the autism therapy center and a proposed drive located in the northwest corner of the

**Our City...Our Values**

property. There are seventy-five parking spaces being proposed. The majority of these spaces will be behind the building. Along the east, south and west side of the building (hashed area), there will be a hatched, drop off/pick up driver's lane. The water service connection will be on the west side of Eastport Center Drive. The sanitary service connection will be on the east side of the road. The south and west portions of the building, including the roof and parking areas will basically drain to Eastport Center Drive. The north and east portions of the roof and driveway will be taken to a proposed swale. A swale will be created along the east property line and the existing swale within the mature tree line will be redefined and deepened so it will convey more storm water to Eastport Center Drive right-of-way. A 35 ft. buffer yard will be created along the north property line in the areas that abut the residential subdivision. Because of some of the parking areas and redefining the existing swale some of the trees will be removed. However, the majority of the trees within the bufferyard in place will be kept. They will utilize the trees to meet the bufferyard requirement. A C bufferyard is required on the Chester side of the property line and an A bufferyard is required on the residential side of the property line. DeBold said they have basically chosen to install the C/A bufferyard on their side. A 6-foot-tall opaque fence will be installed along the north property line. A number of shrubs will also be installed to meet the C/A requirement for the bufferyard along the residential side. A bufferyard will be created along the east side of the property abutting the Heavy Industrial zoning. The trees and shrubs required within the ten-foot bufferyard will be installed. Shrader asked for an explanation of the autism center's business operation. Pequet stated that there will be up to thirty-five therapists in the building. This will not all be at the same time. Visits are scheduled by appointment. At any given time throughout the day there will be a transition of half-hour to one-hour sessions where individuals are coming in for one-on-one sessions with their therapist. Either a parent/chaperone will drop off an individual, or an individual will get there via bus for an appointment. This is not a long-term care facility. Hope Bridge will be the individual corporation running the therapy sessions.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**MCGINLEY:** The proposed water connection appears to be fine. It will be necessary to coordinate the installation with VCU to do the directional bore under the road and set the curb box for the tie-in. This must be paid for before work begins. For the sanitary sewer, a wye in the main is not required. Since it is a 12-inch, it can be a saddle tap for the sewer connection. A Sanitary Sewer Permit will be obtained from Engineering. VCU should be contacted for inspections. McGinley stated this is in a wellhead protection area. A letter from Shaun Shifflett will be included with the minutes.

**FAHEL:** Fabel asked if there is any cooking equipment in the break room. Peuquet said there is no cooking equipment. This is a professional office building. Fabel provided no further comments.

**ZURBRIGGEN:** The site layout looks good. Zurbriggen said he has not yet performed a full review of the drainage report and site plan. Zurbriggen believes the storm sewer in Eastport Centre Drive goes to the basins located within the subdivision. DeBold indicated that this is correct. Zurbriggen asked if they are aware of any limitations regarding impervious area on any site developments in this area. DeBold said his understanding is the site was originally designed to manage the maximum impervious surface allowed to be built on the parcels and they should be well under these values. Zurbriggen asked if DeBold knows what the limitations are. DeBold said he does not know what they are offhand. Zurbriggen said he will see if Engineering has a record of the limitations. An access agreement between the two properties will be needed because of the shared drive. DeBold mentioned they do have an Ingress/Egress Easement allocated for the shared driveway. DeBold asked if something additional is required. Zurbriggen said the Ingress/Egress Easement is sufficient. Shrader interjected that we do typically ask for some type of arrangement for maintenance. The project will not be held up because we do not have the maintenance agreement, but it is the best practice to have something in place. Zurbriggen stated a Site Permit through the Engineering Department will be required.

**LAIRD:** This new lot appears to be just over an acre. If more than an acre is disturbed, an IDEM Construction General Stormwater Permit will be required and applied for through the Engineering Department. DeBold conveyed those drawings have already been sent to Mingyan Zhou for review.

**THRASHER:** A State Construction Design Release is required. A local Building Permit is required. Submittal of full set of paper and pdf plans is required. The Site Permit application and Zoning Clearance can be submitted with the Building Permit application. All contractors must be registered with the City. Signage will require a separate permit.

**STITES:** All initial inspections required during the construction phase must be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy is granted, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. If there are any fire protection contractors installing fire protection systems, they need to contact Stites prior to beginning work. Stites asked if therapy will include the elderly. Peuquet said there will not be any elderly individuals. The client base is focused solely on autism.

**SHRADER:** The use as a medical office is a permitted use in the BP Zoning District. It appears the LSR, Gross FAR, and Net FAR calculations shown either

meet the standards or are under the limits. There are many more parking spaces provided than the code requires. Shrader asked if this is driven by the end users. The number of spaces is almost twice the amount required. DeBold said it is driven by the client and what they asked for. There is basically one-on-one counseling, and there is a need for the parking shown. Peuquet interjected that there is also a transition period where individuals are being dropped off at the same time individuals are leaving. The design created for stacking will allow for people dropping off as others are picking up at the same time. The parking lot lighting fixtures appear to be good in that they cast downward. Parking lots with more than fifteen parking spaces are subject to the requirement that the lighting has to be reduced by 50% no later than 11:00 p.m., and/or within one hour after closing of the business whichever is later. Lighting reduction is only required if an adjacent use is residential. In this case the reduction will be required because of the residential development to the north; therefore, the light fixtures will need to comply with the lighting reduction. The fixture height is twenty-five feet, and this is the maximum. Shrader asked if they had the actual tree survey available that could be reviewed. Shrader mentioned that she appreciated what was provided; however, in Article 10 whether trees need to be replaced depends on the species and the diameter at breast height. Shrader believes that many of the species are exempt because they are a low-quality species. For example, mulberry and honey suckle are both exempt. Any tree or shrub that is smaller in diameter than ten inches at breast height does not count. Shrader needs to know the size of the trees being removed, as well as the size of the species that will be kept. DeBold stated there is a copy of the tree survey that was completed by Lakeshore Landscaping. DeBold indicated the completed tree survey can be emailed. Shrader asked if the tree survey denotes which trees are marked for removal and which trees are being kept to meet bufferyard requirements. DeBold conveyed that the tree survey shows the point number, diameter, and which trees are involved. DeBold mentioned that his landscaping plan shows which trees are being removed and the same point numbers reflected on the Lakeshore Landscaping tree survey. Shrader asked if only three species were identified. DeBold said there were shade trees that were 90% black cherry, 8% were mulberry, and 2% were miscellaneous. Lakeshore also identified understory trees as 50% mock orange, 30% honey suckle, and 20% dead brush. Shrader asked if they have used the tree removal and replacement section before. DeBold said this section has been used before. Shrader mentioned that she did not see this on the plan set and asked if an analysis was done on whether there is any replacement required based on the species and size of trees being removed. DeBold said there are so many that fall within the drive that are overgrown and figured they would fall mainly under the criteria of having to

### Our City...Our Values

donate the \$10,000 per project to the Park Department. Pequet questioned the monetary donation. Shrader said there is a per tree replacement fee based on how many trees ten inches in diameter and over at breast height are removed. If they are not replaced in-kind somewhere within the project, then there is a payment made to the tree fund in lieu of the replacement planting. Pequet said he will actually have to pay for the trees twice, as well as having to pay to cut them down. Shrader suggested referring to Article 10 for the tree protection section. DeBold shared that they are under some pretty steep deadlines. Are they able to submit for the Building Permit? Thrasher interjected that they could submit so the review process can begin. DeBold has already submitted to the State. Shrader asked if there is any information concerning the height, size, or materials of the sign. DeBold said they are pretty much just showing the sign location so they can run conduit. The signage will be done by others. Shrader recommended they review Table 5.303A for maximum height in this area because we have between 150 and 300 feet of street frontage on Eastport Centre Drive. The allowance for signage is one foot of height for every 10-feet of frontage. The allowance for square footage for the total amount of signage (wall signage, monument signage, etc.) is 3-square feet of signage per lineal foot of frontage. There is 63-feet of frontage on Eastport Centre Drive, so there will be approximately a total of 189 square feet of signage allowed. The Zoning Clearance application has been submitted. Shrader advised that she will review the tree survey and contact DeBold with any further comments.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:**

- Landscaping Plan (with tree survey)
- Construction General Stormwater Permit
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release (already submitted)
- Building Permit
- Contractors Registered with the City
- Signage/Fencing Permit