

TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

DATE: April 7, 2022

CASE NO.: DP-22-005

PETITIONER: Lynn Bolek for AJ Veneklasen, Inc.

REQUESTED ACTIONS: Petition seeking Architectural and Site Design Approval for an approximately 56,190 square foot addition to an existing distribution building on a parcel zoned [I-2: Office/Warehouse Distribution](#) within a [Gateway Corridor](#).

LOCATION: 2495 East Perry Road

PARCEL SIZE: 7.75 acres +/-

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Plainfield Zoning Ordinance
Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance
Plainfield Comprehensive Plan



EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE		COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	
Site:	I-2 Office/Warehouse Distribution	Site:	LI: Light Industrial
North:	I-2 Office/Warehouse Distribution	North:	LI: Light Industrial
South:	AG Agriculture	South:	POS: Parks and Open Space
East:	I-2 Office/Warehouse Distribution	East:	LI: Light Industrial
West:	I-2 Office/Warehouse Distribution	West:	LI: Light Industrial

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is seeking Architectural and Site Design Approval for an approximately 56,190 square foot addition to an existing industrial building. The site was master planned for a comparable expansion, but the size of the expansion and time elapsed since the original approval requires Plan Commission approval.

PLANNING OVERVIEW

The site is located at 2495 East Perry Road, which is not actually adjacent to Perry Road, but instead on a shared drive. It was approved in 2008 with the understanding that a future expansion could occur.

Ingress/egress to the site will not be impacted, but an internal drive will be created to circulate around the building.

APPLICABLE PLANNING POLICIES

Public Utilities: The site was master planned to accommodate this expansion.

Floodplain: No known flood plain issues. The property is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area.

Transportation: The site was master planned to accommodate this expansion.

DESIGN REVIEW

The Design Review Committee examined this project at its March 10, 2022 meeting and recommended

TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

approval subject to the addition of painted precast panels to break up the building elevation. The applicant has done so and the information was presented to the DRC, which found the change sufficient. The criteria that the DRC reviews is as follows below:

1. **Minimum Yards and Building Setbacks: Complies.**
2. **Finished Façade Toward a Gateway: Complies.**
3. **Loading Space Orientation: Complies.**
4. **Outside Storage: None shown. Complies.**
5. **Maximum Building Height: Complies.**
6. **Parking Spaces: Complies.**
7. **Site Lighting: Photometric plan and cut sheets **comply**.**
8. **Building Materials: Complies.**
9. **Mechanical Equipment: As per the applicant:** “The equipment design will be provided design/build and is not yet available. The heat system is proposed to be radiant heaters, and no rooftop units are proposed. MEP plans of the roof will be provided to staff for review and approval prior to their construction.”
10. **Trash Enclosure / Trash Compactor: Complies.**
11. **Pedestrian Connectivity: The nearest pedestrian facility is approximately 850 feet away and a connection was not required by ordinance. **Complies.****
12. **Perimeter Yard Landscaping: Complies.**
13. **Parking Lot Trees: Complies.**
14. **Parking Lot Screening: Present for existing and not applicable for new construction. **Complies.****
15. **Foundation Landscaping: Complies.**
16. **Signs: A sign location has been presented. Permits will still be required for any/all non-exempt signage.**

STAFF COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS

1. Are there sufficient architectural details to break up the large mass of the building?

MOTION —Architectural and Site Design:

I move that the Plan Commission **approve / deny / continue** DP-22-005 requesting Architectural and Site Design Approval for an approximately 56,190 square foot addition to an existing distribution building on a parcel zoned [I2-Office/Warehouse Distribution](#) within a [Gateway Corridor](#), finding that:

1. The Development Plan **complies/does not comply** with all applicable Development Standards of the District in which the site is located.
2. The Development Plan **complies/does not comply** with all applicable provisions of the Subdivision Control Ordinance for which a waiver has not been granted.
3. The Development Plan **complies/does not comply** with all applicable provisions for Architectural and Site Design Review for which a waiver has not been granted.
4. The proposed development **is/is not** appropriate to the site and its surroundings.
5. The proposed development **is/is not** consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following condition(s):

1. Substantial compliance with the plans and document approved by the Commission.