

CHESTERTON ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
JUNE 16, 2016
6:30 P.M.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 P.M. Present were members J. Trout, F. Owens, J. Ton, T. Kopko and President G. Stone. Members J. Kowalski and R. Poparad were absent. Attorney C. Parkinson was present as legal advisor. Town Engineer M. O'Dell was in attendance. The pledge of allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member T. Kopko moved approval of the minutes from May 19, 2016 seconded by member J. Ton and passed by unanimous voice vote.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC- None

CONCEPT REVIEW

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS

Lake Erie Land Company 1st Addition to Coffee Creek Center P.U.D., Phase C Block 21, Lot 2, Secondary Plat (Residents At Coffee Creek) Attorney T. Hiestand was present as legal representation for the petitioner. He was accompanied by Lori McLaughlin and Frank Jachim of Westshore Senior Housing Consultants, LLC, also architects Philip and Tom Panzica of Panzica Building Corporation. Attorney Hiestand told the board that initially they had filed their petition to request 110 units but then revised the petition to provide for future expansion and requested an additional 40 units. The Residence at Coffee Creek could potentially contain 150 units.

Ms. Lori McLaughlin of Westshore Senior Housing Consultants, LLC was in attendance to present an overview of the project. She said the Westshore team members have been actively involved in developing operating senior living communities for 60 plus years. This project would be modeled after Residents at Deer Creek in Schererville, IN, which has received numerous regional awards for its design as well as its services and quality care it provides. The assisted living and memory care units would be contained within a three story building. Resident apartments would contain a kitchenette equipped with a microwave and refrigerator. All the assisted living residents receive all their meals and snacks from a staffed commercial kitchen. She stated that the memory care portion of the facility would fill a gap that people in the community are searching for. During the 15 to 18 month construction phase of the project they would employ about 250 workers. Once the community is operational they would employ approximately 100 to 110 employees. She commented that Panzica Corp. has partnered with Westshore for many years and deliver a quality and well thought out community.

Mr. T. Panzica told the board this building has been fine tuned and custom designed for the site and the community. The property is located in

ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
JUNE 16, 2016
PAGE 2

the west corner of Coffee Creek 1050 N. and Sidewalk Rd. and SR 49. He gestured to a site plan depicting the site. The building is positioned to optimize views for the residents. The building would be broken up into smaller pieces looking like an assembly of homes. The one story portion would be the memory care facility. He noted placement of the dining room and outdoor terrace with an oval walkway. A center courtyard would be for exclusive use by the memory care residents.

Mr. P. Panzica walked members of the board through variance requests which can be found in Exhibit C of the PUD Ordinance; hereto attached and made a part of these minutes. At the conclusion of the presentation members of the board were invited to comment.

President G. Stone asked where the additional future 40 units would go.

Mr. P. Panzica said they would most likely go vertical above the memory care area. The construction of these additional units would be driven by the market and need.

Member F. Owens questioned the decision to eliminate wheel stops. He commented that they do serve a purpose and the idea that they presented a trip hazard seemed far less injurious than a car not stopping or even worse accelerating beyond a landscaped shrub lined area.

Mr. P. Panzica explained that wheel stops do present more of a hazard and become a maintenance issue. He felt that the paving, landscaping, greenery and grasses would be enough to make a vehicle stop. He commented that their building philosophy is to always stay away from things that stick up. They tend to trip people and become hazards. Elderly people tend to have poor eyesight making wheel stops a bigger issue.

Member F. Owens found their reasoning to make no sense. If someone tripped they would land in the shrubbery.

In conclusion Mr. Panzica said the members point was well taken.

The use of fencing near the front of the building was clarified. There would be a 6 foot decorative fence installed to offer a sense of openness and security. It would be used to contain patio areas.

Member T. Kopko clarified the petitioners request for a sign on SR 49. The petitioner would be requesting a sign 24 feet above grade. The vision along SR49 is to not have towering signage. He would not support such a request. He commented that Culver's negotiated quite vigorously for an 8 foot sign.

Attorney C. Parkinson clarified that the existing PUD allowed for signs 6 feet 6 inches in height.

ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION

JUNE 16, 2016

PAGE 3

President G. Stone commented that he would not approve the excessive signage request. He strongly advised petitioners to look at what's possible to reduce that sign.

Member J. Trout advised petitioners to take another look at sidewalks. He felt that north south sidewalks along Kelle Drive would be important. He said there would be regret if sidewalks were not installed along Voyage Point and Kelly Drive.

Member F. Owens was in agreement about the sidewalks.

Member J. Trout questioned where the service drive would be terminated. Future development to the south of the project could be cut off.

Mr. P Panzica said the service drive has no easement. He said it's not even a roadway its only 20 feet wide. It's not easement and it's not a dedicated public right of way. It's on private property and comments from the town or real estate brokers consider this location to be a nuisance gathering spot.

Mr. Panzica said there is still discussion about that area they had considered making the area an amenity where residents might take chaperoned walks. They might also install large planter boxes. They could also consider tearing it out.

Town Engineer M. O'Dell said if they intend on keeping the area it should be blocked off. He asked developers to delineate curb and gutter areas in the parking lots on the next set of plans for the public hearing.

It was the general consensus of the board that the signage should be reduced.

There was some conversation and clarification regarding the 8 foot temporary fencing along SR49. It was explained that it would be screen like and may contain the name of the project or a rendering of the building. The temporary screen would be near the building site and prevent debris from flying and also hide unsightly building messes. It also serves the purpose of directing truck traffic to the site.

Member F. Owens moved to set this item for public hearing at the July 21, 2016 seconded by member J. Trout and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Member F. Owens moved to consider the Primary Plat for Porter Hosp., LLC. (Story Point Senior Living Community) seconded by member J. Trout and passed by unanimous voice vote. (This item was inadvertently not included on tonight's agenda.)

ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
JUNE 16, 2016
PAGE 4

Porter Hospital, LLC a Delaware Limited Liability Company Primary Plat (Story Point Senior Living Community) Attorney G. Babcock was present as representation for the petitioner. He said that when the hospital sold a piece of property for the Addison Point Nursing home they allowed one cut off the parent parcel. That was the one cut. Any further activity on the remaining parcel would need a plat, which is what brings us to tonight's presentation. The idea is to look at the one lot parcel.

Town Engineer M. O'Dell requested that the plat and PUD be named. Perhaps Story Point PUD Subdivision Lot 1. Furthermore, he requested a legal description for the parcel, also the dedication of the right of way. Drainage easements need to be delineated.

Member J. Trout moved to set this item for public hearing at the July 21, 2016 meeting subject to the recommendations by M. O'Dell seconded by member F. Owens and past by unanimous voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Porter Hospital, LLC a Delaware Limited Liability Company PUD District Ordinance (Story Point Senior Living Community) Rules for conducting a public hearing were read aloud. The secretary verified proof of publication, notification and payment. Attorney G. Babcock was present as legal representation for the petitioner. He was accompanied by Aaron Seymore and Mike Sympko the project developer of Story Point and Mike Duffy of DLZ. The 18 acre parcel owned by Porter hospital is located off of Dickenson Rd. just north of Addison Point. The property is currently under contract. The property would be developed under the PUD process. The senior living community would contain 162 units consisting of independent and enhanced living.

Aaron Seymore resident of Toledo, Ohio and development officer for Story Point was present. He said they have over 35 years of experience as owners and operators in senior living. Their home office is located in Brighton Michigan. They currently have over 2000 occupied units in operation. They are looking to bring approximately 100 jobs to the area with 40 being full time. Property taxes would be in the \$50,000.00 plus, utilities over \$300,000.00 and a marketing budget of \$150,000.00 per year. He said they tend to focus strongly on local and community charity events. They would be requesting 2 signs one located on SR49 and one located on the property along Dickenson Road. There would be minimal traffic increase. The project would take approximately 18 months to complete. He utilized a power point presentation to give members of the board an overview of the project. Independent living would consist of a three story building with 120 apartments. The building transitions back into a one story building containing 42 enhanced living units. Amenities would include dining, indoor activity areas, shops, and postal services banking services, a salon, library, fitness and media rooms as well as multi-purpose rooms. One meal per day is provided as part of the resident's monthly living fee in the main dining facility.

ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
MAY 19, 2016
PAGE 5

Residents of independent living would be offered parking. Independent living would have 100 one bedroom units, 12 two bedroom units and 8 two bedroom deluxe units. All those units would have full kitchens as well as all other amenities you would find in an apartment.

Residents of enhanced living would have 30 one bedroom units, 8 studio units and 4 two bedroom units. Enhanced living units would contain a kitchenette with a refrigerator and microwave. Residents of enhanced living would be those that require a little extra support. Individual needs would be catered to with regards to health factors. Optional add on services include housekeeping, additional meals and laundry services.

Attorney G. Babcock addressed members of the board citing the numerous ways this project would be in keeping with the vision of the Chesterton Comprehensive Plan. Based on the Ordinance the facility would pay a \$106,000.00 park impact fee. He respectfully requested the board to consider granting the variance requests and forward a favorable recommendation to the town council.

There was no one present to speak in support of the petition.

There was no one present to speak in opposition to the petition. The public comment portion of the public hearing was declared closed.

Member T. Kopko questioned the future use of property located in the back portion of the site. He wondered if they had intention to utilize that in the future.

Mr. Aaron Seymore said they did not have any future plans for the site.

Member T. Kopko noted that the project was defined as a senior living project but found no definition of senior living in the PUD. He commented that if one person was age 55 or older the second resident in a 2 bedroom unit could potentially be teenager.

Attorney G. Babcock said the reason the project is being defined as a senior living facility is that on page 22 of the Zoning Ordinance when it talks about retirement villages it lists 5 criteria. This project has not asked for a variance from any one of those criteria.

Aaron Seymore said they do not have age restrictions; they are an age targeted facility.

Attorney G. Babcock felt that member Kopko was trying to imply that this was simple apartment complex. He commented that if there is someone 82 years of age and has someone 27 living there in a unique living situation they qualified and they need the amenities they would be

**ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION
MAY 19, 2016
PAGE 6**

welcome. He said there are people who are under 55 and might need the amenities from a physical perspective. Their idea is to market the facility to people who meet the Ordinance requirements.

Member J. Trout commented there is a lot more to the project than a simple apartment complex. They are not asking to vary from what the town accepts as a senior living facility. There could be younger folks out there with the need to live in a facility that provides these amenities.

Member J. Ton moved forward a favorable recommendation to the town council regarding this item seconded by member F. Owens and passed by a vote of 4 out of 5 with member T. Kopko abstaining from the vote.

OLD BUSINESS- None

NEW BUSINESS- None

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS- None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the board member J. Ton moved adjournment seconded by member F. Owens and passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail A. Murawski, Secretary

Approved:

President G. Stone, President

EXHIBIT "C"

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ORDINANCE NO. 2016-_____

VARIANCES

All development standards, uses, subdivision regulations, and town standards applicable to a PUD District shall apply to the property, except for the following variances:

Variances from Coffee Creek Center PUD Amendment Exhibit C

1. Variance to amend Section 6 to add one hundred fifty (150) multi-family units, adjusting the Coffee Creek maximum residential units from four hundred sixty-four (464) to six hundred fourteen (614) units.
2. Variance of one hundred (100) residential units to amend the Coffee Creek Center PUD, Amended Plan of Development dated November 12, 2001, as prepared by Howard Engineers, to allow one hundred fifty (150) residential units in lieu of noted Block 1, Maximum Number of Residential units of fifty (50).

Variances from Coffee Creek Center PUD Amendment Exhibit C-1

1. Variance of 204 square feet from Exhibit C-1 Sign Standards, item 1.4, A. 2(e)(i)(ii) to allow a monument sign at front yard of building with each side having a gross surface area of 120 square feet on each of two (2) faces, in lieu of 36 square feet maximum together with a variance of 1'6" for the top of monument sign 8'0" above grade in lieu of 6'6". See attached Exhibit "E".
2. Variance of 356 square feet from Exhibit C-1 Sign Standards, item 1.4, A. 2(e)(i)(ii) to allow a monument sign at the Route 49 side yard with a sign gross surface area of 196 square feet on each of two (2) faces in lieu of 36 square feet maximum together with a variance of 17'6" for the top of a monument sign at 24'0" above grade in lieu of 6'6". See attached Exhibit "E".
3. Variance of 160 square feet from Exhibit C-1 Sign Standards, item 1.4(d) to allow temporary construction/property development signage to be 1 square foot for each 2 lineal feet of frontage at Route 49, but not to exceed 192 square feet of gross signage area, in lieu of maximum 32 square feet. The fabric signage shall be one (1) face, 24'0" long x 8'0" tall, top of sign maximum 10'0". See attached Exhibit "E".

Variations from Chesterton Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance

1. Variance of 90 square feet to allow assisted care efficiency units to be 350 square feet in lieu of specified minimum of 440 square feet of living space required by Article V, Section 506 A.6.
2. Variance of 1 foot to allow off street parking stall size to be 9'0" wide x 20'0" long stalls with two-way drive aisles of 24'0" width instead of 10' wide stalls as required by Article V Section 603 B.2.
3. Variance from Article VII, Section 803 A(2)(C) to eliminate the need for wheel stops where cars may overhang into landscaping.
4. Variance to amend Article VII, Section 806(B) to allow a 6'0" tall decorative fence at front building plane.

Variations from Chesterton Town Standards

1. Variance to delete 5'0" sidewalk on Sidewalk Road (CR E 1050 N), Village Point and Quail Trace as may be required by Section 1, part B(6)(a) and Section 14(O) of Ordinance 2002-05.
2. Variance to waive principal structure finished floor elevation from maximum 30" above edge of road pavement as defined by Section 1 Part F(6)(d), on this site with a 20' of grade change.
3. Variance from Section 1 Part C(7)(a) to waive curbs in parking lots where part of storm water management plan.