



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

MEETING: Site Review Committee
SUBJECT: Grand Gardner Hotel
ADDRESS: 354 Jefferson Street
PRELIMINARY SITE REVIEW

LOCATION: Zoom
DATE: December 1, 2022

IN ATTENDANCE:

Beth Shrader, Planning Director
(219) 462-1161 / bshrder@valpo.us
Jessica Gage, Associate Planner
(219) 462-1161 / jgage@valpo.us
Vicki Thrasher, Building Commissioner
(219) 462-1161 / vthrasher@valpo.us
Tim Stites, Fire Department
(219) 462-8325 / tstites@valpo.us
Bill Laird, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / blaird@valpo.us
Matt Zurbriggen, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / mzurbriggen@valpo.us
Will Rose, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / wrose@valpo.us
Max Rehlander, Engineering Dept.
(219) 462-1161 / mrehlander@valpo.us
Mike Jabo, Director of Engineering
(219) 462-1161 / mjabo@valpo.us
Nate McGinley, VCS
(219) 462-6174 / nmcginley@valpo.us
Bob Garmon, VCS
(219) 426-6174 / bgarmon@valpo.us
Tony Fahel, VCS
(219) 464-4973 / tfahel@valpo.us
Hanna Seats, VCS
(219) 464-4973 / hseats@valpo.us
Councilman Robert Cotton
rcotton@valpo.us

PRESENTERS:

Todd Leeth, Hoepfner, Wagner & Evans
(219) 462-4961 / tleeth@hwelaw.com
Randell Peterson, Abomarche
(219) 246-4196
rpeterson@abonmarche.com
Dustin Eggink, Ratio Design
(317) 633-4040
deggink@ratiodesign.com
Tom Cloud, Ratio Design
(317)633-4040
tcloud@ratiodesign.com
Jennifer Brooks, Urschel
(219) 474-4811
jbrooks@urschel.com

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

OPENING: The Site Review Committee met to discuss the proposed Grand Gardner Hotel to be located at 354 Jefferson Street. 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: Leeth gave an explanation of the project. This is the old Boys & Girls Club. The building dates back to the 1800s. Urschel's has acquired three homes to the east to the north/south alley. There is a small parcel north of the school. All total this is 1.5 acres. This is a single-site PUD. It is unique in that it is not intended to be subdivided or broken out. It is going to be redeveloped keeping the old school building and removing everything else, including the old gymnasium and the homes that lie to the east of it. It will be redeveloped as a 58-guest room boutique hotel. Ratio has done a phenomenal job with the architecture in keeping with the architectural treasure of the old school building. Urschel's primary goal was to acquire the property to preserve that and then find a use that is

economically feasible in order to incorporate that architectural feature into a development project. There is a site plan, architecture, and interior building layouts. What they don't have is final engineering, stormwater calculations, or a lot of detail. Leeth believes they do have what is necessary at this stage and that is the view toward uses and zoning. They decided to do a single-site PUD, rather than rezone the property, which would be spot zoning. With a PUD they can tie their hands to exactly what they are proposing. The site plan and architecture are both exhibits to the document. So, you know exactly what you are going to get. If it were zoned commercial, the City would not know, without commitments, what it would get. This will be very similar to St. Paul Square, which is also a single-site PUD. The St. Paul Square property is in very close proximity. The process is not new. It is a great tool the Planning Department can use to drive a unique development such as this. Leeth indicated that Eggink has all the details. This is very preliminary. Leeth suggested going through the City Departments for questions or comments. As long as the PUD is approved, they will then turn the project over for engineering. Then they will be back with plumbing, building, engineering, and storm water calculations. This is when the technical review will be drilled into. Shrader noticed that there were a number of things in the PUD outside of commercial lodging that are permitted by right. Some of those affect other site development needs. Shrader's first inclination is that this needs to be narrowed down quite a bit, or potentially, everything but commercial lodging eliminated. Institutional Residential and Single-Family are included as part of the PUD Ordinance. Are these truly desired or will they be omitted from the PUD Ordinance? Leeth stated that he will need to go back and look at his notes and the ordinance. The items that were left in are items that would be found in NC-60, which is the underlying zoning. Shrader understands why the NC-60 permitted uses were left in. However, for this purpose, she thinks they may want to focus the PUD on Commercial Lodging only. It can be converted later. It refines the focus for everybody's comments. Leeth stated that the overriding goal is to build this hotel. He thinks it is bad planning to create any kind of zoning, whether it is through a PUD or a rezoning, with just one use. That is why he listed what they could, by right, use today on that property with the NC-60 underlying zone. Shrader said they can follow up on this later. She suggested a meeting between Gage, Leeth and herself before the next meeting to discuss this further.

Dustin Eggink: This building will be developed in three sections. The existing Gardner School is the center piece. There will be a retail lounge and bar off the lobby. The gathering spaces, banquet room, and the food and beverage components for the entire development are to the west. This is a three-story development and it matches the height of the existing building. The guest rooms are to the east. These floors stack in the typical way, right on top of each other. There are suites on the second level in the center area. From that level you can see below. The banquet space is a two-story space in the west wing and it is opened to below. There is a fitness area off the side. There is also a mechanical room. On the third level in the east wing the rooms stack up as they are. There are suites in the center, spa spaces, and a breakfast area. There is a bar and breakfast area in the west wing or the hotel but they will be open to the public as well. Breakfast and small plates will be served throughout the day. The fourth level of the school is a speakeasy space. The character of the space will be maintained. The connectors are a lighter glass. The east and west wings will keep the same pattern as the school. They want to keep the same pattern and roof lines. The goal is to be complimentary to the school and let that be the star of the show. Shrader asked them to speak about the site design. Eggink said there is a new main entry and a guest drop off area. This is a one-way street heading east. Along the street there are reverse angle parking spaces. The main parking area for guests and visitors is on the east side. They are utilizing the alley as a way to ingress and egress out of the parking. There is parking along the alley way as well. Peterson mentioned that the reverse angle parking on Jefferson is unique for Valparaiso. The required number of parking spaces is met.

There is an offsite, adjacent parking area to the north of the alley and it is part of their property. Shrader asked about improvements being planned for the pavement. Eggink indicated that improvements to the alley have not been 100% vetted yet. It can be discussed. Peterson explained that there is a pedestrian paver system directly in front of the building and entrance area to the west. They have tried to leave green space between the building and the street, as well as a green space for the guests. They have purposely staggered the construction of the east wing to break the scale of that down with respect to the street to give it a residential feel along with a sloped roof. Peterson stated that there is an existing sewer line in the alley and an existing water main on Jefferson Street. The only drainage facility is a set of inlets at the intersection of Campbell and Jefferson. The intent is to connect any new sewer laterals to those in the alley and to extend a new water and fire service from Jefferson into the site. The location of the line may vary. It will meet City standards and connect to the building. Peterson mentioned that he had discussions with City staff early in the process about drainage. There is a channel that comes off the side of what was the gymnasium, but it isn't a great situation. There is also a lot of coverage and impervious space. They are going to divide the building at the end of the school and the start of the east addition. They will capture and use some up sized pipes and provide an underground storage system. Everything to the west of the line will go directly to the storm sewer system. They will show an overall reduction in runoff. This will keep from dumping more water into the storm sewer pipe at a status quo level. Most of the storm water management will happen in the east parking lot. Downspouts will be connected to the pipe system. There will be a restrictor to hold the water back and release it at a slow rate.

STAFF COMMENTS:

ZURBRIGGEN: Zurbruggen stated that they have not received the utility plan and requested that Abonmarche provide that to staff for review. The PUD states it will generally be meeting the UDO and the technical standards. Zurbruggen asked what "generally" means and what are specific areas that will not be met. For the parking and overall site, Engineering would like to see an additional dimension plan. There were some dimensions that are not clear as far as the angled parking and depth of stalls. Engineering wants to see heavier dimensioning and traffic flow, what are the turning movements, and how do cars maneuver throughout the parking lot and into the alley and back out on to Jefferson. There are some more specific comments concerning the Jefferson Street parking. A more in-depth meeting might be better too since there is parking on Jefferson Street and that affects the entire design and layout of the road. The northwest existing parking lot is probably just going to remain as is, but Engineering needs to see some dimensions on what the parking stalls look like to ensure the people in the northern most spots can turn and get to the alley.

ROSE: Will the address for the entire property be 354 Jefferson Street? Leeth stated this is what is preferred.

JABO: From the plans, it appears Jefferson is going to be a two-lane roadway. Currently it is a one-lane roadway. Jabo asked them to explain their thinking on traffic and circulation on the public street. Peterson said the line on the plan below "Jefferson Street" is the center line and it is just a boundary line. It is not intended to be striping for multiple lanes. There is absolutely no intention to change what is there now. Jabo asked if the parking east of the reverse angle parking will remain parallel parking. Peterson confirmed it will remain parallel parking.

REHLANDER: Rehlander mentioned that it would help if traffic flow arrows were added to Campbell and Jefferson, as well as parking stripes and bike lane markers. Rehlander requested dimensions along the existing alley be provided. This will help evaluate turning movements if the alley is going to be used as proposed. Jabo interjected that a truck would overhang the sidewalk quite a bit. The sidewalk width appears to be 5 ft. wide. Jabo thinks the sidewalk should be wider. Shrader added that the bike lane needs to be represented. Shrader stated that in this part of the City the right-of-way

in the alley is 16 ft. Shrader does not think that it is all paved, so they cannot count on all of that width for turning movement. Peterson said they do show the existing edges of pavement on the site plan. The pavement width varies throughout the alley either because of terrain or improvements built right up to the property line. Shrader mentioned that there is a house built right up to the alley. If they intend to use this as part of the circulation, it will be necessary to show how this will work.

LAIRD: As part of this process and construction, a Storm Water General Construction Permit from IDEM will be required. The Engineering Department will provide local approval. A Site Permit and Erosion Control Permit will also be required as part of this project. These permits should be submitted at the same time Building Permits are submitted. They will be approved through the Engineering Department.

MCGINLEY: PUD Section 8 states the sewer collection system and water department have the necessary capacity to serve the development. It is difficult for VCS to confirm that at this time. VCS does not know what the daily demands for usage will be. McGinley stated that he needs to know the daily water and sewer demands for the facility before VCS can confirm that existing infrastructure can support this change in use. The sewer will discharge into a combination sewer. So, they definitely want to make sure the demands from this facility will not cause any issue to that combination sewer. Once the utility plan is completed, VCS will need it for review purposes. The Metering Department stated that an RPZ backflow will be required on the domestic line and a double check valve system will be required on the fire line. If there is an irrigation system, a pressure vacuum breaker will be required on that line. A Sanitary Sewer Permit will be required and should be submitted at the same time the Site Permit application is submitted. All inspections for sewer connections will be done by the Collection and Distribution Department. VCS will work with the developer and engineer to figure out the demands for the site.

GARMON: Garmon is concerned about the sizing for the fire flow for a building. Shrader asked how quickly Ratio could produce some water demand information for VCS to review. Cloud stated the information could be put together pretty quickly. It would be based on historical data. As far as fire flow, the building is approximately 65,000 sq. ft. of enclosed space. Shrader indicated that it will be important that VCS has a comfort level with the statement in the PUD before the Plan Commission gives its final approval. The second meeting to review this before Plan Commission will be January 3, 2023.

FAHEL: Fahel asked if grease equipment will be installed in the kitchens. Peterson indicated that details have not been worked out yet; however, they are assuming there will be a grease interceptor prior to the sanitary sewer coming out of the kitchens. Fahel conveyed that an internal plumbing plan will be required. A detailed floor plan of the kitchen will also be required. Fahel said it appears there are two elevators and asked if they will be hydraulic or electric. Peterson advised that he is not sure if this has been decided. The industry has moved away from hydraulic, even for a short run. Fahel advised that if the elevators are hydraulic, it will be necessary to have a sump pit for any leakage. Fahel will look forward to receiving the utility plans.

THRASHER: Thrasher asked if a right-of-way dedication will be required along Campbell. Laird conveyed that Engineering is not sure at this time. Thrasher conveyed that Construction Design Releases will be required from the State of Indiana for all phases of the construction. A local Building Permit is required. All contractors working on the project must be registered with the City before permits are issued. Submittal of a PDF set plans and full paper set of plans is required. Signage will require a separate permit. Since there are kitchens, approval from the Porter County Health Department will be needed. Thrasher asked if the sprinkler system will be an NFPA 13 system. The Grand Gardner team confirmed the system will be a full NFPA 13 system. Thrasher asked if this project will be permitted in phases or as a whole. Peterson advised that the documents have been

prepared as a single project.

ON BEHALF OF TIM STITES (FIRE DEPARTMENT): Fire apparatus access must be determined and the requirements must be met. It will be necessary to look for areas where access can be improved and incorporated into the site design. A Knox Box will be required. A set of sprinkler and fire alarm plans should be submitted to the Fire Department. All inspections required during the construction phase must be scheduled and coordinated through the Building Department. After occupancy, the facility will be subject to annual fire inspections.

SHRADER: Some of the language in the PUD Ordinance will have to be addressed. It will be necessary to look at uses and the intent of when the UDO comes into play when the PUD Ordinance is silent on a certain issue. Planning recognizes this is an area in flux and is hoping to address this area of the City, the collar around downtown. Shrader is unsure of what this will look like, whether it is zones or an overlay, but thinks it will be in response to a greater density the City is seeing in this area. Overall, Planning wants to ensure that the PUD Ordinance takes care of this project but also, where the PUD is silent that it will adapt with however we need to change what is going on in this area from a zoning perspective. Right now, there is some language that points to that. More detailed discussion is needed concerning Section 2 a & b. Leeth said he did have a chance to look at the UDO and his notes. There are six uses in 3(a) that are permitted uses of the PUD Ordinance. There are six uses over and above the Commercial Lodging, which is obviously the intended use. All six of these uses are permitted in NC-60. Leeth stated that he did not incorporate all of the uses allowed in NC-60 into the PUD Ordinance. He only included what he thought was appropriate. Leeth conveyed that he will be happy to talk with Shrader and Gage on how to address any concerns. Shrader stated that the way the site will be developed it does not lend itself to any other use, perhaps Institutional Residential and some other things that were not mentioned. Having single-family homes or manufactured homes can be discussed. Shrader stated that unless somewhere in the future this site were to be raised and single-family homes built, that use does not really fit in this PUD even though it does belong in the NC-60 zone. Understanding how this PUD will interact with amendments to the UDO is something to be discussed. Instead of the permitted principal uses, maybe listing accessory uses should be considered. That might give the Petitioner some protection with the speak easy and spa which are accessory uses to a hotel. Section 5 of the UDO using General Commercial for development standards, she thinks they should pick a different zone to use. General Commercial is the only one of the zones that permits Commercial Lodging by right. But that does not mean all of those development standards will work in this location. Maybe Central Place, CBD or some hybrid Planning identifies will be more appropriate. In the architectural section there is mention of Low E for glazing which could mean a lot of different things. Low E can be completely transparent and there is Low E that you cannot see through at all. Planning would like more detail from the architect on the types of glazing that being proposed. The principal concern will be in the ground floor areas. There is a loading dock/outdoor storage. What is the anticipated refuse situation? Typically, it is with a private hauler in a use like this. Will the refuse be kept inside? Leeth stated that refuse will all be stored internally and collected from the in the alley in the rear. Eggink confirmed the use of a private hauler. Shrader mentioned that Jabo made a comment about the proposed parking and current sizes of vehicles. It is common that vehicles will overhang the sidewalk. Planning would like to see how this works. Throughout the site the parking dimensions are less than the standards in the UDO. The 17 ft. depth of the stall is something that works at certain angles but it appears that at the angled parking shown along Jefferson there are concerns about overhang and cars not fitting. It would be

helpful to have further discussion with Abonmarche about how that will work and to see some typical cars in there to know it works. There is no street lighting expected. Shrader anticipates lighting in the parking lot or on the building. Eggink stated this is generally correct. Ratio wants to look towards neighborhood standards and make sure they are not over lighting. Shrader stated that Planning will be looking for some innovative lighting design to protect the neighbors. The standard is zero-foot candles at the lot line when up against a residential district. It will be necessary to make sure there is no glare that is visible. Maybe a lower type of fixture at bollard height that would provide the lighting needed. Shrader would be interested in what type of low-level light Ratio can come up with. Eggink stated anything that would be higher up would be in the parking level to meet safety requirements. Full cut off fixtures would be used so there is no bleed beyond the lot lines. In the public areas everything can be kept pretty low. Shrader conveyed that Section 17 points to two different areas of the sign code. It will be necessary to choose one or define a hybrid in the text. She is not concerned that the site will be over-signed. However, Shrader feels illuminated signs will not be allowed in this area. Certain types of halo lights will meet the standard. It will be necessary to make sure the lumens are respectful of the neighbors. She wants to explore this to make sure there is no expectation to have a type of sign that will not work here. Planning is very concerned about light intrusion into the neighbors. Signage comes at the end of a project, but it would be good to have some precedent images to respond to and help refine this section. Other than light and noise, parking and traffic congestion are what the neighbors are most concerned about. While Shrader understands how they came up with the parking demand calculations, using the UDO for hotel. The alternative is a hotel convention center like McCormick Place. Clearly, this is not that. However, it is not just a hotel. This does have a banquet center that will have its own demand. The parking is somewhere between 64 spaces as calculated and 90 some spaces that would be required using the hotel with event space standard. There are 74 spaces calculated. Engineering shares the concern that all of the spaces are undersized. There are parking lots within the City that have undersized spaces and they are a problem. Planning does not want this to be a problem. The only reason Planning is considering street parking is because this is an extraordinary project, a once in several generations type of project. Shrader thinks the drop off and street parking will help better integrate this use into the neighborhood. Planning does want to explore having these. The angle of the parking needs to be looked at to see if a longer stall is possible. These spaces appear to be at 30 degrees now. Shrader feels they need to explore 45 degrees. The stalls in the alley are at a depth of 16.7 feet. This is very undersized for the angle they are coming in at. Shrader said there is concern that some parking spaces will be lost once it is insured the parking as designed will work. A broader look needs to be taken at other parking options. Maybe the Grand Gardner team already has thoughts on this. Maybe there could be some partnerships or methods of operation that will be mentioned in the PUD. This will give comfort to the neighbors and will be very helpful. Are there any thoughts beyond what is shown here to getting access to more parking? Leeth said certainly not on site. It is maxed out. They do recognize that the City is addressing parking on a global area. There is an ariel showing how close this site is to downtown and the existing parking lots within a 3-minute walk. Leeth does not believe their hotel guests should park in these areas. The guests that come to a small event in the west wing would be able to utilize those spaces. The Elevate Valpo Study does the rings for parking and this site falls within those rings. The Grand Gardner team will be happy to explore those questions and concerns. Shrader indicated that there are some public parking spaces but giving some thought as to how this would work would be necessary. Some have restrictions such as needing a permit. This would not be expected of someone attending a meeting or conference. It will be necessary to think about how to reflect this in the PUD. Peterson conveyed that the dimensions of

the parking spaces are to the nearest foot. It is measured from the end of the curb at the sidewalk to the radius point, not necessarily to the end of the stall. Peterson mentioned he went off of the table in the UDO. The parking stalls in the parking lot are noted at 17 ft. but that is a horizontal dimension. If you do the trigonometry the angle is 30 degrees so the length is 19.7 ft. and that would be the actual bay length. This is according to the UDO. Shrader said the parking stall depth is 17.8 ft. for a 30-degree angle. The spaces are in range but not quite. The City needs to be able to understand if this will work and are there some tweaks needed to be made. Areas specifically to look at are where the space is right up against the radius. Shrader showed problem stalls on the drawing. The Fire Department will want to know they have the full alley to work with for fire access. Shrader asked how they envision the existing parking on the northwest corner to work. Leeth stated he is unsure they have gotten this far yet. Shrader said that since this is part of the project, it needs to be addressed. Maybe the sidewalk carries through or having some sort of crosswalk to tie it in to the site. Shrader asked for the dimension for the height of the walls in the front. The UDO does have maximum height. For the sidewalk in front, we will need to think about whether we are adjusting the right of way or providing some sort of public access easement to clean up the fact that the public sidewalk comes through private property. Is bike parking anticipated? Eggink stated this is not designated right now. Rehlander interjected that the existing slope from the drop off area to the entrance appears to be steep. Rehlander cautioned that the site will need to be ADA compliant for sidewalk and access. Shrader indicated a sidewalk on the plan and said that there is room to make the sidewalk a little bit wider to adjust for vehicle overhang. She pointed out another area with less room but stated that it still needs to meet the minimum ADA width. They need to show that it works or make adjustments to the width to make it work. Shrader advised that the landscape looks pretty good. She will look at it further. Once the parking area is refined, Shrader pointed out a planting area that will need a closer look. They might want to do some type of four seasons screening depending on the height of the fence. The fence in the corner needs to be cut back in for site distance around the alley corner.

GAGE: Gage asked if the fourth floor speak easy is all useable space. Is that meeting space/banquet space in total. Eggink said it is not completely all of that space. The turrets will not be included. The speak easy is not a banquet space. It is a bar. Shrader asked if it is bar open to the public. Eggink said it will be open to the public. Gage asked if this was included in the parking totals. Shrader stated it was not included. The 90-something was just including the banquet room. The board room or the retail uses were not included. That will bump up the parking demand. This emphasizes the need to look at relationships off site and put something in about how this will work. Gage conveyed the northern lot makes sense for employees. Engineering talked about making sure vehicles can back up. She heard dimensions, sidewalk, cross walks, and proper ramps will be added as needed. Gage is aware that Engineering spoke about the slope at the entrance. Gage said the site plan will want to reflect ramps and striping at the appropriate spots. The same comments apply to the east lot. The northern most accessible spot does not meet code. Her understanding looking at the Ordinance is that these are 60-degree spaces. So, the spacing needs to be more than was mentioned. Shrader asked if Peterson could confirm the angle of this parking. Peterson stated that is possible. Just not right now. Gage will look forward to meeting with Leeth about the ordinance language. As much as we can often say this will get a closer look later, in essence this is a site plan with a PUD that writes a new Ordinance. Shrader stated this project will appear at Plan Commission on Tuesday. There will be a Public Hearing. There will be refinement and revisions before it is presented back on January 3rd for a vote. After that it goes to City Council.

Page 8
Site Review
Grand Gardner Hotel
December 1, 2022

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

Storm Water Construction General Permit from IDEM
Site Plan
Erosion Plan
Utility Plan
Sanitary Sewer Permit
Construction Design Release
Knox Box
Plans of the Sprinkler and Fire Alarm for the Fire Department
Traffic Flow Arrows Added to Campbell and Jefferson
Add Parking Stripes and Bike Lane Markings
Provide Dimension Along the Existing Alley
Provide Daily Water and Sewer Demands for the Facility
RPZ Backflow on Domestic Line
Double Check Valve for Fire Line
Pressure Vacuum Breaker for Irrigation System
Internal Plumbing Plan
Detailed Floor Plan of Kitchen
Building Permit
Contractors Registered with the City
Contact Porter County Health Department
Signage Permit
Knox Box
Front Entrance ADA Compliant