

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

**DATE:** 10-06-2025

**CASE NO.:** RZ-25-069 and PP-25-015

**PETITIONER:** Melissa Garrard, Pulte Homes of Indiana

**REQUESTED ACTIONS:** **RZ-25-069:** Requesting a Zone Map Amendment of 217 +/- acres from AG: Agriculture to:  
     R-3: Medium Density Residential: 74.11 acres  
     R-4: Medium Density Residential: 115.83 acres  
     R-5: High Density Residential: 27.08 acres  
**PP-25-015:** Requesting a primary plat to create 416 lots on 217 +/- acres that have been requested for rezone from AG: Agriculture to R3, R4, and R5.

**LOCATION:** South of E US Highway 40 (4991-5165 E US Highway 40) to Hadley Road/CR 600 South (5128 E CR 600 S).

**PARCEL SIZE:** 217 +/- acres (proposed)



EXISTING ZONING AND <i>LAND USE</i>		THRIVE! COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	
<b>Site:</b>	AG Agriculture	<b>Site:</b>	SMR <a href="#">Suburban Mixed Residential</a>
<b>North:</b>	PUD <a href="#">Vandalia PUD</a> RB <i>Single Family Residential (Hendricks County)</i>	<b>North:</b>	SR <a href="#">Suburban Residential</a> CC <a href="#">Commercial Corridor</a>
<b>South:</b>	AG Agriculture AGR <i>Agricultural Residential (Hendricks County)</i>	<b>South:</b>	SR <a href="#">Suburban Residential</a>
<b>East:</b>	PUD <a href="#">Sugar Grove Farms PUD</a> AGR <i>Agricultural Residential (Hendricks County)</i>	<b>East:</b>	OS <a href="#">Open Space</a> SMR <a href="#">Suburban Mixed Residential</a>
<b>West:</b>	AGR <i>Agricultural Residential (Hendricks County)</i>	<b>West:</b>	SMR <a href="#">Suburban Mixed Residential</a>

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- Requested Action:
- Requesting a Zone Map Amendment of 217 +/- acres from AG: Agriculture to R-3: Medium Density Residential, R-4 Medium Density Residential, and R-5 High Density Residential.
  - Requesting a primary plat to create 416 lots on 217 +/- acres that have been requested for rezone from AG: Agriculture to R3, R4, and R5.
- 
- Concurrent Actions:
- None Required
- 
- Future Action(s):
- Secondary Plat (*Administrative*)
  - Improvement Location Permit and other required permits (*Administrative*).



## STAFF COMMENTS

<b>PLANNING:</b>	<p>This petition returns to Euclidean zoning after a withdrawn <a href="#">PUD</a>. The applicant requests R-3 (74 acres), R-4 (115 acres) and R-5 (27 acres) districts with written commitments for each. In concept, these districts are compatible with <a href="#">Thrive!'s</a> Suburban Mixed Residential (SMR) designation; however, several commitments narrow how R-4 and R-5 would function, and multiple deviations from the Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) are proposed. Because this is a Euclidean petition, the baseline expectation is compliance with the <a href="#">Plainfield Zoning Ordinance</a> (PZO) and <a href="#">Subdivision Control Ordinance</a>, with only limited deviations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>There are still areas where the project does not meet minimum standards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is still not a confirmed and viable means to construct a pedestrian connection to the Town's existing network of sidewalk and trails as part of this development.</li> <li>○ The sign plan shown by the applicant is incomplete and what is shown will require multiple variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>The report will be organized from this point as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project History</li> <li>▪ Zone Map Amendment Considerations (Indiana Code 36-7-4-603)</li> <li>▪ Zoning Request</li> <li>▪ Commitment Concerns—               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ General</li> <li>▪ Development Standards Modifications                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Lot Area</li> <li>• Minimum Floor Area</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Residential Design Guidelines                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exterior Materials</li> <li>• Garage Design</li> <li>• Design Criteria and Anti-Monotony</li> <li>• Roof Standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Streets and Rights of Way</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Product Mix</li> <li>▪ Speed Control and Streetscape</li> </ul>
------------------	---

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connectivity</li> <li>▪ Signage</li> <li>▪ Overall Analysis of Zoning Districts and their Requested Amendments</li> <li>▪ Potential Motions</li> </ul>
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES:</b>	<p>Previous comments below in italics still apply to the current Petition.</p> <p><i>Water for this proposed project is planned to come from an existing 12-inch water main on Main Street. Progression of the project south from Main Street would eventually require looping of the water main within Westlyn back to the east, likely along the future roadway shown at about the midpoint of the project. The loop would connect into existing water mains in Sugar Grove Farms and to an existing main along Moon Road. Full build out of this project to Hadley Road would then require looping of water main east along Hadley to Moon. Timing of each phase and loop would be determined based upon the Town water system demands. Water capacity has not yet been allocated to this project.</i></p> <p><i>Sanitary sewer route planning, depth and size, has been coordinated with the Town of Plainfield sewer master plan. A large interceptor sewer is planned to pass through the development along the west and south. Space has been reserved for the planned sewer. Phasing of the proposed development project anticipates relocation and reuse of an existing pump station and extension of an existing force main from Sugar Grove Farms. The relocated pump station is not capable of serving the entire build out of the proposed project. Full build out will require construction of a gravity interceptor sewer extension south of the project to reach an existing sewer, or construction of a new pumping station and force main as an interim solution. Sewer treatment capacity has not yet been allocated to this project.</i></p> <p><i>Storm sewers are planned with detention throughout the project. Outlet from these proposed ponds is to the existing stream along the east side of the project. A detailed drainage plan will be required should the project advance.</i></p>
<b>FLOODPLAIN:</b>	<p>Portions of at least three lots are within FEMA’s AE flood zone, which it describes as <a href="#">“considered to have a high risk. Those areas have at least a one-in-four chance of flooding during a 30-year mortgage.”</a> The encroaching areas are scaled from a FIRM map, so the amount of actual encroachment may be greater or lesser.</p>
<b>TRANSPORTATION:</b>	<p><i>Previous Report: See <a href="#">traffic memo</a> from Scott Singleton.</i></p> <p>While the change from a PUD to the RZ-25-069 mixed zoning described above does not create any meaningful change from a high level traffic analysis, one change that is appropriate to note from my previous memo is that the realignment of CR 521 is no longer under consideration by the Petitioner.</p> <p>Further, it is of note that the Petitioner has not secured any viable means to construct a pedestrian connection to the Town’s existing network of sidewalk and trails as part of this development.</p>

## Project History

The applicants decided to pursue conventional Euclidean zoning following concerns that the earlier PUD petition did not demonstrate the level of distinction expected for that process. The proposed mix of R-3, R-4, and R-5 districts is consistent with the Suburban Mixed Residential designation in the Thrive! Comprehensive Plan and, executed well, could be an appropriate zoning framework for this location.

While the current proposal addresses some technical concerns raised during the previous review, several of the submitted commitments continue to modify the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) and development standards in ways that merit careful consideration. Staff’s analysis evaluates whether those modifications are consistent with the intent of each zoning district, whether they support the type of development envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan, and whether they align with the broader goal of quality design, neighborhood connectivity, and responsible growth. Although density has remained a prominent topic in public conversation, this report focuses on

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

the substantive planning and zoning questions before the Commission – namely, whether the proposed zoning districts and associated commitments are appropriate for this location and advance the long-term vision established for this part of Plainfield.

## **Zone Map Amendment Considerations (Indiana Code 36-7-4-603)**

According to IC 36-7-4-603, the following 5 considerations shall be paid responsible regard when considering a Zone Map Amendment:

### **1. The comprehensive plan**

The Thrive! Comprehensive Plan designates the site as Suburban Mixed Residential (SMR). This character and land use category anticipates a variety of housing types – including detached, attached, and two-family formats – arranged at moderate to higher densities and supported by a connected network of sidewalks, trails, and open spaces. SMR areas are also expected to demonstrate a higher degree of design quality than conventional subdivisions, with a focus on architectural variety, thoughtful streetscape treatment, and integration into the surrounding community fabric.

The applicant’s proposed combination of R-3, R-4, and R-5 zoning districts is broadly consistent with the SMR designation and appropriate for residential use at this location. However, several of the associated written commitments – including prohibitions on attached dwellings, increased minimum lot sizes, and modified design standards – narrow the ways in which those districts function. This limits the range of housing choices, reduces the likelihood of “missing middle” products, and may result in a more uniform pattern of detached single-family homes than the Plan envisions.

While the proposal remains generally aligned with SMR, the reduced diversity and design expectations mean it only partially advances the Comprehensive Plan’s goals. The Plan Commission may wish to consider whether additional design or housing commitments would better achieve the intent of the SMR category – particularly its emphasis on variety, density paired with quality, and long-term neighborhood resilience.

### **2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;**

The site is primarily agricultural, with two single-family homes located near its northern boundary along U.S. 40. It is surrounded by residential development of varying scales: the Forest Creek and Sugar Grove subdivisions to the east consist of detached single-family homes and paired villas; larger-lot single-family properties exist to the north and south; and farmland remains to the west. This pattern is typical of transitional areas along the Town’s growth edge, where new residential development extends and connects existing neighborhoods.

The proposed zoning would continue this evolution by introducing residential use that is compatible with nearby development while supporting the Town’s planned growth trajectory. The site’s context – adjacency to residential areas, proximity to utilities and services, and frontage on a major corridor – supports its suitability for residential zoning.

### **3. The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted**

The property’s location, infrastructure access, and adjacency to existing neighborhoods make it well-suited for residential development. The Suburban Mixed Residential land use designation reinforces this, calling for a range of housing forms that provide choices for different household types, life stages, and income levels. This mix – from detached single-family homes to townhomes and paired villas – helps ensure that Plainfield’s housing stock remains resilient, adaptable, and responsive to demographic change.

While the applicant’s proposal advances residential use, the prohibition of attached dwellings and expansion of lot sizes narrow the range of housing outcomes and reduce the likelihood of achieving that diversity. A zoning pattern that more fully utilizes the flexibility of R-4 and R-5 could deliver a richer variety of housing, provide more attainable options, and support neighborhood vitality over time. Without that mix, the development risks functioning more as a conventional subdivision rather than a neighborhood that fully

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

aligns with the Plan's long-term vision.

#### **4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and,**

The transition from agricultural to residential use is expected to be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and is not anticipated to diminish property values. In many cases, new housing can stabilize or enhance property values when development is well-designed, context-sensitive, and aligned with community expectations.

Several commitments, however, reduce or replace standards recommended in the Residential Design Guidelines, such as minimum masonry percentages, garage orientation, and façade articulation. These standards were ordinarily adopted to help ensure that new neighborhoods maintain architectural character and long-term durability. While deviations from the RDGs do not necessarily result in lower quality, stronger alignment with those guidelines could provide greater assurance that the development will positively contribute to the built environment and sustain property values.

#### **5. Responsible development and growth**

Responsible growth in Plainfield is guided by the principles of context-appropriate density, connected neighborhoods, quality design, and long-term adaptability. The subject property benefits from existing transportation and utility infrastructure and is a logical extension of the Town's development pattern. From a location standpoint, the petition aligns with the Town's goal of focusing growth in areas that are already served by public services and facilities.




Several aspects of the petition, however, diverge from the Town's broader vision for responsible development. Larger lot sizes and the removal of attached housing formats limit the community's ability to accommodate a wide range of housing needs, while modifications to design standards may reduce architectural variety and streetscape quality. Together, these changes shift the character of the development toward a more conventional suburban form, rather than one that reflects the principles of mixed-density, walkable neighborhoods envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan.

In this context, the proposal can be considered orderly and serviceable, but additional attention to housing diversity, design quality, and neighborhood integration could bring it into closer alignment with the Town's long-term planning goals.

--remainder of page left blank for formatting--

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

## Zoning Request

	<b>R-3</b> Medium Density Residential	<b>R-4</b> Medium Density Residential	<b>R-5</b> High Density Residential
			
<b>Acres</b>	<b>74.11</b>	<b>115.83</b>	<b>27.08</b>
<b>Lots</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>82</b>

### Commitment Concerns—General

As part of this rezoning request, the applicant has submitted written commitments associated with each of the proposed zoning districts (R-3, R-4, and R-5). These commitments establish specific standards and, in several instances, modify provisions of the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) and Subdivision Control Ordinance. While written commitments are often used to clarify expectations, address site-specific conditions, or elevate the quality of development, several of the commitments proposed as part of this petition warrant closer examination.

Some of the proposed modifications adjust or replace standards that have historically guided the Town’s expectations for neighborhood design and development quality. In certain cases, they also narrow the range of outcomes the zoning districts are intended to provide. The following sections outline where the commitments diverge from established policy direction and discuss the potential implications for the character, quality, and performance of the resulting neighborhood.

### Commitment Concerns—Development Standards Commitments

The R-3: Medium Density Residential Classification made no development standards commitments.

	<b>R-4</b>		<b>R-5</b>	
	<b>Medium Density Residential</b>		<b>High Density Residential</b>	
	Ordinance	Commitment	Ordinance	Commitment
<b>Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)</b>	6,000	7,500	5,000	7,000
<b>Minimum Lot Width feet)</b>	No change		50	55
<b>Main Floor Area</b>	Ordinance	Commitment	Ordinance	Commitment
<b>One Story Building (sq. ft.)</b>	1,200	1,200	1,000	1,640
<b>Two Story Building (sq. ft.)</b>	900	1,025		
<b>Additional Building Types</b>	Ordinance	Commitment	Ordinance	Commitment
<b>Attached Dwellings</b>	Permitted	Not Permitted	Permitted	Not Permitted
<b>Two-Family Dwellings</b>	Not Permitted		Permitted	Not Permitted

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

**Minimum Lot Area.** The minimum lot area commitment influences how those districts would function in practice. These adjustments, in concert with other adjustments, narrow the range of housing types that the underlying zones are intended to accommodate. As a result, while the zoning categories remain suitable on paper, the likely built outcome would lean toward a more uniform detached single-family pattern, rather than the broader mix of housing forms and densities envisioned under Suburban Mixed Residential. Careful consideration of whether the proposed standards still achieve the Comprehensive Plan’s goals for variety, density, and neighborhood character will be important as part of this review.

**Minimum Floor Area.** The applicant’s revisions appropriately resolve earlier concerns regarding noncompliance with minimum floor area standards. The updated commitments align with the Town’s requirements and eliminate the need for variances. However, the increase in minimum size for the R-5 homes may limit opportunities for smaller, more diverse housing formats – a consideration as the Town continues to encourage a mix of housing options at varying price points. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here](#).*

## **Commitment Concerns—Development Standards Modifications**

**Exterior Materials:** The commitments remove the RDG guidelines for minimum masonry coverage (85% for single-story, 100% first floor for two-story homes) and does not replace them with a quantitative standard. Instead, exterior siding must be constructed of fiber-cement or masonry materials, with vinyl prohibited. While this approach maintains a durable materials palette, the absence of a specific masonry threshold (even on corner lots) changes the architectural expectations typically applied to R-3 development in Plainfield. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here](#).*

**Garage Design:** All homes will include a minimum two-car attached garage. The R-3 and R-4 parcels will have the required minimum garage size of 484 square feet, but the R-5 will be only 415 square feet. The requirement that garage doors comprise may comprise up to 40%(R-3), 42.5%(R-4), and 40.6%(R-5) of the ground-floor façade remains, although the third-bay exclusion from this calculation could increase the visual prominence of garage doors to well beyond 50% of the house’s ground-floor façade. The offset or side-loading options that the RDGs encourage to minimize streetscape impact are also removed. These changes do not conflict with zoning standards but could impact the overall character of the streetscape. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here](#).*

**Design Criteria and Anti-Monotony:** The applicant proposes to replace the Town’s design feature tables with Exhibits B-1 and B-2 from the written commitments, which specify required architectural elements for front, side, and rear elevations. In addition, Exhibit C in the written commitments establishes an anti-monotony code intended to prevent repetition of identical elevations. These exhibits provide a structured approach to design variety, though they are more relaxed and flexible than the standards contained in the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here \(Façade Design Standards\)](#) and [here \(Streetscape Standards\)](#).*

**Roof Standards:** While reduced roof pitches for specific styles are not inherently problematic, the modification to how overhangs are measured would result in smaller eaves than the Residential Design Guidelines intend. Overhangs are a key design element that provides depth, shadow lines, and weather protection. Reducing their effective size could diminish architectural character and functionality. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here](#).*

## **Commitment Concerns—Streets and Rights-of-Way**

**Right of Way Dedication.** The updated language appropriately clarifies the Town’s discretion in deciding whether a future road connection is warranted. The presence of a dedicated corridor does not, on its own, establish a timeline or obligation for construction. Should the Town determine that a roadway connection within this corridor is desirable in the future, that improvement would be undertaken as a separate action and project. *More analysis can be found in the appendix document [here](#).*

## **Product Mix**

The applicant proposes a neighborhood composed exclusively of one and two-story single-family detached homes. While the submittal includes a series of elevations – twenty-one individual plans in total – the overall product lineup relies entirely on conventional, front-loaded formats with attached garages as the dominant street-facing feature. The result is a neighborhood that, despite a number of floor plan options, remains limited in terms of housing type, form, and architectural approach.

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

When first reviewed as a PUD, staff noted that the proposal lacked sufficient diversity in product type and design to be considered innovative. At that time, staff suggested exploring ways to introduce greater differentiation – such as alley-loaded units, alternative lot configurations, courtyard models, or other distinct housing types – but those ideas were not incorporated into the current submittal. The reviews plan under Euclidean zoning reflects the same fundamental product strategy.

Plainfield’s adopted plans and residential design standards consistently emphasize that variety is not measured solely by the number of elevations offered, but by how those products contribute to a neighborhood’s overall character, streetscape, and long-term adaptability. Recent developments in Plainfield demonstrate that incorporating a broader spectrum of building types and frontage conditions – rather than repeated variations of the same product – creates neighborhoods that feel more intentional and visually engaging, even at higher densities.

The proposed mix, while technically including multiple models, does not advance that broader goal. Most elevations share similar massing, scale, and street presence, and nearly all rely on a garage-forward design. Without greater differentiation in form and frontage, the development risks delivering a streetscape that feels repetitive, tedious, and monotonous rather than one that pairs density with design quality in a way consistent with the Town’s expectations for new neighborhoods.

## **Speed Control & Streetscape**

Speeding in residential neighborhoods continues to be one of the most frequent concerns raised by Plainfield residents, and it remains a key consideration for this project given the overall size of the development and the layout of its internal street network. The current plan establishes a primary north-south street that will serve as the neighborhood’s central spine, carrying higher volumes of local traffic and lined with homes on both sides. While stop signs are included at several intersections, the street still contains long, straight segments where operating speeds may rise without additional design measures to reinforce pedestrian safety and neighborhood character.

As part of this submittal, the applicant provided a stop sign and crosswalk plan identifying controlled intersections and pedestrian crossing points – an element that was missing from the original submission. This represents meaningful progress and addresses a significant gap previously identified by staff regarding traffic control and pedestrian safety.

However, several concerns remain. The submitted plan does not include a key or legend, making it unclear what each symbol or color represents and requiring staff to make assumptions about intended traffic controls. In addition, while eight crosswalks are shown along the primary pedestrian spine, at least three additional trail-street intersections are depicted without marked crossings. These omissions could result in inconsistent pedestrian safety conditions within the neighborhood.

Staff also notes that some of the design strategies previously recommended during the PUD review – such as shorter block lengths, narrower cross-sections, or intersection curb extensions – are still not incorporated or depicted in submitted plans. According to the Federal Highway Administration, these physical design measures are often more effective than signage along in reducing vehicle speeds and improving the overall walkability of a neighborhood.

While the applicant’s including of a stop sign and crosswalk plan is a positive step forward, the submittal continues to rely primarily on conventional traffic control measures rather than design-based solutions. As a result, staff remains concerned about the long-term performance of the street network with respect to speed management, pedestrian comfort, and overall neighborhood safety.

## **Connectivity**

The Thrive! Comprehensive Plan emphasizes that Suburban Mixed Residential neighborhoods should be designed as part of a larger connected system – not only with well-organized internal circulation, but also with safe connections to surrounding neighborhoods, schools, parks, and commercial areas. Strong pedestrian and vehicular connectivity, paired with coordinated trail and sidewalk networks, is a fundamental expectation for this zoning designation.

Since the original submittal, the applicant has made a notable improvement by including an interrupted north-south multi-use trail connection linking Main Street and Hadley Road. This corridor aligns with the Town’s adopted Sidewalk

# **TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT**

and Trail Master Plan and represents a meaningful step toward creating a more cohesive internal network.

Even so, several aspects of external connectivity remain unclear. The site's wooded eastern edge limits opportunities for direct neighborhood-to-neighborhood trail links, but its frontage along U.S. 40 represents a key opportunity to strengthen pedestrian access to the broader system. Previous discussions contemplated a continuous sidewalk along U.S. 40, including across frontage not included in this petition, but confirmation of that coordination has not yet been provided. Additionally, details such as intersection treatments, crosswalk locations, and how the north-south trail will transition to the internal and external sidewalk system will be important to understanding the project's overall connectivity.

In summary, while the updated trail alignment addresses one of staff's primary concerns, the broader connectivity plan remains partially unresolved. Greater clarity on sidewalk coordination along U.S. 40 and on how internal routes will integrate into the external pedestrian network will be critical to meeting the intent of Thrive! and ensuring the subdivision functions as fully connected part of the community.

## **Signage**

### **Ordinance Context:**

The Plainfield Zoning Ordinance requires that when a subdivision proposes a permanent entry monument constructed of ornamental metal, stone masonry, or other permanent material, the sign must be reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission as part of the subdivision approval. Dimensional and placement standards in Article 7 still apply.

### **Current Status:**

A conceptual entry monument sign, including proposed materials and dimensions, has been submitted, and a location plan has been provided showing two points labeled "Entry Signage." Staff assumes that the same monument design will be replicated at both locations, although additional clarification is suggested. The plan also identifies additional features labeled "Entry Columns," but no supporting information regarding their design, materials, or dimensions has been submitted.

### **Staff Comment:**

The inclusion of a monument sign and corresponding location map is helpful in clarifying the applicant's intent. However, as currently shown, the proposed sign dimensions would necessitate variances for height, width, and placement under article 7 of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance. In addition, while the plan identifies features labeled as "Entry Columns," no details about their design or materials have been provided. Further clarification of these elements will be necessary to allow for a complete review of all permanent signage associated with the subdivision.

## **Overall Analysis of Zoning Districts and Their Requested Amendments**

However, the accompanying commitments materially influence how those districts would function in practice. Adjustments such as larger minimum lot sizes, increased floor area requirements, and the prohibition of attached and two-family dwellings narrow the range of housing types that R-4 and R-5 are intended to accommodate. As a result, while the zoning categories remain suitable on paper, the likely built outcome would lean toward a more uniform detached single-family pattern, rather than the broader mix of housing forms and densities envisioned under Suburban Mixed Residential.

In summary, the zoning request aligns with the Town's land use framework, but the commitments significantly limit the flexibility and diversity these districts are designed to support. Careful consideration of whether the proposed standards still achieve the Comprehensive Plan's goals for variety, density, and neighborhood character will be important as part of this review.

**R-3: Medium Density Residential.** The R-3 district is intended to accommodate medium-density single-family residential development with a balance of livability, architectural quality, and neighborhood character. The applicant's proposal maintains the baseline dimensional framework of this district – including minimum lot size, lot

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

width, and density – but introduces several modifications through written commitments that alter how design, materials, and neighborhood form would be regulated.

Overall, the R-3 petition maintains the fundamental dimensional characteristics of the district but modifies several qualitative design expectations. The proposed commitments continue to regulate materials, garage design, and architectural variety, though they do so with substantially fewer prescriptive requirements than those established in the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines. As a result,

**R-4: Medium Density Residential.** The stated intent of the R-4 district emphasizes flexibility, housing diversity, and a transitional character suited to neighborhoods near the Town Center. This includes the potential for attached formats and smaller-lot detached housing types that help bridge the scale between traditional single-family areas and more compact residential environments.

The applicant’s commitments modify several of those expectations. By prohibiting attached dwellings and increasing the minimum lot size from 6,000 to 7,500 sq ft, the proposal removes much of the flexibility that distinguishes R-4 from lower-density districts. These changes narrow the range of housing options available and shift the character of the district closer to that of R-3, albeit on slightly smaller lots, which limits its ability to serve as a true transitional residential form.

In summary, while the petition preserves many dimensional elements of R-4 zoning, the proposed commitments diverge from the district’s core intent by limiting housing diversity and relaxing design expectations. These changes are key considerations for the Plan Commission as it evaluates whether the request fulfills the purpose of the R-4 district – particularly its role as a flexible, transitional zoning category within Plainfield’s residential framework.

**R-5: High Density Residential.** The R-5 district is designed to serve as Plainfield’s highest-density single-family zoning classification and to provide flexibility for a variety of housing types – including two-family and attached dwellings – in contexts where compact lots and walkable patterns are appropriate. It has historically been applied in locations near the Town’s core or where proximity to services, amenities, and infrastructure support a more diverse mix of housing forms.

The applicant’s proposal, however, removes two-family and attached housing from consideration and significantly increases both minimum lot size and minimum floor area. These changes reduce the density and flexibility that define R-5 and reorient the district toward larger-lot, single-family housing designed for a specific market segment (in this case, an age-restricted product type). While the resulting neighborhood would still deliver detached housing at a higher density than R-3 or R-4, it would do so without many of the varied housing choices R-5 is intended to accommodate.

As with the other zoning districts in this petition, the commitments also relax several qualitative design standards, including masonry requirements and garage frontage limits. These modifications would yield a built environment that departs from the character envisioned by the R-5 district – less compact, less diverse in housing type, and less aligned with the ordinance’s intent to pair higher density with variety and architectural quality.

## POTENTIAL MOTIONS.

The following motions are provided to the Plan Commission for the possible decisions that can be made on each of the petitions: **favorable/approve**, **unfavorable/deny**, and **continue**.

Conditions and/or commitments can be added as the Commission deems appropriate, even if no conditions or commitments have been provided/proposed by the applicant or Town Staff.

### MOTION 1: Zone Map Amendment (Westlyn R-3)

I move that the Plan Commission certify [RZ-25-069](#), a Zone Map Amendment of 74.11 acres (+/-) of land to R-3: Medium Density Residential with a **favorable recommendation** / **unfavorable recommendation** / **no recommendation** with the following conditions:

# TOWN OF PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION REPORT

## MOTION 2: Zone Map Amendment (Westlyn R-4)

I move that the Plan Commission certify [RZ-25-069](#), a Zone Map Amendment of 115.83 acres (+/-) of land to R-4: Medium Density Residential with a **favorable recommendation** / **unfavorable recommendation** / **no recommendation** with the following conditions:

## MOTION 3: Zone Map Amendment (Westlyn R-5)

I move that the Plan Commission certify [RZ-25-069](#), a Zone Map Amendment of 27.08 acres (+/-) of land to R-5: High Density Residential with a **favorable recommendation** / **unfavorable recommendation** / **no recommendation** with the following conditions:

## MOTION 4: Primary Plat

I move that the Plan Commission **approve** / **deny** / **continue** [PP-25-015](#) to create a 416-lot residential subdivision on approximately 217 acres finding that:

1. Adequate provisions **have** / **have not** been made for regulation of minimum lot width, minimum lot depth and minimum lot area;
2. Adequate provisions **have** / **have not** been made for the widths, grades, curves and coordination of subdivisions public ways with current and planned public ways; and
3. Adequate provisions **have** / **have not** been made for the extension of water, sewer, and other municipal services.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the Town Standards, including but not limited to the following Chapters of the Plainfield Town Code;
  - Chapter 51: General Sewer Use and Wastewater Pretreatment
  - Chapter 52: Water Regulations;
  - Chapter 55: Drainage;
  - Chapter 56: Storm Water;
  - Chapter 93.15: Access to Public Streets and Thoroughfares;
  - Chapter 152: Flood Hazard Reduction; and,
  - Chapter 153: Subdivision Control Ordinance
2. Substantial compliance with the primary plat filed dated September 19, 2025.
3. Approval is subject to the ratification of the Zone Map Amendment ordinance by the Town Council.
4. Primary Plat approval is subject to Pulte executing an approved Development Agreement with the Town Council.