



166 Lincolnway
Valparaiso, IN 46383
(219) 462-1161
Valpo.us

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Drive and Shine
ADDRESS: 2501 & 2511 Calumet Avenue
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: Zoom
DATE: October 20, 2022

IN ATTENDANCE:

Beth Shrader, Planning Director
(219) 462-1161 / bshrader@valpo.us
Jessica Gage, Associate Planner
(219) 462-1161 / jgage@valpo.us
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us
Bill Laird, Engineering Department
(219) 462-1161 / blaird@valpo.us
Nate McGinley, VCS
(219) 462-6174 / nmcginley@valpo.us
Tony Fabel, VCS
(219) 464-4973 / tfabel@valpo.us
Hanna Seats, VCS
(219) 464-4973 / hseats@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Russ Pozen, DVG Team
(219) 281-4068
rpozen@dvqteam.com
Robyn Pappenheim, DVG Team
(219) 281-3133
rpappenheim@dvqteam.com
Jeffrey Ban / jrbans@dvqteam.com
Brandon Maust, Drive & Shine
(574) 277-8877
bmaust@driveandshine.com
Joseph Dzierla,
Joseph A. Dzierla & Associates
(574) 234-8619
jdzierla@outlook.com
John Bals,
Joseph A. Dzierla & Associates, Inc.
jcbals@outlook.com

The following is a summary of the discussion at this meeting.

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Drive and Shine Carwash to be located at 2501 and 2511 Calumet Avenue. 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: Pozen mentioned that the main function of the carwash and self-vacuums for Drive and Shine will be on the south portion of the properties. The project is just south of the Family Express and they will be accessing the existing ingress/egress road. A proposed lube center will be located on the north property. The carwash will have three lanes for stacking and there will also be a by-pass lane. Bals said that along the elevations various bump outs no more than 80 ft. apart have been included. The lower portion of the building is architectural masonry and then it switches to a uniform brick with a masonry band. A large, green glass curtain wall system provides a view into the self-vacuum area. Dzierla explained that they tried to pickup on things that were requested at an earlier meeting. They feel that the bump outs and building height do meet the requirements. They do not have the utility design yet. They will be connecting to existing storm sewers at the southwest, south, and north. There is a water main adjacent to this development. There is a sanitary stub on the east side on Calumet. These plans will be forthcoming. They will be trying to meet the requirements of the UDO for not only the architectural requirements, but also site requirements for bufferyards, landscaping, etc.

STAFF COMMENTS:

MCGINELY: McGinley stated that he will wait to review the utility plan for water and sewer. The plans must be approved before any permits can be issued. McGinley mentioned that the Metering Department wants to make sure they know backflow will be required for both the domestic and fire service if a

fire service line is necessary. Permitting for sewer will go through the Engineering Department. Inspections will be done by Collections and Distribution.

FAHEL: The Water Reclamation Department is concerned about what is being discharged into the sanitary sewer. Submittal of a detailed floor plan and an internal plumbing plan will be required. Material Safety Data Sheets will be required for all chemicals used at this facility. Fahel asked if a grease interceptor is being installed. The installation of an interceptor was confirmed. Fahel said the interceptor should be part of the plumbing plan.

LAIRD: Engineering will be interested in the proposed utility plan, especially as it relates to the storm sewer. It will be necessary to submit a proposed grading plan to see how runoff will be handled and how storm water will be collected. Laird understands that this is a regional basin sized for the development; however, when this was done, it was based on lot coverages of 85% impervious surface. Laird will need to see the percentage of coverage to confirm that this will adhere to the original drainage design. Pozen stated they are less than 85%. Laird said that Engineering will wait for the utility plans and grading plans to be submitted for review of lot coverage. Shrader stated this is an unusual situation with easements for private roads. The locations for these easements and private roads are sometimes split between parcels and sometimes totally on one parcel. Does the calculation for the 85% calculation include all of the paved surface on the existing roads and driveways. Laird believes this is true. Posen said the northern lot is Lot 1 and the southern lot is Lot 2 and there is a private drive in between. Pozen will use the center line of the private drive for his measurement. Shrader believes this will be true for storm water purposes. However, when they get into the calculation for floor area ratio, or anything on the Planning side, it may be different.

STITES: The addresses need to be on the Calumet side of the facilities and visible from Calumet. Stites asked if the buildings will be sprinkled or have a fire alarm. The comment was made that Drive and Shine has never sprinkled any of their buildings, so they are not planning on sprinklers; however, there will be a fire alarm. Stites conveyed that any fire protection contractor will need to contact Stites before beginning any work. During the construction phase, all inspections are to be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections. Stites asked if the entrance at the northwest is gated and about the size of the entrance. Pozen said it is 14 ft. wide and it is an arm gate. Stites mentioned this entrance will not accommodate a fire truck. Stites will provide the minimum requirements for fire apparatus access. He does not know if the Fire Department can make the turn into the middle drive with the way the road is angled. Shrader pointed out the area Stites was talking about. Pozen stated this is an exit gate only and it is not the main access point to the site. Pozen asked where the Fire Department would get into the site. Stites stated that they would need to get in as close as possible. They could use the stacking area to enter but on the east side where the exit gate is they would need to have access through that area. Stites said they require either 20 ft. or 24 ft. Stites will provide the correct information. Maust said they could do a Knox Box. Maust said from the southeast corner of the building to where a fire truck could be parked is 115 ft. Stites asked about the distance from the road on the west side to the middle of the building. Maust stated the distance is 93 ft. Shrader asked if there is a preferred location for the FDC on the building. Stites conveyed that if the building is not sprinkled, they will not need an FDC.

ON BEHALF OF VICKI THRASHER (BUILDING COMMISSIONER): A Construction Design Release from the State will be required prior to issuance of any permits. A local Building Permit will be required. Submittal of a list of contractors working on the project will be required, and all contractors must be registered with the City. One (1) set of paper plans and one (1) set of pdf plans must be submitted. The Site Permit application and Zoning Clearance should be submitted with the Building Permit application. Signage will require a separate permit.

SHRADER: Shrader requested they explain circulation through the site. Pozen conveyed that the cars will come into the stacking area. The cars will come around south to east. The entrance to the actual carwash is at the southeast. The cars can come out to the north towards the private drive and exit or take a right and loop back to the large, paved area to go south to another access point to the exterior vacuums. If the car goes through the 8-1/2 ft. wide gate area on to the 12 ft. drive area it will access the building again for a detailing-type function. Then they can exit out to the north and leave the facility. Maust said there are about 22 spaces at the rear of the building for customers to pull in a use the vacuums. If customers use the carwash the

vacuums are provided free of charge. The gates are there to stop people who are not customers of the carwash. Pozen stated that to get to the other lot, it is necessary to access to the west where the dumpster is located, go east to the loop to the three spots for an oil change. From there the cars are funneled down to a 16 ft. drive that is one-way, go north to the ingress/egress and exit the facility. Shrader conveyed that this is located in the Commercial General (CG) Zoning District. The uses are light automobile service and a carwash. It is being presented as a joint project, but we will treat them as separate projects. They appear to be compliant with the limited use standards in Section 2.552 for a light automobile service and Section 2.532 for a carwash. Shrader noticed some site calculations. These look good as far as the LSR being reported. Shrader stated they need to be using the standards for Commercial General, All Other Uses. The LSR is .15, Gross FAR is .431 and Net FAR is .507. This information is in Table 3.301B. It appears they used the standards for BP. Pozen stated they probably did use the BP standards. Shrader said for minimum site area they need to take the entire lot all the way to the center line of the easement of the private road and drive. For the FAR's and LSR, Planning would consider the lot to be based on where the right-of-way would be, which is essentially the edge of the easement. It is a 60 ft. access and utility easement and it should be treated as if it were the boundary and this is where the setbacks will be taken from. This is how calculations will need to be done for the site coverages, etc. The non-residential bulk requirements, Table 3.505, All Other Uses, or possibly Commercial Retail, the important thing is the front yard is 15 ft. Shrader mentioned that as discussed before, there are three (3) front yards. The front yard on Calumet is in an overlay district and the front yard setback is 30 ft. The other two front yards will use the 15 ft. setbacks. This is from what would be the right-of-way. This is based on how Planning did the calculations and review for the medical office building. Pozen believes that because they have three (3) front yards and the fact that the building toward the northwest corner would be from the easement and would be less than 15 ft. causes a hardship for them. Pozen stated they will have to seek a variance. Shrader said the fourth side is considered a side yard and the setback is 10 ft. and is measured from the building. A landscape plan was not included in the submittal. It can be difficult to set all the plant material. Shrader suggested they do a conceptual landscape plan before they submit a petition for the BZA, so if they realize they cannot meet the landscape requirements this can be included in the BZA petition. Posen said they received a preliminary landscape plan but it was too late to include it in the site review submittal. The plan will be sent to Planning for review. Shrader will need a plan for photometrics. The lighting standards are located in Article 9, Division 9.500. Planning conveyed that this is a commercial district and use. The maximum foot candle measured vertically and horizontally is .5 at the property line. Shrader cautioned that they keep in mind the ground level luminous ratio cannot exceed 12:1. Planning assumes that at the property lines they will be at .5 and this sets the maximum illumination anywhere on site. The parking requirements for these uses seem to be met. Because this facility is located in a signature corridor, the non-residential standards for architecture apply. It appears that the earlier feedback Planning supplied has been incorporated into the plans. There is a great deal of transparency on the east building elevation and it is obvious the requirement is being met there; however, we are looking at Section 11.506—along street frontages buildings shall provide transparency between a height of 3 ft. and 8 ft. above finished grade. The requirement is 60% along the primary façade and we count Calumet as the primary façade. All other street frontages, and there are two (2) other street frontages, will require 30% transparency. No tint is allowed. It appears there is a green color of the glass, Shrader would like more information about this. How transparent does it remain? It will be necessary to do the calculations between 3 ft. and 8 ft. on each façade. There may be issues because the transparency is above 8 ft. Shrader would like the calculations and to see if they can work towards compliance. If it requires a variance, solutions can be discussed. Bals said the green glass is very transparent. The aluminum on the storefront is green. It is the owners signature mark and the owner will be very adamant about keeping this element. A picture of an actual building was presented. Shrader thinks the green glass will be fine; however, there are issues on other elevations with the quantity of transparency. The other item that is relevant to this is Section 11.507, which is the building material requirements for non-residential architectural standards. The list of permitted materials does allow glass curtain walls, but they may not be used as a predominant exterior building material. The UDO does not have a definition of predominant. Planning interprets predominant as the greatest percentage of a façade. This will require a variance. Maust asked

if Planning is looking at all four facades. Shrader explained that the transparency requirements are only for facades that face a street. The facades that require the 30% are the northern and western. Maust said all the equipment is behind the west wall and requiring transparency causes a concern. Shrader suggested they do their best to meet the requirements but it will still need a variance. She suggested the use of spandrel glass or something that allows them to have a back-of-house element and is still attempting to meet the requirement can go a long way to getting approvals through the Board of Zoning Appeals. Maust said the whole area is full of equipment and pipes and is not something you want to look at. It would just be a phony glass wall. He believes they will have to seek a variance for the west wall elevation. Installing fake windows is a waste of money. Shrader stated this happens all the time. Shrader mentioned no landscape plan was included, but something to keep in mind in a situation like this where you will be seeking a variance for lack of transparency, the situation can also be addressed with a landscape plan. Other architectural elements can also be used to ensure that it is not a blank façade. Shrader mentioned that she will want a calculation of the footprint of the canopies. Shrader asked if the canopy is detached. Pozen confirmed it is detached. Shrader stated it will fall under other detached accessory structures. It cannot be larger than 25% of the footprint of the principal structure. Pozen said they looked at this and it is fine. Shrader mentioned that it cannot be closer than 6 ft. to a building. Pozen said it is closer than 6 ft. Shrader said it has to be attached or not closer than 6 ft. This is kind of a repeat of the building code. With what has been provided, these are all the Planning comments for now for the site; however, there is more to review before they get to the point of having a complete list of required variances. The next deadline for the Board of Zoning Appeals is November 18th for the December 21st meeting. Another site review can be done at a later point once some of the elements that have been requested are more fleshed out.

GAGE: Gage asked who accesses the building. Pozen said the employees access the building, but the general public is not allowed access. Maust said the public can access the inside vacuum area. Gage asked how many vehicles sit in the area. Maust stated there can be 18 vehicles in the area. Gage said her thought was that if the lots are being treated as separate lots, it may be necessary to add a handicapped accessible space for Lot 1. Also, Gage stated that she does not see how functional the handicapped space is on Lot 2. Gage conveyed that the dryers are not shown on the east parking area. The dryers were shown more prominently on the initial site plan. She wants to be able to see the posts that come up. Posen said this will be included on the plans. Gage mentioned a handicapped spot in the dryer area for the sake of being able to swing that door open. Not everyone who is handicapped is in a wheel chair. Gage feels this is a relevant point. Pozen said it is relatively easy to add a handicapped space to Lot 1; however, Lot 2 is a different animal. Pozen understands the need in the vacuum area. The public is not coming into the building from a parked access. A space may be needed for employees to get into the building at the southwest bump-out. Gage asked if employees are able to exit from this location. Pozen confirmed. The stacking of the parking is not going to be 24/7. Cars can backout and get to the bypass lane. There will always be someone there from Drive and Shine to help maneuver a vehicle out of the site. There should not be a problem with people backing up onto the private roads. Gage asked them to explain the circulation from the western exit and the inside dry area. Are there ever traffic conflicts with two vehicles trying to turn right, or someone trying to come out the west side trying to loop back in at the same time the person inside drying trying to leave. Maust said every once in a while there might be two or three coming out, but the area is so wide because of this. It sounds like some adjustments may need to be made. If it is busy and full, there is at least a 15 second lull. It's not like there is another car is right behind turning. If there is any kind of backup the belt automatically shuts down. Gage asked if there is directional signage Maust said they like to use as such directional signage as the municipality will allow, as well as markings on the pavement. Gage requested that the directional signage be shared on the next plan revision. Gage is concerned about the radii with how they are accessing the private drives. 20 ft. is a typical subdivision radii. Planning is looking at safer intersections. Gage asked if these could be made a little smaller. Stites interjected that when a turning radius is made smaller, the Fire Department cannot access certain spaces. Stites will send the information for the fire truck. Pozen said he will do some calculations to make sure the radii are wide enough for the Fire Department but not so wide they cause problems. Gage asked Posen to add a 15 ft. setback line off the internal drive. Shrader asked why the drive is

Page 5
Site Review
2501 and 2511 Calumet Ave.
Drive and Shine

so wide. Posen stated this is existing as part of the subdivision and unless he has to move it, he would rather not mess with it.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Landscaping Plan
Sewer Permit
Drainage Plan
Utility Plan
Detailed Floor Plan
Internal Plumbing Plan
MSDS Sheets – All Chemicals Used on Site
Detailed Site Plan
Backflow Prevention
Site Improvement Permit
Grading Plan
Photometric Plan
Calculation of Canopy Footprint
State Design Release
Building Permit
List of Contractors
Contractors Registered with City
Provide One (1) Set of Paper Plans and One (1) Set of PDF Plans
Signage/Fencing Permit
Variances as Required
Transparency (West and North Facades) Knox Box (at gate)
Zoning Clearance