



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Plan Commission  
**FROM:** Eric Berg, AICP, Senior Planner  
**THROUGH:** Kevin Whaley, AICP, Director of Planning  
**DATE:** 12-01-2025  
**RE:** [PUD-25-062/FDP-25-062](#)—Village at Plank Road

---

In prior meetings, Staff raised concerns about the aesthetics of the project, its layout, and its impact upon the Town’s primary eastern gateway. These concerns remain.

Below is an analysis of the Planned Unit Development Text as of the applicant’s last revision on November 20<sup>th</sup>.

### **Commitments: Existing versus proposed**

The applicant’s text proposes to make all prior zoning commitments null and void and to replace and supersede with the proposed. The following are the significant changes and omissions from the proposed commitments:

- Moves the mailboxes from inside the buildings to centralized, drive-up mail kiosks
- Eliminates bicycle racks capable of holding 10-12 bikes near an entrance
- Eliminates electric vehicle charging stations
- Eliminates motorcycle parking areas
- Does not establish who will maintain the private drives, parking areas, and trails, nor does it indicate who will maintain newly created east-west public street until dedication to the Town.

### **Section 3. General Terms and Conditions**

In Section 3.3B, the applicant indicates that FDP-22-119 will “remain as currently approved for Area A1 and A2”, but the Final Detailed Plan (inaccurately referred to as the “Final Detailed Development Plan”) shows plans other than the approved plans. This differs from the Commission’s direction, which was that plans for the future site remain as approved in FDP-22-119,

### **Section 4: Permitted Uses, Subsection A: Permitted Uses**

- As a minor correction, the Architectural and Site Design Packet is not published with the Comprehensive Plan. It is a part of the Development Guide, which is authorized annually by the Plan Commission.
- The permitted uses removes “carriage houses” and adds “detached garages.”

*A Community of Values*

TOWN OF PLAINFIELD

**Section 4: Permitted Uses, Subsection B: Development Standards.** Except where noted as combined or specific to C1 or C2, the comment shall apply to both C1 and C2.

Section 4, Article B.1: When combined, C1 and C2 increase the number of units to 432 from 375. This results in an increase of 2.4 units per acre with no corresponding increase in architectural quality.

Section 4, Article B.9 Signs: As Staff mentioned in 2023, earlier this year with the Westlyn PUD and again with this request, no compelling reasons have been provided as to why this project cannot follow the requirements of Article 7 of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the signs that it is requesting are those typically required for a single-family subdivision, not a multifamily development.

Section 4, Article B.11. The proposed Developed Recreational Open Space standards changed as follows:

	<u>Removed by new standards</u>	<u>Added by new standards</u>
<b>Amenity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pond viewing areas</li> <li>• Creek/Bridge Crossing</li> <li>• Fire pit</li> <li>• Two pickleball courts</li> <li>• Dog park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pet waste stations</li> </ul>

Section 4, Article B.2. The Plainfield Zoning Ordinance has standards for Private Streets, Interior Access Driveway, and Interior Access Drives (Article 4.13). The request does not currently identify a basis for departing from these established standards.

Section 4, Article E. The request does not currently identify a reason for departing from the established lighting standards.

Section 4, Article B.13 (C1 only). The applicant proposes:

“For a second means of access, there shall be a gated, fire only access for Area C1 through Double Creek Flats Apartments (Area B), contingent upon final acquisition of land and/or easement area from the adjacent landowner.”

This is concerning for multiple reasons.

- First, what is the plan if there is not a final acquisition of land and/or easement area from the adjacent landowner?
- Second, the Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance defines how a remote secondary access should be designed. (Highlights added for emphasis)

**Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance**

**Article 3.3.B4.3 Design of remote secondary access.**

1. A remote secondary means of access may be designed as:

a. A dedicated public street; or

b. A gated or un-gated emergency vehicle access easement providing direct access to an improved perimeter public street or connecting to a public street in an abutting subdivision which provides access to an improved perimeter public street.

2. If a remote secondary means of access is provided by way of an emergency vehicle access easement, such emergency vehicle access easement shall be designed to comply with the requirements for a “fire apparatus access road” including having a minimum pavement width of 20 feet and being constructed of a heavy duty pavement section of asphalt, concrete or other driving surface approved by the Town Fire Chief or his or her designee, and capable of supporting an imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds.

The proposed gated emergency vehicle access fails to meet the standard set forth in 1.b above. The proposed access connects to a private parking lot, which is not a public street. It requires 680 feet of driving on private streets and parking lots to reach South Raceway Road (*nearest public street to the east*) and 1,450 feet of driving on private streets and parking lots to reach East Main Street (*nearest public street to the south*).

It is not known whether the required area between the gated access and either South Raceway Road and East Main Street have been built to the “fire apparatus access road” standard. Based upon private roadways that the Town has been compelled to repair on behalf of the public, it is not likely that this is the case.

This will require a waiver from the Subdivision Control Ordinance. The findings for such a waiver are shown below.

**Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance Article 4.3**

The Plan Commission shall not approve waivers unless it shall make written findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

- (A) The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare, or injurious to other property;
- (B) The conditions upon which the request for a waiver is based are unique to the property for which a waiver is sought and are not applicable generally to other property;
- (C) Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations are carried out;
- (D) The waiver will not contravene the provisions of the Town Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan; and
- (E) Where the waiver impacts on the design, construction or maintenance obligations of public facilities, that the appropriate public agency has reviewed and approved the proposed development in writing to the Plan Commission.

- Third, the removal of the parking spaces on the Double Creek put it in conflict with its approved Final Detailed Plan.

### Document 3: Multifamily Design Guidelines for Areas C1 and C2

The use of the word “guidelines” versus “standards” implies that these are not regulatory. An example of this is the Residential Design Guidelines, which are regulatory only if an applicant commits to using them.

Section A.1: Accommodations for trash collection shall be centralized enclosures with the following characteristics.

Subsection A.1.d refers to signage. This is likely in the wrong spot.

d. Signage/: The type, use and location of signs throughout the multifamily development shall be administratively approved by the Plainfield Planning staff based upon a master sign package submitted to and approved by the Plainfield Plan Commission.

Section A also removes proposed requirements for foundation landscaping and the requirement that onsite secondary and accessory structures use the same architectural modulation principles.

Section B.1.e. Allows for standing seam metal siding but does not give examples and uses a term in “large sheet pole barn metal siding” which was neither defined nor found in a search of standing seam metal. This was in the prior version, but no further information has been provided.

Section B.1.g. Adds “aluminum commercial lap siding”

Section B.1.h.1 The window glazing requirements for C1 and C2 now refer to standards for “commercial spaces.” It does not appear that “commercial spaces” are allowed under the revised PUD, nor were they allowed under the previous PUD. What type of “commercial spaces” does the applicant propose and why are they not stated in the uses?

Section B.1.h.4 “Every bedroom and living room shall have a minimum of one operable window or balcony door unit to provide fresh air. This could mean that clerestory windows could be used to meet this requirement. As written, this would conflict with the applicable fire and building codes.

### Conclusion.

The proposed Planned Unit Development reduces several previously identified amenities and design features and introduces material changes that represent a lower finish level than what was initially presented. Several provisions in the proposed text appear to be inconsistent with the standards of the Plainfield Subdivision Control Ordinance. The Final Detailed Plan has not been updated to reflect the Plan Commission’s prior direction that plans for the future sites remain as approved in FDP-22-119.

### 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: Planned Unit Development**

I move that the Plan Commission certify [PUD-25-062](#) with a(n) **favorable recommendation / unfavorable recommendation / no recommendation** subject to the following condition(s):

- 1.

### **MOTION 2: Final Detailed Plan Phase I**

I move that the Plan Commission **approve / deny / continue** [FDP-25-062](#) requesting Final Detailed Plan approval for Phase 1 the Village at Plank Road finding that:

1. The Final Detailed Plan **satisfies / does not satisfy** the Development Requirements and Development Standards specified in the PUD District ordinance establishing such District;
2. The Final Detailed Plan **accomplishes / does not accomplish** the intent set forth in Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance;
3. The Final Detailed Plan **provides / does not provide** for the protection or provision of the site features and amenities outlined in Article 6.1, C., 2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

1. Town Council approval of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance.
2. Plan Commission approval of the amended Primary Plat.
3. Substantial compliance with Phase 1 of Village at Plank Road Final Detailed Plan for file dated December 1, 2025.