



Petition Number: 1306-DP-10

Subject Site Address: 1950-2000 East Greyhound Pass (Village Park Plaza)

Petitioner: Simon Property Group (Village Park Plaza, LLC)

Request: Petitioner requests Development Plan review for its proposed façade renovations.

Current Zoning: SB-PD (Special Business-Planned Development)

Current Land Use: Regional Shopping Center

Approximate Acreage: Not Applicable (façade review only)

Exhibits:

1. Staff Report
2. Aerial Location Map
3. Existing Conditions Exhibit
4. Original Proposed Elevations
5. Revised Proposed Elevations

Zoning History:

88-PD-16	Original Development Plan
88-V-9	Original Sign Variance

Staff Reviewer: Jesse M. Pohlman, Senior Planner

PROCEDURAL

Approval of a Primary Plat, Development Plan, and Site Plan Review must be granted if the submitted plans demonstrate compliance with the terms of the underlying zoning district and, subdivision control ordinance or applicable PUD Ordinance, any variances associated with the site, and any commitments associated with the site.

The petition received a public hearing at the Plan Commission’s June 3, 2013, meeting.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Petitioner is requesting review and approval of its Development Plan for proposed façade renovations to buildings located in Village Park Plaza (see [Exhibit 2](#)). Village Park Plaza is an outdoor regional shopping center that received its original approval in 1988 under the SB-PD (Special Business – Planned Development) District, a zoning district that pre-dated the Planned Unit Development (PUD) District. A PUD District would typically be established today for a development of this nature.



The Petitioner desires to update the commercial center's building façades as well as update the center's signs standards (as originally established by a sign variance in 1988). The Petitioner has filed this Development Plan Review request for its proposed façade improvements. No site plan changes are proposed at this time. The subject building facades are highlighted on the Aerial Location Map (see [Exhibit 2](#)). Photographs of the existing building conditions are included for reference at [Exhibit 3](#). The proposed façade improvements (see [Exhibit 4](#) (elevations presented at June 3, 2013, public hearing) and [Exhibit 5](#) (revised elevations proposed in response to public comments)) were reviewed by the Department under the Zoning Ordinance's Development Plan Review (DPR) standards that apply to all business districts.

The Petitioner is in the process of addressing the sign standards under a separate petition for a change of zoning to a PUD District (Petition No. 1306-PUD-07).

The Development Plan for the proposed façade improvements complies with the applicable ordinances.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Development Plan Review (WC 16.04.165): *Please note the standards listed below are only those zoning ordinance standards that apply to the review of a building façade.*

1) Zoning District Standards: *(Business District Standards (WC 16.04.050))*

a) General Requirements: *(WC 16.04.050(A))*:

Comment: **Development Plan complies.**

b) SB-PD District Specific Standards: *(WC 16.04.050(G))*

i) Maximum Building Height: Per Planned Business Development district (note, however, that the Planned Business Development district does not establish a maximum building height)

Comment: **Development Plan complies.**

c) GB District Specific Standards: *(WC 16.04.050(F))*

i) Maximum Building Height: 60 feet

Comment: **Development Plan complies.**

2) Overlay District Standards: Not applicable.

Comment: **The subject property is located within the U.S. Highway 31 Overlay District (the "Overlay"); however, the related improvements are exempt from the Overlay because the buildings were in existence when the Overlay was established (WC 16.04.070(9)).**

3) Development Plan Review Standards: *(WC 16.04.165(D)(4))*

a) **Building Orientation:**

i) **Standard:** Each building façade visible from a public street shall be a finished façade.



Comment: Development Plan complies.

- ii) Standard: No loading spaces or loading docks shall be permitted to face a public street.

Comment: Development Plan complies. Of the facades subject to this review, only the south elevation of Building D (elevation adjacent to 146th Street) includes facades with service areas that face a public street. The subject facades do not include loading docks or overhead doors; rather, as illustrated on the exhibits, these elevations include pedestrian-scaled service doors, which exist today.

The Petitioner is proposing limited renovations to the south elevation of Building D that includes adding a parapet wall above the existing wall (which screens the roof mounted equipment from 146th Street) and painting the existing wall. The new parapet on the rear elevation of Building D will match the height of the existing parapet on the front elevation of Building D (see existing parapet height in photos #10 and #13 in Exhibit 3).

The Department believes the proposed renovations to the south elevation of Building D will increase the compliance of the existing building with the current DPR Standards, resulting in a more desirable design than exists today.

- iii) Standard: All roof or ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be completely enclosed. Ground-mounted enclosures for mechanical equipment shall be landscaped on all sides not facing the building served.

Comment: Development Plan complies. As noted above, the renovations include a new parapet wall that will screen the roof mounted equipment on Building D from 146th Street.

b) **Building Materials:**

- i) Standard: In order to create variation and interest in the built environment, all new buildings or building additions located within any Business District shall use the exterior building materials specified below on each facade visible from a public street or an adjoining Residential District: (1) All brick (excluding window, display window, door, roofing, fascia and soffit materials); or, (2) Two (2) or more building materials (excluding window, display window, door and roofing materials), provided, however, that the primary building material shall be either brick or Exterior Insulation and Finish System (E.I.F.S.) and shall constitute a minimum of sixty (60) percent of each facade visible from a public street or an adjoining Residential District.

Comment: Development Plan complies. Facades are proposed to include E.I.F.S., brick and cultured stone.

- ii) Standard: The exterior building material selection shall be supplemented with the use of multiple colors, multiple textures (e.g., rough, smooth, striated, etc.) or the addition of architectural elements (e.g., quoins, pilasters, soldier courses, lintels, friezes, cornices, dentils, architraves, etc.) on each facade visible from a public street or an adjoining Residential District.

Comment: Development Plan complies. Multiple textures and materials are proposed.



4) **Comprehensive Plan Compliance:** The proposed development shall be appropriate to the site and its surroundings based upon the recommendations contained in the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan (the "Comprehensive Plan").

Comment: Development Plan complies. The Future Land Use Plan in the Comprehensive Plan identifies this center as "Regional Commercial". The existing commercial center and the proposed Development Plan meet many of Comprehensive Plan's development policies for this area, including, but not limited to: (i) Reserve exclusively for regional commercial development; (ii) Permit regional commercial uses only in planned centers with consistent design and architectural style for each center; (iii) require that buildings be designed to enhance the community character; and (iv) required the size, materials, color, and design of buildings to be unique to Westfield. "Franchise" architecture that represents no effort to create a unique design that fits Westfield-Washington Township is not acceptable.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

At the June 3, 2013, Plan Commission public hearing, the Plan Commission and the public provided comments regarding the proposed renovations, specifically regarding the "rear" elevations (elevations facing Greyhound Pass, 146th Street and Cool Creek Road). The comments originated from two primary concerns: (1) the rear elevations are now highly visible, not only from the perimeter thoroughfares, but also internal to the site; and (2) if the sign standards requested by the proposed PUD District Ordinance (Petition No. 1306-PUD-07) are approved (allowing larger signs) and the new sign bands are constructed, then greater attention will be drawn to the rear elevations. As a result, the Plan Commission requested the Petitioner revisit the proposed renovations of the rear elevations. Considerations suggested by the Plan Commission and public included:

- Incorporating greater contrast (e.g., materials, colors, and textures);
- Enclosing downspouts with masonry columns (e.g., Wal-Mart along Cool Creek Road);
- Incorporating additional architectural elements to add interest (e.g., faux windows, varying rooflines, cornices (at top of parapet wall) and awnings); and
- Incorporating more "front" elevation design elements to the rear elevations.

The Petitioner has submitted revised elevations to address the above comments, which are included at **Exhibit 5**.



STAFF COMMENTS

If the Plan Commission believes the revised elevations have addressed its concerns with regard to the rear elevations and that the elevations otherwise comply with the standards outlined in this report and the proposed PUD District Ordinance, then staff recommends approving the Development Plan for the façade renovations.

If any APC member has questions prior to the public hearing, then please contact Jesse Pohlman at 317.402.4380 or jpohlman@westfield.in.gov.