

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

**DATE:** April 6, 2023

**CASE NO.:** DP-23-003

**PETITIONER:** Airwest G

**REQUESTED ACTIONS:** Architectural and Site Design Review for +/- 70,425 SF light industrial warehouse on a +/-7 acres +/- parcel zoned I-2 within a Gateway Corridor overlay District.

Development Incentive to allow loading docks to face a street.

**LOCATION:** Northwest corner of the intersection of Columbia Road and Reeves Road.

**PARCEL SIZE:** 7.05 acres +/-

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



<u>EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE</u>		<u>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN</u>	
<b>Site:</b>	I2	Office/Warehouse Distribution	<b>Site:</b> LI
<b>North:</b>	I2	Office/Warehouse Distribution	<b>North:</b> POS
<b>South:</b>	I2	Office/Warehouse Distribution	<b>South:</b> LI
<b>East:</b>	AG	Agriculture	<b>East:</b> POS
<b>West:</b>	I2	Office/Warehouse Distribution	<b>West:</b> LI
			Light Industrial

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Architectural and Site Design Review for a 70,000 square foot speculative distribution building. As proposed, this development will require a Development Incentive to allow loading docks to face a street.

## PLANNING OVERVIEW

The site is located at the location where Columbia Road curves to meet Reeves Road. Due to its small size, it has been largely overlooked by the typical distribution developer that searches for large sized flat parcels. The Town has been protective of this site due to visual prominence. Multiple undesirable uses have sought this site, including semi parking, lay-down yards, and impounded vehicle storage. However, these uses have not met the underlying zoning for the site and have not moved forward for review.

## DESIGN REVIEW

The following items are identified by the Zoning Ordinance as standards for Development Plan review:

Building/Architectural	Complies?	Question/Comments
Maximum Building Height	Yes	

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

Finished Façade Toward a Gateway	Yes	
Building Materials	Yes	
<b>Site Design</b>	<b>Complies?</b>	<b>Question/Comments</b>
Minimum Yards and Building Setbacks	Yes	
Loading Space Orientation	No	The applicant has requested an Orientation of Loading Space Development Incentive.
Outside Storage	Yes	No outside storage is proposed.
Parking Spaces	N/A	The applicant has provided proposed parking requirements. The Town Zoning Ordinance does not set parking minimums.
Site Lighting (Photometric and Cut Sheets)	Yes	
Mechanical Equipment:	Yes	
Trash Enclosure / Trash Compactor	Yes	
Pedestrian Connectivity	Yes	
Signs:	Unknown	No sign package has been provided. Signage will be reviewed fully at the time of permit application.
<b>Landscaping</b>	<b>Complies?</b>	<b>Question/Comments</b>
Perimeter Yard Landscaping	Yes (alternate landscape plan)	Complies with the Plant Unit Value (PUV). The applicant has worked with the easement holder to add trees to come closer to the requirement as an alternative landscape plan.
Parking Lot Trees	Yes (alternate landscape plan)	Parking lot trees have been moved to the perimeter due to power line easement, but they have been replaced by shrubs as an alternative landscape plan.
Parking Lot Screening	Yes	Currently not required, but the future parking spaces will require parking lot screening.
Foundation Landscaping	Yes	

The Design Review Committee reviewed the project at their March 9, 2023, meeting. They requested modifications to the landscaping, screening, and building materials. The applicant was generally amenable and has subsequently made those changes. The Committee moved to forward the project to the Plan Commission with a **favorable** recommendation.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Public Utilities:** Adequate water, sanitary sewer and drainage systems exist in the area to support the proposed project.

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

**Transportation:** The proposed 70,425 sf building exceeds the minimum threshold requiring a Traffic Impact Analysis. The Petitioner has provided a brief memo that summarizes the expected trip generation for the proposed facility and compares the trip count to some known traffic volumes in the area, determining that the added volumes represent a small, marginal increase compared to the existing area traffic. Staff agrees that the increased trip generation should not be expected to significantly impact existing, local traffic patterns.

The facility is proposed to be constructed with a single drive to Reeves Road. Due to the shape of the lot and the curve geometry, it is undesirable to have a 2<sup>nd</sup> point of access to Columbia Road where sight distance concerns would be an increased concern. The proposed drive to Reeves Road has been reviewed for sight distance compliance and can meet these requirements, provided landscaping is not added that would prohibit sight

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

lines. The engineer is aware of these requirements and will accommodate as part of its final site and landscaping design.

Lastly, neighboring developments do not include sidewalks or paths along Reeves Road, however the Petitioner has been encouraged to offer an internal sidewalk on the site that would provide access from the building/parking lot area to the public right-of-way that would allow for a connection to be made in the future.

## **STAFF COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS**

1. Although not directly adjacent to the Ronald Reagan Parkway roadway, the building is within the Gateway Corridor will have prominence along sections.

## **MOTION 1—Orientation of Loading Space Development Incentive:**

I move that the Plan Commission **approve / deny / continue** the requested Orientation of Loading Space Development Incentive, finding that:

1. The required front yard or required front bufferyard **is/is not** effectively screened with a plant unit value which exceeds the standard for such yard by adding a plant unit value of 4.0 to the total plant unit value otherwise required by this ordinance or other development incentive; or
2. The proposed development **is/is not** appropriate to the site and its surroundings; and
3. The proposed development **is/is not** consistent with the intent and purpose of this ordinance.

## **MOTION 2—Architectural and Site Design:**

I move that the Plan Commission **approve / deny / continue** DP-23-003 requesting Architectural and Site Design Approval for +/- 70,425 SF light industrial warehouse on a +/-7 acres +/- parcel zoned I-2 within a Gateway Corridor overlay District, 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.