CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Smith: It is 7:00 p.m. and welcome to the Plainfield Plan Commission for July 6, 2017.

ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Smith: If I could ask Mr. Klinger to call the roll to determine a quorum.

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Philip- here
Mr. McPhail- here
Mr. Brandgard- here
Mr. Smith- here
Mr. Kirchoff- here
Mr. Slavens- here

Mr. Bahr indicated that he would not make it tonight. We have a quorum.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Smith: Please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance

APPROVAL OF MINUTES- June 5, 2017

Mr. Smith: If everyone has had an opportunity to review the minutes of the meeting of June 5th. Does anyone have any corrections, additions, deletions, changes?

Mr. Philip: I move we accept the minutes as submitted.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second.

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Slavens: Please note that I abstained.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Smith reviewed the Guidelines Governing the conduct of public hearings.

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Daniel conducted the Oath of Testimony.
PETITIONS CONTINUED FROM JUNE MEETING

Mr. Smith: I will call upon our Planning Director, Joe James. On the agenda first up says DP-17-007, Kohls.

Mr. James: Good evening I will give you an update on the Kohls petition. Kohls will screen the 8 units with screen panels. The ordinance does not dictate how a unit should be screened and so therefore the screening is in compliance. So in my opinion the waiver can be withdrawn and the screening plan can be approved by an ILP. There are a total of 8 units that need to be screened, 3 on each side, they are going to screen them with 3 sides. The interior side will be exposed but you can’t see the interior side from the east or west side of the building. The units will be over 7’ tall and the panels will be as tall as the units. They are going to use corrugated screen panels as you can see right there, an example of how it will be screened and how it will be placed on the roof. Here is the screen panel. Then the 2 front panels closest to Bradford Road will be screened with 2 panels, one in the front and one on the sides. You can’t see the exposed side, so in my opinion it is adequate job of screening the panels and it can be approved with the ILP.

Mr. Smith: Are there any questions or concerns since our discussion last month?

Mr. McPhail: Joe is there any discussion, is the color going to match the building?

Mr. James: Yes, the color will match the color of the building.

Mr. Smith: This I think one of the adjoining neighbor was concerned, a residential neighbor, this also covers his side.

Mr. James: Yes Bruce, 3 sides.

Mr. McPhail: Do we need a motion

Mr. James: No. I just wanted to update you.

Mr. Kirchoff: They will be screened, they screened the one long side but not the other long side, why is that?

Mr. James: Because the parapet there are parapet’s in the front and the parapet does screen them. Those are the inside sides.

Mr. Smith: So do we agree with Joe’s report by consent and move forward? Thank you. Next up would be TA-17-001, Plainfield Zoning Ordinance update.

Mr. James: The sign code still needs a little work, we need to work on some definitions and clean it up a little bit, so I am going to recommend we continue this to the August meeting.

Mr. Brandgard: I move we continue TA-17-001 to next month’s meeting.

Mr. McPhail: Second.

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second to continue TA-17-001 to next month, all in favor, thank you. DP-17-008.
Mr. Berg: As Mr. President mentioned this is architectural site design review for 46 residential units on 14.3 acres zoned General Commercial within the Gateway Corridor. They give an approximate address of 1813 Reeves Road, that is not going to be the address, it has not been addressed yet. It is immediately south of the existing Cumberland Trace Senior Living facility. Quaker Boulevard, Reeves, Hadley, I am sure you are familiar with the location already. This is the overall site, north is left on the screen here. Largely duplexes around a little bit on the inside, but there will be three quadplex’s as well. On these two intersections, there are 3 way stops and that should help to keep speeding down or anything like that. It is connected to the sidewalk along here. Crosswalk brings you down to units as well. So, it does have the required connection. Obviously if you’ve looked at the packets and you know that it is more than just this color but I didn’t want to go through every color. We did review these, they are residential units and in relation to the residential design guidelines and they do comply with that. The quadplex’s also are in compliance with residential design guidelines. Landscaping plan, they have existing landscaping along the south and west perimeter that they will be able to utilize. They have added landscaping here on the perimeter along the east to the north. Then you will note in the staff report we talked about some landscaping for the mechanical units for building 20 and that has been taken care of. Foundation landscaping for the duplexes, this is all in compliance again they have the screened mechanical units that do face 267. The quads it is showing how that mechanical units, the HVAC unit screened. The DRC at their meeting last month did recommend approval, subject to a couple of conditions. One was that the landscape plan reflected the screening for the HVAC unit on building 20 and then there was a request that staff would be provided with the thickness and conditional Hardi-plank, which has been done. The only staff comment that we have is the typical approval looking at ILP engineering fire protection. The applicants are here, and I have tried to speak quicker than Ryan will. They are here if there are any questions.

Mr. McPhail: Eric I have 2 questions for you. Sometime back we approved an addition to the main building is that still in play?

Mr. Berg: It has been built.

Mr. McPhail: They did do it? I didn’t notice that.

Mr. Brandgard: It is a seamless addition, you can’t tell it.

Mr. McPhail: Okay, well I kept thinking did they ever do that and I never noticed it. The second question I have to ask, in our residential building codes, we got a restriction on the amount of the front façade can be garage doors, I know this probably exceeds that, but this is a PUD, does that waive that conflict? I don’t have a problem with what they are doing, but I know we wouldn’t allow that much garage door in the front façade in a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Lindley: Good evening, Ryan Lindley with Banning Engineering 853 Columbia Road, Plainfield. I trust everybody had a great holiday weekend. We are back at it. Eric did a fantastic job as usual, no waivers this time. We are here to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Smith: I don’t recall any questions in the Design Review Committee. It is a pretty consistent design with the main building colors and so forth,
style wise and all. We did talk about the flood level because it is laying between two creeks.

Mr. Lindley: We are at the required minimum of 2’ with the lowest level open access in meeting the elevations.

Mr. Smith: Very good.

Mr. Smith: Any other questions at this point? This is a public hearing so I will open the public hearing and ask if anyone has any comments either for or opposed to CarDon and Associates plan to expand their facility along Quaker Boulevard. Hearing none I will close the public hearing and open it to the Commission again for comments, questions, or a motion.

Mr. Slavens: Mr. President I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-17-008 as filed by CarDon & Associates requesting Architectural and Site Design approval for 46 new residential units on 14.3 acres immediately south of the existing Cumberland Trace facility on a parcel zoned General Commercial:

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

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

1. Substantial compliance with the site plan and photometric plan, building elevations and landscape plan dated June 28, 2017.

Mr. Brandgard: Second.

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second to approve DP-17-008. Will you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Philip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens- yes

DP-17-008 is approved.

Mr. Smith: Next up would be DP-17-009, Butkus Development.

Mr. Berg: DP-17-009 is the Butkus Development, Architectural and site design review for 1,340 square foot drive through restaurant on .46 acres zoned general commercial in the gateway corridor located here at 1805 E. Main Street. You may remember that under its previous incarnation as a Marathon Gas Station. Quaker Boulevard, Main Street, Dan Jones, Kroger, residential surrounded by general commercial use. As two members probably remember this did get some variances for setbacks and to eliminate the bail out lane as we typically see it. Basically, the variance brought forth the site plan you
see today. They do have a version of what you see today. They do have a version of a bail out lane here doing slightly different than what you would normally see. Also, the ingress off Locust, ingress/egress off of Elm wide enough Main to right out to Main. Structure located just east of the center of the parcel. They do provide site lot connection here, trash enclosure located on the southwest. It had originally been twice as big but they have brought that down to a smaller size. Seven parking spaces are required, they provided 14. We are happy to see a ground sign right here. They are looking for waivers to use metal on the façade. Mechanicals as I mentioned there you can see one here are screened by these metal panels it is brick and metal as the façade materials. This kind of the rendering, we will not be getting the outdoor seating. The landscaping plan is in compliance. They did have to use an alternative landscape plan for the foundation because landscaping doesn’t stand up to well to a drive thru lane. The one required parking lot tree is there, they do have the proper screening along the west side. Perimeter screening including they are going to be bringing in an encroachment agreement into the Town to place landscaping in that area there to help buffer this residential user, then it would also provide proper screening around the ground sign which is six evergreen shrubs. Photometric plan, it is all LED, that mass of colors there we have looked at it and it is in compliance. Trash enclosure, brick with the cedar like we like to see. This is the sign plan, it is in compliance, again I mentioned 3 or 4 times now it is a ground sign their metal on the front and again on the sides pretty much the sign package sign message on each side, it is in compliance. The menu board and there is a name for that small board I can’t remember what it is. Then at each of the entrance points they do have incidental signage and all of this is within the guidelines. DRC wanted the rooftop unit to be screened and that has been provided. We ask that the trash enclosure be shrunk down to one bay, one gate, that has been done. They wanted more information on Tru Grain and probably, I shouldn’t speak for them but I think because they had to go up they substituted the metal panels for the Tru Grain. As with the last one it proved that we still have the same ILP, engineering, fire, utility, all of that stuff will be acquired. The metal panels were exchanged for the Tru Grain, either material requires a waiver. I guess this was added to create the parapet to screen the units is that justifiable exchange. Just mentioning the variances again, they did receive that in case you are looking at the setbacks and wonder why.

Mr. Smith: Are there any questions or comments? I will call upon the petitioner if you would like to add.

Mr. Tursman: Good evening, Dan Tursman with Butkus Development, 3580 N. Hobart Road, Hobart, Indiana. Again Mr. Berg did an excellent job presenting our project here. A couple of things that he touched on briefly from our previous submission, we altered the elevations to utilize some different materials and also raise the parapet walls so I did bring a sample of that middle material. I don’t know if that helps you at all, but it would be a prefinished factory finished material that would last a long time and I know that was a main concern about other materials.

Mr. Smith: Can you briefly describe how that is attached?

Mr. Tursman: Essentially each of these panels are made in different sizes to kind of create the revealed, so you notice that flange on the underside of that panel and this channel gets fastened to the building, so you will essentially put this panel in the next panel locks into that and then the overlap here.
Mr. Smith: Feels ridged against the wind load and that sort of thing?

Mr. Tursman: Yes.

Mr. Smith: And how tall would you make that?

Mr. Tursman: If you look at the elevations there is essentially 2 details that would utilize this. The trunk of the main entrance façade, there would be bigger squares. I believe those would be somewhere around 4’ square and on the side (inaudible).

Mr. Smith: Anything else we didn’t know in particular at this point.

Mr. Tursman: The only other thing I had to bring up, I know we discussed and I don’t remember if it was at the DRC meeting or a previous meeting, but there was discussion about wanting to get some kind of encroachment agreement for the landscaping that would be in the right of way by the adjacent property.

Mr. Smith: That probably goes to the Town Council, does it not?

Mr. Tursman: I have an agreement with me I didn’t know if that is something I give you guys tonight or if that is something I need...

Mr. James: That is done by the Town Council.

Mr. Smith: There was one other thing that came up in the DRC and that was if any, there is a walk-in cooler attached on the back of the building. So, the question is whether this should be also clad in something other than just the cooler finish, is that good enough or is it something we want to see covered?

Mr. Tursman: The plan is currently that it would be a prefinished from the factory, they have a factory option that has a color that blends with the building color, so it wouldn’t be a bright color or something like that.

Mr. Kirchoff: You said the rear of the building, right?

Mr. Smith: It is in the rear, right. I guess every car going through your drive thru is going to loop around it, around the back.

Mr. Brandgard: I don’t have any problem with it.

Mr. McPhail: It will match the color of the building is what you are saying?

Mr. Tursman: Yes.

Mr. Smith: Any other questions or concerns with the petition right now?

Mr. Tursman: Thank you very much.

Mr. Smith: This is listed for public hearing and so I will at this time open the hearing for any public comments either for or opposed. Hearing none I will close the public hearing and go back to any additional comments or concerns.
Mr. Kirchoff: I have a couple questions I guess I look to Joe or Eric. I think you mentioned Eric that there is only 7 parking spaces required. Could you educate me, how do we come up for a project like this would only require 7, it would seem to me...

Mr. James: It is based on seating.

Mr. Tursman: There are essentially four tables.

Mr. Kirchoff: I’m sure you talked about this previously, is this site big enough for this project?

Mr. James: That is why they had to get the variances. They had to get a front variance, they got 3 frontages, so it is a small site and it had the 3 street frontages, so that is why they had to get the variances and then they also got the variance to not have the bail out lane, which they are going to use, Locust Drive basically as the bail out. They made it work with the variances.

Mr. Philip: Conversation with the BZA was that it was a challenging site no matter what and that smaller footprint building like this was about as a good of use as we could really think of and they did come up with great ways to deal with the bail out and ingress/egress. It is a challenging site and so they got variances.

Mr. McPhail: It looks like they got about the same amount of seating as Starbucks has, which is not much.

Mr. Philip: Starbucks is roomy.

Mr. Brandgard: It does not have near as much as what Starbucks has.

Mr. Smith: About how many employees would you have?

Mr. Tursman: There would be 4 maybe 5.

Mr. Smith: Any other questions, concerns, observations?

Mr. Philip: Mr. President I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-17-009 as filed by Butkus Development requesting Architectural and Site Design for a 1,340-square foot drive through restaurant building on a 0.46-acre parcel zoned General Commercial within the Gateway Corridor finding that:

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

And, regarding a waiver for material types, the Plan Commission finds that:
1. The proposed development represents an innovative use of building material and brick color which will enhance the use or value of area properties;
2. The proposed development is consistent with and compatible with other development located along the Gateway Corridor; and
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

And that such approval shall be subject to the following conditions;
1. Substantial compliance with the site plan and photometric plan, building elevation, landscape plan and line of sight illustration dated June 28, 2017.

Mr. Kirchoff: Second.

Mr. Philip: Was their waiver necessary for the walk-in cooler?

Mr. James: The waiver is included in the building material types. That is for the metal and for the walk-in cooler.

Mr. Smith: I thought he said something about the little strip of landscaping across the street.

Mr. James: That is done with an encroachment agreement.

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and a second, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klinger: Mr. Philip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens-yes

DP-17-009 is approved 6-0.

Mr. Smith: DP-17-010, Williams Trace.

Mr. James: The development plan for the two 7,200 square foot buildings was approved last year. It included the waiver to allow wood board and batten as a primary and secondary building material to give the building a more rustic appearance to reflect the business. Other materials included EFIS and stone. The builder can’t find an acceptable EFIS so he would like to replace the EFIS with hardi-Board, so the hardi-Board requires a waiver. Here is the site, it is back off of Main Street, this is Williams Trace. The reason why they need the waiver is because it is next to residential zoning but as you can see it is back off of the two gateway corridors. The elevations were approved for the development plan, this is the EFIS, stone, and wainscot. That is the board and batten, primary material on one side and then there is just a little bit of a secondary material. He wants to replace all of the EFIS with the hardi Board. It would be a vertical lap of hardi Board which would blend well with the board and batten. Replace the EFIS with the hardi-Board. So, that is what the request is and Mr. Williams is here if you have any questions.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Williams do you care to add anything?

Mr. McPhail: I personally believe that hardi plank is a better product than EFIS.
Mr. James: Besides not being on a gateway corridor the vertical hardi board would give the building an even more rustic appearance. The Builder says the appraised value will not change and that the hardi board would be more durable than the EFIS, so does the Plan Commission think these are good justifications?

Mr. Smith: It is listed for public hearing so I will open the public hearing at this time for any comments for or opposed. Hearing none I will close the public hearing and ask the Commission if there is anything to add, questions, comments, or a motion.

Mr. Kirchoff: Mr. President, I move that the Plan Commission approve DP-17-010, as filed by Robert G. Williams, requesting approval of a waiver to allow Hardi-Board as a primary and secondary building materials for two 7,200 sf buildings on 1.54 acres zoned GC finding that:

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

and, regarding a waiver to allow Hardi-Board as a primary and secondary material, the Plan Commission finds that:

1. The proposed development represents an innovative use of primary building materials which will enhance the use or value of area properties;
2. The proposed development is consistent with and compatible with other development located along the Gateway Corridor or a residential district; and
3. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Plainfield Zoning Ordinance.

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


Mr. Slavens: Second.

Mr. Smith: I have a motion and second to approve DP-17-010, would you call the roll please?

Mr. Klunger: Mr. Philip- yes
Mr. McPhail- yes
Mr. Brandgard- yes
Mr. Smith- yes
Mr. Kirchoff- yes
Mr. Slavens- yes

DP-17-010 is approved 6-0.

Mr. Brandgard: I want to make a comment, I think this is a better product than the EFIS.
OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Smith: Old business new business, Joe?

Mr. James: No, that is all we have tonight.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Brandgard: Move to adjourn.