

PUD(P) 18-03 Fairwood PUD

Planning & Building Department Staff Report

August 27, 2018

Advisory Plan Commission, Public Hearing

Jodi Dickey

- A. Petition Number: PUD(P) 18-03, Fairwood PUD
- B. Applicant: Platinum Properties Management Company, LLC
- C. Location: The subject property lies at the southwest corner of CR 200 S and S CR 800 E.
- D. Parcel Size: Approximately 140 acres.
- E. Land Use and Zoning: The property is zoned R-1a and is currently farmed. To the north property is zoned R-1a (Avon High School) and C-4 (professional office). To the east (across S CR 800 E) property is zoned PUD (The Settlement and Settlement West) and contains residential and passive park uses. To the south property is zoned residential and contains residential subdivision under the Town of Plainfield's jurisdiction (Williamsburg in the Woods) and a few larger unplatted residential lots. To the west property is zoned residential and contains residential subdivision under Hendricks County's jurisdiction (Hidden Valley Estates). There is also Avon school property immediately west of the subject parcel; this serves as the high school cross-country team practice area.
- F. Action Requested: Hold a public hearing on the proposal and offer comments and suggestions. A positive recommendation is requested.
- G. History: This proposal was introduced to the Plan Commission at the June 25, 2018 meeting. Commissioners discussed the proposal and had the following general comments/questions for the petitioner:
- Is this development appropriate for PUD zoning or would straight zoning suffice?
 - Does the market study account for lots already approved in Town?
 - Why is increased density good for the town?
 - Is water and sewer available?
 - Have there been discussions with Avon School administration?
 - Is an additional access for the proposed commercial area desired?
 - Will the commercial area be marketed by the developer?
 - Will the expected price points change?
 - Can the proposed south connector road be gated for emergency access only?

Commissioners also allowed the public to make comments on this proposal at the introductory meeting. Their concerns centered on density, traffic (amount and safety), connectivity, proposed home values, and impacts to schools. Additional concerns may be brought to light during the public hearing.

H. Staff Comments: Since the initial filing, the petitioner has continued to modify and update his proposal, based on staff comments. The petitioner has submitted an itemized list of the most recent updates, which is included separately as part of this report. That same list is also included in the petitioner's binder, behind Tab 10.

The petitioner lists as one of the commitments, limiting the number of single family lots to 282 (reduced from 300 originally) and approximately 25,000 square feet of commercial on approximately 140 acres. The commercial area is described as being about 7 acres and there is about 8 acres of floodplain, leaving approximately 131 developable acres. The residential area will be developed in two lot sizes – 7,000sf minimum and 10,000sf minimum – allowing differing home sizes and prices and targeting a more diverse market.

The petitioner has submitted a site plan showing a conceptual layout. This plan shows the smaller Villa lots at the northern section of the property, across the street from Avon High School. The southern section will contain the larger Estate lots, abutting the existing Williamsburg in the Wood subdivision. A color rendering of the concept plan is included behind Tab 4 in the petitioner's packet.

As a comparison to the 282 lots shown, R-1a standards (the property's current zoning) would allow for the development of about 229 net lots and R-2 would allow approximately 275 net lots.

Also, the text of the PUD notes 7 acres devoted to commercial development while the original concept plan shows a commercial outlot of only 2 acres. The recent petitioner's packet notes a commercial area of 5 acres. The petitioner should submit revised plans and text with the final determined commercial area noted.

The petitioner has also submitted architectural standards which would replace those in the Avon zoning ordinance. The Avon ordinance contains the following residential architectural standards:

1. Where two wall materials are combined horizontally on one façade, the heavier material must be below.
2. At least fifty percent (50%) of the first floor on the front façade, exclusive of windows and doorways, of residential buildings shall be masonry.
3. Where a residential structure abuts a perimeter road or a less intense residential zoning district, a minimum of fifty percent (50%)

of the first floor on all faces of the building visible from the road or adjoining the less intense residential district, exclusive of windows and doorways, shall be masonry.

4. If used, vinyl shall be premium grade vinyl siding and shall have a minimum thickness of 0.044 inches and shall comply with the ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) Standard Specification for rigid poly siding (ASTM D3679) All siding shall be Class I as listed in this standard. The minimum length of uncut siding pieces shall be twelve (12) feet. The installer shall make every effort to minimize the number of joints and to keep the length of installed siding pieces to twelve (12) feet. Additionally, the selected materials shall preserve a wood grained finish in both the siding and the trim.
5. Residential drives shall be constructed of concrete material.
6. In order to facilitate creative streetscapes, each residential subdivision shall institute within its covenants a monotony code for single family housing. Such monotony code shall set forth the standards for separation of similar building facades and/or building colors so that a variety of housing styles is apparent from any point within the neighborhood.

In contrast to Avon's standards, the petitioner has included a number of minimum standards for all homes and has included a list of additional features each home must incorporate. It is worth noting that both the front and rear façades of all homes must have extra architectural features and the developer has made the effort to design the layout so that homes along Dan Jones front on that public road. Pages 6-9 of the petitioner's PUD proposal include all of the architectural details. The petitioner has also submitted representative photos of the types of homes for each section. Dan Jones Road is noted as a Signature Street (Chapter 25 of the zoning ordinance), which contains certain residential architectural standards. That same chapter contains a list of 10 items from which the builder must incorporate three into each home. Staff is satisfied the petitioner's proposal would satisfy these requirements for the homes along Dan Jones Road and 200 South.

Each home will be evaluated for compliance to the PUD standards during building permit review.

The chart below shows the bulk standards comparison between the proposed Fairwood PUD and current Town of Avon standards for both R-1a and R-2 zoning districts.

	Fairwood	Avon Zoning Ordinance
Min Lot Size	7,000 sf (Villas) 10,000 sf (Estate)	R-1a = 15,000 sf R-2 = 12,500 sf
Min Lot Width	60' (at bldg.setback) (Villas) 80' (at bldg.setback) (Estate)	R-1a = 100' R-2 = 90'
Max Lot Coverage	Not specified	R-1a/R-2 = 35%
Min Livable Floor Area Single Story	1,300 sqft (Villas) 1,600 sqft (Estate)	R-1a/R-2 = 1,400sf
Multi-Story: Ground Floor Min. Total	700 sqft (Both) 1,600 sqft & 1,800 sqft	R-1a & R-2 =1,100sf R-1a & R-2 =1,400sf
Max. Building Height	40'	40'
Min. Front Yard Setback	30-35'	25' subdivision rd. 30' local road
Min. Side Yard Setback	5'	R-1a = 15' R-2 = 10'
Minimum Distance Between Buildings	10' (Villas) 20' (Estate)	R-1a = 35' R-2 = 30'
Min. Rear Yard Setback	20'	R-1a = 15' R-2 = 15'

Commercial area

The Fairwood PUD includes about 7 acres of proposed commercial area in the northeast corner of the property. This section would comply with the standards contained in the C-4 (Transitional Office) zoning district of the town's ordinance. The petitioner has voluntarily eliminated certain uses from the Permitted Use List:

- Cell towers
- Commercial outdoor recreation
- Commercial parking garages
- Hotels/motels
- Ordinance products
- Taverns and lounges

Commissioners may wish to review the remaining permitted uses and determine whether any others should be removed:

- Business service establishments
- Commercial indoor recreation
- Financial institutions
- Funeral homes and mortuaries
- Government buildings
- Hospitals/clinics/emergency health care clinics
- Libraries and museums
- Media broadcast stations
- Media print production and distribution
- Medical labs and testing
- Medical and scientific research
- Membership halls and organizations
- Municipal buildings/utilities/services
- Nursing home
- Office
- Parks and playgrounds
- Professional service establishments
- Places of worship
- Public utilities
- Research and development industries
- Restaurants – Class A
- Retail goods establishments, less than 5,000 sf
- Schools, public and private
- Specialty food stores
- Studios, artists, dance, and music
- Utilities

The petitioner has included photos indicating an appropriate architectural style for commercial office and for retail uses.

As noted earlier, the Signature Street chapter requires certain minimum architectural treatments. Commercial architectural standards for projects abutting 200 S and/or Dan Jones Road include a three sided architectural treatment, must use brick, stone, dryvit, or stucco, and include two architectural features or two colors and textures.

Plan commissioners may want to discuss specific acceptable building materials and styling and include those in the text of the PUD document.

Review for compliance with regulations would occur during development plan review and building permit review.

Open space, Amenity area and trails

The Subdivision Control Ordinance requires a minimum of 15% open space for traditional subdivisions. The Fairwood proposal includes 49 acres of open space, or about 37% of the total acreage. The SCO allows items such as man-made water features, dry detention areas, perimeter landscaping, and floodplain areas with certain conditions to count as open

space. Fairwood's open space includes active and passive areas, including an amenity area (roughly 4 acres in size) and common areas.

The proposed amenity area will be developed in compliance with the SCO regulations contained in Article 3, which would require two amenity center features. In fulfillment of the SCO requirements, the petitioner is also proposing at least two of the following items:

- Swimming pool
- Shade pavilion
- Playground
- Play court
- Pergola covered walkway

These items are included on page 10 of the petitioner's PUD document. As noted earlier, the petitioner submitted a list of PUD revisions....in that document the amenities have been further specified to include but not be limited to:

- 800sf building with restrooms and 50sf lockable storage;
- 300sf outdoor patio space;
- Community swimming pool and wading pool; and,
- playground

The petitioner has also included a pathway system running through the development as shown on the concept plan. Text regarding the trail system is included on page 11 of the Fairwood PUD document. Avon's Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathway Plan would require a 10' wide path through the development and connecting to Avon High School and a sidewalk along Dan Jones. The petitioner has clarified in his revisions the connecting pathway will be 10' wide and has shown this behind Tab 5 of his packet.

The petitioner notes in his text that a buffer area between the Estate homes (larger lots) and the existing Williamsburg in the Woods subdivision is provided. This buffer area is not detailed in the PUD proposal. Commissioners should require buffer yard details (minimum width, plantings, fencing, etc.). Although standard residential developments are not required to provide a buffer between adjacent uses, Staff would note that PUD developments do require a 40' wide buffer yard along the perimeter of the development (per Chapter 16 of the Avon zoning ordinance). The submitted concept plan appears to comply with this standard, with the omission of specific plantings being included in the text.

Township request

The Township Trustee has recently (on 8/14) asked the developer to donate 3 acres for a future fire station. As this is a recent request, it is not part of the proposal. Commissioners may wish to discuss a commitment from the developer to provide the requested land donation.

School request

The Avon Community School Corporation (ACSC) reviewed the preliminary plans submitted by the petitioner and has offered the following

comments and requests:

1. Installation of fencing separating this development and ACSC property (practice fields and cross country course).
2. Installation of access road connecting northern entrance to development off of the roundabout to the high school access drive. This would allow traffic exiting the high school onto Dan Jones to flow through the roundabout. Costs to construct the road and costs associated with any wetland remediation as a result would be the responsibility of the developer.
3. If the northern entrance to the development is extended west (as requested by the Town), extension of the walking trail and a crosswalk placed at a mutually agreed upon location to allow students the ability to walk from the development to the high school.
4. Increase turning radii on entrance into sub-division. The addition of acceleration/deceleration lanes would be preferable.
5. Revise the required setback on boulevards to allow more room for buses to negotiate entrance.
6. Require that trees planted in boulevards be trimmed so as to not restrict lane width
7. Create provisions to control on-street parking. We have had numerous occasions where buses could not navigate streets due to vehicular parking.
8. Since some of the variances being granted when designing new subdivisions greatly restrict the ability of a school bus to safely navigate streets, provisions to adjust our guidelines will more than likely need to be addressed. As discussed, several options need to be weighed and implemented.
 - a. Could a clubhouse or shelter be made mandatory, and located in an area near the main entry to allow a bus to make a single stop. In developments where this may not be possible, refer to line b.
 - b. Bus stops should be assigned and designated on the original site plans. This will allow potential buyers to select their building site based on their needs or personal bias. In instances where roads are too narrow to safely navigate buses, the walk distance may exceed the norm. As long as the stop locations are made known to the potential buyer prior to their purchase, these adjustments can be noted on our web-page.
9. The school corporation would ask for no boulders placed in entrances and any easement.

Staff is given to understand that negotiations are ongoing between the developer and ACSC on the above list. Should the petitioner be willing to commit to any of the above, those items should be made part of the written commitments that are recommended by the plan commission to the council for their consideration. Commissioners may wish to make a condition that the petitioner continue to work with town and school staff to reach mutually satisfactory outcomes and that those specifics are made part of any plat and development plan approval.

Phasing plan

The petitioner has submitted a phasing schedule. If approved, construction is anticipated to begin mid-2019 with the first section of homes. All single-family lots are expected to be complete at the end of 2024. The commercial component is projected to begin mid-2024 and be complete at the end of the following year. The total build out is estimated to be complete in 6 years.

Fiscal Impacts

(the complete fiscal study was previously emailed to each commissioner)

The petitioner has submitted a fiscal impact study. As a summary to that study (prepared by the Town's fiscal advisor), the development's estimated total net assessed value is \$47,840,250. Revenues and expenditures have been projected out five years. The total estimated Town revenue at year 1 is \$57,490 and increases to \$243,750 by year 5. By contrast, Town expenditures in year 1 are estimated at \$65,076 (a shortfall of \$7,586) and increase to \$269,874 (a shortfall of \$26,124).

The Township's only increase in assumed expenditures relates to providing fire protection and is shown as increasing at the same rate as currently exists, with a year 5 shortfall of \$43,368.

County and Library expenditures are also expected to increase, with year 5 shortfalls of \$27,050 and \$10,859, respectively.

The development is expected to add 54 students initially, with a 5-year total of 226. This assumes 0.8 students per 100 homes (total of 282 homes was also assumed). The revenue shortfall to the school corporation is anticipated at \$22,286 in year 1 and \$88,222 in year 5. It should be noted this study takes into account only the transportation levy as no new debt service should accrue as a result of this development.

It should also be noted that historically, residential development does not pay the full cost of services provided and has never provided a "balanced" cost benefit ratio. The Circuit Breaker intensifies this negative impact.

The proposed development will have some positive impacts. In addition to the overall increase in property values, the Town collects park impact fees at a rate of \$1,095 per home. With a total of 282 homes, the potential revenue is estimated at \$308,790. Also, there is an estimated direct impact to local business of \$84,000,000 and an indirect impact of \$66,000,000 during the construction phase.

As noted in the fiscal study, the plan commission may choose to discuss a financial contribution from the developer in order to offset a portion of the expected revenue shortfall.

Roads and Traffic

(the complete traffic study was previously emailed to each commissioner)

The petitioner has submitted a traffic study for review. The study was

completed by A& F Engineers and reviewed by GRW, the Town's consulting engineer. Actual traffic counts were utilized in generating the traffic impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding road network. The study includes recommendations for road and intersection improvements to CR 200 S extension west of Dan Jones Road, left turn lanes at Avon Avenue and Township Line Road, and some lane and intersection improvements along Dan Jones Road where entrance(s) to the proposed development are planned.

The initial traffic study assumed 272 lots and 25,000 sf of retail development. A follow up memo was prepared based on a total of 300 single family lots. That additional investigation validated the original conclusions and no additional improvements were suggested. A copy of the memo is included as an attachment to this report. As noted earlier, the petitioner has revised his PUD to limit the number of lots to 282.

While it is not unheard of for construction standards to be included as part of a PUD ordinance, Avon chooses to address these specifications through waivers during the platting process. As indicated on the petitioner's list of revisions, the development will comply with Avon construction standards for 2A and 3A road standards. The petitioner is proposing to modify the standards for the frontage road along Dan Jones. This request will be submitted and reviewed as part of platting and development plan approval.

The town's Public Works Department submitted a list of items for discussion as part of a preliminary technical committee review. The complete list is included with this staff report.

In general, the comments center on road improvements, pedestrian/bike paths, and street cross-section design. One specific comment concerns the subdivision connection to the south which would connect to the adjacent Williamsburg in the Woods subdivision. The town encourages and requires connectivity between current and potential future developments. It is staff's understanding that the Town of Plainfield may proceed with vacating the road extension that exists from Williamsburg in the Woods to the Fairwood property. Because that has not yet occurred, staff would still require the petitioner to construct a road stub. If Plainfield does vacate the existing street and right-of-way, then this petitioner should still dedicate the necessary right-of-way to ensure any future required connection could be made.

Market Survey

(the complete market survey was previously emailed to each commissioner)

The petitioner submitted a market analysis for review. In general, this study examines the risk of building the residential component of the proposed development, based on existing supply. The study notes the overall risk of developing homes in the \$275,000 to \$325,000 price range is minimal (page 2). There is steady demand for homes in this price range and not a lot of inventory available. On page 12 of the study, the data indicate a 1.6 year supply of homes within east central Hendricks County,

while on page 14 indications are there is just over a 1 month supply of homes in the price range expected from this development. One piece of information that is not included in the study is the commercial component. Commissioners may wish to require the petitioner to revise his study to include this information so they may better understand the marketability of commercial in this location.

I: Considerations for PUD proposals

According to Chapter 5, section 5-2, the following should be evaluated when considering any proposed new PUD:

a: The Proposal will achieve the purposes for which PUDs may be approved

The intent of the PUD ordinance is to provide greater flexibility, innovative approaches to meeting housing and business needs, and be in the best interest of the Town.

The petitioner's proposal does benefit from the flexibility offered by PUD zoning, in allowing smaller lots to be developed and being more responsive to market demands. There is also a small commercial component to this proposal. Under typical zoning standards, commercial and residential uses are not allowed to be built in the same districts.

Whether or not the proposal uses innovative approaches to meet housing or business need is, of course, subjective. The conceptual layout is certainly typical, as is the housing product offered.

This PUD proposal does allow the town to further negotiations between the school corporation and township services.

b: The Proposal will not violate the general purposes, goals, and objectives of the Zoning Ordinance and the Town's Comprehensive Plan

The general objectives of the zoning ordinance and comprehensive plans are, of course, to provide for reasonable and desirable growth. The PUD ordinance specifically was enacted to provide more flexibility for developments, more innovation than the general zoning ordinance allows, and more opportunities for developments beneficial to the Town and residents. The petitioner's proposal meets or exceeds general guidelines contained in town ordinances and is seeking to take advantage of the flexibility offered through PUD zoning.

The Comprehensive Plan anticipates this area is best suited for single family residential development. The subject site is not included in any special Cluster District as noted on the Future Land Use Map and is therefore expected to develop per the underlying zoning district, which is single-family residential.

The Future Land Use map does not contemplate commercial development in this area. Commercial and/or retail uses may be

appropriate however, given existing office uses to the north of the subject property and future commercial across Dan Jones (approved as part of The Settlement PUD).

Commissioners should determine whether commercial uses are appropriate for this site and include their conclusion in any recommendation to the town council.

c: The Proposal will not unduly burden adjacent roadways

The petitioner has submitted a traffic impact study with his proposal. The study indicates suggested roadway improvements to be made as a result of this development. These suggested improvements should insure adjacent roads are not unduly congested. The traffic study concludes the majority of intersections will operate at acceptable service levels when this development (including commercial) is complete. Where levels of service are not acceptable (D, E, and F notations) are the intersection at Avon Avenue/150 S (PM peak only), Avon Avenue and Township Line Road, and Dan Jones Road and a proposed retail and residential access drive (PM peaks only). Where future failures are noted, the study also includes improvements that should be made to the road network.

d: The Proposal will result in a development providing adequate and appropriate levels of open space and other compensating amenities both within the proposed development and to the Town

The PUD ordinance proposes around 37% open space overall. The open space is intended to be integrated into site plans, as development plans move forward. The petitioner is showing one central amenity area along with a pathway/sidewalk network.

J: Statutory
Guidelines for
Rezoning:

State law (IC-36-7-4-603) establishes five criteria for any zoning change and requires Plan Commission and Town Council to pay reasonable regard to them:

Criterion 1: The Comprehensive Plan, as adopted and amended from time to time

The recently adopted Future Land Use Map indicates this area as most appropriate for single-family residential. The property is not part of any designated Cluster Area and would therefore be anticipated to develop per the underlying zoning.

Criterion 2: Current conditions and the character of the current structures and uses in each district

The property is zoned R-1a and is currently farmed. Properties surrounding the subject property are residentially zoned and developed. Avon High School abuts the property to the north, and to the west is also school property used as a practice area for cross-country team. The subdivisions to the west and south contain homes built generally in the 70s & 80s (west) and 90s (south). These homes are on lots ranging from one-third of an acre to just over an acre in size. Subdivisions to the east are existing or proposed (Settlement West) newer homes (built in 2000s) on similarly sized lots as what is proposed. There is also an existing commercial (office) development to the north. The petitioner's

proposal would be an appropriate addition to the surrounding area.

Criterion 3: The most desirable use for which the land in each zoning district is adapted

As noted above, the comprehensive plan anticipates this area to develop for residential uses.

The Town Council, as with all re-zonings, may make the determination of “desirable and appropriate” uses in the best interests of the community.

Criterion 4: The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction

The proposed development is expected to have neutral or positive impacts on property values. Overall property values can be expected to grow in the future, as they have in the past, as this and other areas are developed. With developed property (as opposed to agricultural land) the town can expect additional tax and impact fee revenues as a direct result of this proposal.

Criterion 5: Responsible development and growth

This proposed project would construct needed homes on property which is adjacent to developed areas. As such, it can be considered as desirable infill as opposed to a development at the far reaches of town. Infill projects are more desirable than what is considered sprawl, as existing services are already available or can be provided with less impact to resources. This proposal also offers more than one type of desirable housing type. This will appeal to a wider spectrum of home buyers and is much more efficient than developing two or three separate subdivisions offering the same range of products.

In addition, there is a small commercial component to this proposal. This would offer convenient services right next door and potential places of employment for residents of the neighborhood

The Town Council, as with all petitions to rezone land, has the ultimate decision on this petition.

COMMITMENTS

Indiana Code 36-7-4-600 Series also allows communities to gain ‘commitments’ from developers through the rezone process. These commitments are voluntary on the part of the landowner and developer and must be recommended by the Advisory Plan Commission and approved by the Town Council.

- K. Recommendation: The Plan Commission may choose to forward a positive, negative, or no recommendation to the Town Council.

Requested Action: Hold a public hearing on PUD(P) 18-03 and forward a recommendation to the Town Council. Should the commissioners choose to make a recommendation, Staff is generally supportive of this proposal and recommends a **positive** recommendation for PUD(P) 18-03, with the

following conditions:

1. Any conditions discussed at the plan commission meeting be added to the PUD text;
2. The petitioner revise the market study to include the specific commercial uses;
3. The petitioner revise the commercial area so the text and concept plan match;
4. Any additional commercial uses eliminated from the permitted use list be included in the PUD text;
5. Any additional commercial architectural standards agreed to at the plan commission meeting be included in the PUD text;
6. Buffer yard requirements be added to the PUD text;
7. The petitioner continue work with town and school staff to arrive at mutually agreeable road improvements and that specifics are included in subsequent plat and development plan approvals; and,
8. These conditions are satisfactorily resolved with staff prior to an introduction to town council.

Commissioners may choose to continue the petition to allow the petitioner the opportunity to respond to questions and comments that arise from the public hearing, to obtain additional information requested by the commissioners, and/or to revise any documents.

Should the PC want to forward a negative recommendation, Staff offers these thoughts for consideration:

1. The proposed commercial component does not meet the suggested land use as shown on the Future Land Use Map;
2. The proposed PUD does not satisfactorily address staff concerns for roadway design and/or improvements; or,
3. The property can be effectively developed through the existing zoning district standards.

Sample Plan Commission Motion

AVON ADVISORY PLAN COMMISSION

Motion for approval of a proposed PUD

Case Number: PUD(P) 18-03, Fairwood

The Avon Plan Commission Staff has considered the proposed PUD proposal on the subject property and has found that the proposal satisfies the general intent of the PUD ordinance and those development goals and objectives of the Town of Avon.

I move that we forward a **positive** recommendation for PUD(P) 18-03, Fairwood, to the Town Council, with the following conditions:

1. Any conditions discussed at the plan commission meeting be added to the PUD text;
2. The petitioner revise the market study to include the specific commercial uses;
3. The petitioner revise the commercial area so the text and concept plan match;
4. Any additional commercial uses eliminated from the permitted use list be included in the PUD text;
5. Any additional commercial architectural standards agreed to at the plan commission meeting be included in the PUD text;
6. Buffer yard requirements be added to the PUD text;
7. The petitioner continue work with town and school staff to arrive at mutually agreeable road improvements and that specifics are included in subsequent plat and development plan approvals; and,
8. These conditions are satisfactorily resolved with staff prior to an introduction to town council.

OR

I move that we forward a **negative** recommendation for PUD(P), Fairwood, to the Town Council for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed commercial component does not meet the suggested land use as shown on the Future Land Use Map;
2. The proposed PUD does not satisfactorily address staff concerns for roadway design and/or improvements; or,
3. The property can be effectively developed through the existing zoning district standards.
4. (List other)