

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 24, 2025

Adam Rude: We'll go ahead and call to order the June 24, 2025 technical review committee meeting. The only item on the agenda today is Sunbelt Rentals site development plan and I believe we have the project team, a few members of the project team on zoom. Are you all able to hear us?

(?): Yes.

Rude: Awesome. So the way that this will work is whoever on your guys's end wants to kind of run with it. Either you can share the plans or I can share the PDF of the plans and then if you'll just... at a high level someone walk through the project and then we will just go one by one down the row and talk through our comments on our end. So if you guys want to share or I can share my screen. Are you guys able to share on your end? I think.

(?): Are you able to go ahead and share it for us since we're on zoom? I don't know that we have the ability to share on a screen.

Rude: Yes, let me go ahead and share. Okay and then just let me know if you need me to flip to another sheet but yeah feel free to walk us through this, someone on your guys's end. Lisa or David or someone on your team, if you want to unmute.

(?): There we go. So basically the existing Sunbelt Rentals, they're looking to expand both their buildings and their lot area behind the building. As part of that, they're trying to preserve as much as they can of the original building frontage, along with the parking in that area and then going in and redoing the adjacent area around that along with the entrances to both East Michigan Road and Progress Road. I guess I.... I'm not sure how much in the weeds you want me to get into it.

Rude: That's good enough. We can just run down the row on our end and just talk through comments from each member. So we'll start to my left with Mr. Comstock.

Tyler Comstock: Good morning, Tyler Comstock, City Engineer. The first comment is on that southern new drive. There appears to be a pretty significant utility pole with guidewires at that location that will need to be moved and relocated. Has coordination started that and begun with the utility companies and if so I think we need to know where that proposed relocation will be with respect to everything.

(?): I unfortunately am not sure Dave Tyber.

(?): David , I can contribute to this. We have not begun the relocation of the utility pole yet. We're waiting to find out what comments this committee will have.

Comstock: Okay, whenever you do have that coordination, if you can just show us where that new relocation will be as you reference in the plans, there's a future project here for a roundabout we just want to make sure that we're not going to move it to somewhere that will then be an issue here in just a year or so.

(?): Is the roundabout a sure thing and do you know the timeline of when that may happen?

Comstock: It's currently under design. We're probably a couple years out but as design progresses, depending on your guys' timeline, we'll share updates whether it be right of way limits or anything like that. So if you guys haven't started construction yet then we can make sure that that's all coordinated but it's very very early in design. So we don't have that far enough along yet.

(?): Okay, we were trying to make sure that we were taking that into consideration as we were helping Sunbelt create their upgrades so thank you.

Comstock: We appreciate that it did help see that you were at least acknowledging it and aware it's coming and kind of accounting for that, that way it doesn't create an issue in the future. Second comment, the route from the public sidewalk needs to be ADA compliant. I couldn't quite tell if the width is fully wide enough as well as slope requirements. We need to get some additional spot elevations on there so that we can confirm everything is ADA compliant, whether it be width and slopes. Same applies for all ADA parking spaces, access ramps, and sidewalk ramps. Comment number three. The sidewalk ramps along Progress Parkway, it appears maybe they are a little too steep. The grading seems to show that maybe it's a little too steep with the cross slope so take a look at that. We want to make sure that everything within the public right of way as well as ADA access from the public is fully ADA compliant so just be aware of that one. Comment number four that I have, there are many spot grades on the plans that do not appear to actually fall on the line work that you guys have. It looks like maybe the surface and the line work might not be exactly in sync so if you could please modify your grading plans and your surface to match the line work so that we can see the actual grades at the locations of the curbing in the low spots. Comment number five. It doesn't appear that there's really any storm sewer for the site so we were wondering how the storm water is going to be collected and conveyed. Is that something that's maybe just shut off or is there really no storm water on the site.

(?): So there was no existing sewer on site, basically everything kind of sheet flowed back to I guess, I don't know if you want to call it a swale or pond in the back right corner of the site. As part of these improvements, our plan was to basically preserve that. The idea being that the majority of the site will sheet flow to that and as part of that we expanded out the size to accommodate the additional water created by increasing the impervious. The front of the site by existing conditions seems to basically, essentially, flow and join up with the storm sewer along

the roads. So we kind of held that same line and the front half going out to the road and the back half, the rest, going back to that pond or swale.

Comstock: Okay, so you're not fully able to collect and convey the water to the proposed detention?

(?): For depth purposes, we couldn't provide a pond deep enough to allow for underground conveyance.

Comstock: Okay, I have a future comment coming up but we need to make sure anything that's directly offsite flow that can't be detained, we need to make sure that within the drainage information that we, I'll comment on here a little further, need to make sure that's clear that what's going there and what's not going there and make sure that we're not overloading anything per se.

(?): Understood.

Comstock: My next comment is kind of the same thing, it looks like a lot of impervious surfaces added. No indication of storm sewer water quality. I didn't fully see that that was detention on the southeast side but now that you're saying, it looks like it's kind of graded to expand that. So we'll need some added information on that, the basin that goes there, sizing calculations, things like that so again I'll... Actually my next comment, drainage calculations for the existing and proposed site conditions we need provided. We usually see that in a report form, that way it shows kind of like you did. I think you have a sheet that shows the basins but we need it in a report form that shows the existing basins. Your calculations on how you came up with your existing runoff rates, your CFS, and then with your proposed conditions, same, showing a basin map that shows your detention. We'd like to see the calculations and the math that goes in that, that way we can see how you're reducing that. I know that you provided a chart but we'd like to dig into the weeds. Just like how much storage area you have, where the water stage is within that detention because I know there's a residence not too far so we want to make sure that it's not overflowing. Same thing like that towards the roadways as well so we do require that report to be provided along with the plans. Comment number eight, the existing fence along the north appears to be within the right of way. I'm sure planning will have additional comments on that but that's probably going to be an issue within the right of way. Comment number nine. The signs appear to be within what we call the site triangles for the intersections as well as the entrance. Planning will probably have more defined stipulations on where those can be located or therefore not located so I just wanted to point that out to make sure that those weren't missed. Comment number ten. It looks like your sanitary lateral is 4 inches. Per our city standards, we have a 6 inch minimum requirement. Typical slope for that is 1.04% but 6 inches required. Again number eleven, sanitary cleanout. It's good you have a clean out near the building however it looks like there is a 90 degree turn. I'll let the sanitary department talk about that one but that's just something I typically don't see as a 90 degree turn. Usually that needs to happen at a structure versus a clean out. Kyle with sanitary will comment more on that one. My comment number twelve. So the only utility I really see is the sanitary. Are there other utility

connections because I know there's a wash bay that I saw. Is there water or anything or other utilities coming into this new addition or is it all pulled from the existing building?

(?): I believe our intention is to pull it from the existing building.

Comstock: Okay, I'll let Miguel with the water company comment on that just to make sure there's enough on there. I was just checking because I didn't see very much coming in so just wanted to make sure that was all coordinated. For the proposed fencing I always ask if we can get a fencing detail that shows the footings and things like that so we know the fence can hold up and stand. So please add that detail to the plans. The next comment is that the entrances for commercial for city standards need to be concrete. They're currently showed as heavy duty asphalt. So if you could please refer to our city standards and change those to concrete as well as just general comment for city standards, any improvements made within the right of way per city standards whether it be the sidewalk, the entrances, or anything else that might come about. Please include those details from our city standards within your plans so the contractors can go directly to that sheet and refer to it. You can either take a snippet of our details from our standard details or what some people do is include the whole sheet and just kind of highlight which details apply but I'd like to get those in the plan set so it's not overlooked. That is it for me.

Rude: Mr. Byers.

Derrick Byers: Good morning, Derrick Byers, City of Shelbyville Storm Water Repair Utility. I had sent Mr. Tabers some comments last night with some links with some more information. As you guys work through those if you have any questions feel free to contact me directly. That's all I have at this time.

Rude: Thank you sir. Kyle.

Kyle ?: Kyle with wastewater. So as Tyler done touched. The plans are stated 4 inch, city standards are all 6 inch gasketed, cleanout 6 inch also. We do not allow any 90s, use 45 or 22 ½. You'll need a 10 to 6 Y on the main where you hook up by Parkway Drive. We'll inspect it and everything once stone's on it and we'll be good to go but I think it's pretty simple, the lateral y'all have going on. So there ain't much to it. Now another question is that the inline water and oil separator will it have access to be cleaned on that? So it can be cleaned out.

(?): Yeah it should have above ground access.

Kyle: Awesome, that's all I got man thank you.

Rude: Adam Rude planning and building department for the city. We had uploaded these comments yesterday, maybe or Friday. So you might have had a chance to look through them. I'll just kind of hit some highlights here and you can reach out if there's any specific issues or questions. So the general comment on the architectural standards, I know early early on in this project we had talked through the existing building and how it was built prior to us having any

architectural standards out in that area, specifically for this site. The site is located in the business general which requires all of the business and institutional architectural standards to apply. Looking at it, most of them aren't being met. So we just made that general comment that all of those are going to have to be satisfied or a variance approved for that. On the commercial standards UDO 5.09 this kind of mimics some of the city engineers comments but there is a requirement that public sidewalks at least 6 feet in width are installed along the frontages of the property. So the northwest and south side of the property are required to have that public sidewalk installed. I believe only the west side, the Progress Road side, has that public sidewalk and then it turns the corner and kind of dead ends at the corner of the property on Michigan. That'll have to be extended all the way to your property lines on the other two sides. The requirement for an internal pedestrian connection from the public sidewalk to the front door, that has to be at least six feet in width and where it crosses an drive aisles, any parking areas, you'll have to utilize concrete or another durable material. Specifically a stamped concrete to create that visual difference. Where the sidewalks are required along the quote street facing facades of the building, so the north, west and south sides, it's also required to have a six foot wide landscape bed. I guess I should have begun and prefaced that a lot of these standards apply to front facades or front yards. You do have three front yards here because of Michigan to the south, Progress to the north and Parkway Drive or sorry Parkway Drive to the north and Progress to the West. A lot of these... I know you guys designed the site with the North and East sides being side and rear yards but technically per the ordinance they're front yards. I don't believe there's going to be any outdoor sales of merchandise, ice boxes, propane tank exchanges, those kinds of things. If there are going to be any, there's a reference here of what standards apply and we'll need to know exactly where and how large that outdoor sales area is. For any new customer entrances, awnings, or other weather protection is required at least 10 feet beyond the entrance and then the big one on this and then we'll address it in some other sections but all outdoor storage areas, so the entire paved area for all the rental equipment so on the north, east, and south sides of the building, they can not be visible from an abiding street. This is the language in the ordinance so the screening will have to be completed with some kind of opaque fence or wall. We'll need maximum or lot coverage requirements for UDO 5.11. I believe the maximum lot coverage is 85%. We did not see what the proposed lot coverage was of the site so we'll need those areas. On the entrance and drive standards your proposed entrances on I believe both or maybe all three of the proposed entrances don't meet the minimum separation requirement based on the classification of those roads. So those will need variances and the measurement for the maximum width looks like you all had found the 36 foot maximum width, that actually has to be measured at where the driveway crosses the right of way line. So a few of those drives are right at 36 feet if they're measured further back on the site where it crosses the right of way line. Further down on the fence, hedge, and wall standards, Mr. Comstock already touched on this but, that northern fence is encroaching into the right of way. Along those same lines, the ordinance does not allow a fence even a fence for screening purposes to extend beyond the front facade of a building, Again you have three front yards per the text of the ordinance, the fence would not be able to extend west closer to the Progress Parkway than the building or north closer to Parkway Drive without a variance. Then we also saw there was a note for a fence gate off of Parkway Drive or no there was no note for a fence gate off Parkway Drive and I believe there is a gate out there today and there's a curb cut

shown on the plans. On the landscaping standards, I won't go through all the numbers, you have three front facades so the calculation is based off of if a side of a building is a front facade, side facade, or rear facade. So your foundation plantings will need to be looked at again. On the parking lot plantings it shows like the correct number of plantings being shown but the trees being shown should be a combination of ornamental and deciduous and the for the interior parking lot plantings, if you could provide and exhibit or a note on the plans showing the square footages of the paved areas being included and excluded in your calculations. Just so we can see how you're getting to the rest of your calculations there. The buffer yard with the residential to the southeast, a buffer yard type three is required. A type two is being shown and we'll need details on the dumpster enclosure and any mechanical equipment that is ground mounted. That outdoor storage standards, again for all parked rental equipment there's a specific UDO 5.45B, a specific section in the ordinance that regulates that. All of that will have to meet the setback standards for parking lots, which is a comment I'll have further on. We had some questions on the parking standards; if you'll read into that we just need some additional information. Then on the setback standards, the northern property line is also a front yard and it's subject to the setbacks of a front yard. The north, west, and south sides of the property, the parking drive areas, the asphalt is all encroaching into that parking lot setback. So that'll more than likely need a variance. I think we've had the discussion around that before and looking at the site, it's fairly tight on those sides with the existing building there. Then I believe last comment, kind of goes hand in hand with what Mr. Comstock had mentioned that the two proposed signs are in the vision clearance triangle. He's correct. Those cannot be located there. Signs are permitted separately and reviewed and approved administratively but I just want to make a note on the record that what's noted on the plans is a pole/pylon sign and those are not permitted by right in this zoning district so the signs would have to be moved elsewhere and that specific type of sign would not be permitted. Any comments or questions on that? I know that was a lot but we had passed along all of that was well so you can read through it.

(?): I guess for the 36 foot entrances at the right of way, part of the reason they're kind of shown as what they are is we do have to have WB57 vehicles be able to access the site. I guess if we provide some form of truck turning exhibit or something like that, illustrating the need for that extra. They're 36 once you get past the right of way. I understand the requirement is they need to be 36 at the right of way but that limits what we can do in regards to the radi allowing for vehicles to enter the site. If we can illustrate that we may need that extra space for that type of vehicle. Is that something we can provide and have a discussion on or is it just a straight it has to be 36.

Rude: That turning movement exhibit will be helpful when applying for a variance. That's a fairly common variance request but the board will more or less expect to see that exhibit showing that turning movement.

(?): Understood, thank you.

Rude: Okay, Darin

Darin Moore: Darin Moore, fire inspector for the Shelbyville Fire Department. I did have concerns also with the exit and entrances. I know this is the future for the roundabout but the one off Progress Road, if that remains an entrance and exit and people coming off the roundabout and people trying to turn out as close as that is. I didn't know if that's something that should be addressed now. I know it may not be...

Comstock: We have an exhibit that shows. I believe this location is where it has been coordinated with the exhibits that we had for the roundabout. I'll double check those and coordinate that and make sure that it matches up with where we really need it to go. I thought I did. I think it was just north enough of the center median islands that they can make the full left access turns but we'll make sure that's coordinated.

Moore: On C3.1, that drawing that you guys turned in. Tyler, how close is that? I mean I know we don't even have the...

Comstock: Are you saying the entrance from...

Moore: Yes, what they're showing there.

Comstock: I believe this location, if this is the line work that I think was shared of the roundabout. I believe this is the preferred choice. The reason is, just as it shows, you can get a little bit of a turning access. We don't want to get too far to the north to where we're creating conflict with your guy's entrance and the fire station's entrance as well as the roadway Parkway Drive. It's south enough that it works for them. Again I'll double check with that line work and make sure I get with the designers of the roundabout and make sure that's coordinated.

Moore: I just figured this was the time to mention it while all this is going on. Along with the roundabout, which won't include you guys, the current hydrant locations are fine where they're at. I know there will be one getting moved down the road when the roundabout takes place and other than that all I have is that I'd like to see you install a Knoxbox and all the padlocks that will be put on your manual gates keyed the same so you can put one of those keys inside the Knoxbox so we can have access to the building and also through the gates without doing any kind of damage if something were to happen after hours. Other than that that's all I have.

Rude: Thank you Darin. Miguel?

Miguel Morales: Good Morning, my name is Miguel Morales. I'm with Indiana American Water. With the understanding the roundabout is proposed and that there's a fire hydrant that might be in conflict on the southwest corner of the property. The only other comment that I have is relative to the existing service which is a ¾ inch line. Do you anticipate needing more water and if so then we can continue the conversation about upsizing that to meet your new demands. Just make sure that you know that you only have a ¾ inch line serving that property currently.

Rude: Okay thank you. Anything else from us? Before we get into next steps and all of that, does anyone from the project team have a question for one of us or a follow up?

(?): Are there any specific recommendations for the screening on the fence?

Rude: Elsewhere similar conditions have existed, like a 8 foot tall, wood, solid fence has been used. That's kind of the most common solution to that screening requirement.

(?): Are the slats for a chain link fence permitted?

Rude: They do not meet the requirement. The language of the ordinance is fully opaque not visible to the public right of way so no the slats that go into a chain link do not meet that requirement.

(?): Okay thank you.

Rude: Okay, anything else on your guys's end before we talk through next steps?

(?): Is it generally the same rule applies for the fence around the dumpster enclosure?

Rude: The dumpster enclosure, whatever that citation in the ordinance is, there are specific design requirements for that in terms of the enclosure itself, the materials that has to be made of and the gate. So that will be different from the fence.

(?): Okay.

Rude: So next steps for your guys's team is we're going to pass along all these comments, the ones we've already received from board members we've put into the folder that was shared with you all and we will gather the rest of these that we haven't already and get those into the folder as well. We will need revisions based off of all those comments as well as we request written responses to those comments. Just exactly how you addressed or resolved any of the comments and all that will then be submitted back to our office digitally and then based off the... we'll send that back out to the tech review committee and for their review and based off of the level of changes that were made and if anything is still needed, we might bring this back to a future tech review meeting. If the committee members feel comfortable they can also forward it on to the plan commission for the public hearing component. So any questions on that?

(?): Do we have a timeline for our response that we need to make sure we are mindful of?

Rude: Yeah so again it's not guaranteed that everyone will be ready to forward it on to plan commission but if we are trying to hit the next plan commission meeting that would be in July. The submission deadline for that is July 7th. So no later than July 7th. Again if the members of this committee are ready then that would put you on track for that plan commission meeting.

Otherwise it is you guys guiding the timeline on that whenever those revisions are done and ready for us then we can start that review and everything.

(?): Okay, thank you.

Rude: Yep. Okay, any other questions on your guys's end? No, okay, well thank you and I will adjourn the meeting. Thank you all.

(?): Thank you.

(?): Thank you.

Meeting adjourned.