



Westfield City Council Report

Ordinance Number:	13-24
APC Petition Number:	1311-PUD-11
Requested Action:	Chatham Oaks, LLP requests a change in zoning from the Agriculture-Single Family Rural (AG-SF1) District to the Chatham Hills PUD District.
Current Zoning District:	Agriculture-Single Family Rural (AG-SF1) District
Current Land Use:	Agricultural / Residential / Undeveloped
Requested Zoning District:	Chatham Hills Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Exhibits:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Staff Report2. Aerial Location Map3. Concept Plan (Exhibit B of PUD District Ordinance)4. APC Certification5. PUD District Ordinance
Prepared by:	Jesse M. Pohlman, Senior Planner

PETITION HISTORY

This petition was introduced at the October 14, 2013, City Council meeting. The petition received a public hearing at the November 4, 2013, Advisory Plan Commission (the "APC") meeting. The petition was continued from the November 18, 2013, and December 2, 2013, APC meetings to allow the Petitioner an opportunity to address comments received from the Economic and Community Development Department (the "Department") and interested parties at and following the public hearing. The APC forwarded the petition to the Westfield City Council (the "Council") with a unanimous favorable recommendation for approval at its December 16, 2013, meeting. The APC Certification is included at Exhibit 4.

PROCEDURAL

- Requests for a change in zoning are required to be considered at a public hearing, in accordance with Indiana Code 36-7-4-1511. The public hearing for this petition was held on November 4, 2013, at the APC meeting. Notice of the November 4, 2013, public hearing was provided in accordance with the APC Rules of Procedure.
- At its December 16, 2013, meeting, the APC issued a favorable recommendation (8-0) of the proposed change of zoning to the Council.
- The Council may take action on this item at its January 13, 2014, meeting.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Location: This subject property (collectively, the “Property”) is approximately seven hundred and forty-six (746) acres and includes property located on the west side of Horton Road and 206th Street, and then property located generally between the intersection of 199th Street and the Monon Trail and the intersection of U.S. Highway 31 and State Road 38 (see Exhibit 2). The Property is currently zoned AG-SF1 (Agriculture-Single Family Rural) District and consists of residential and agricultural uses.

Project Description: The Petitioner is requesting a change of zoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) District to be known as “Chatham Hills”, that would allow for a mixed-use golf course development. The PUD Ordinance establishes two (2) districts for the development of the Property, as generally illustrated on the Conceptual Plan at Exhibit 3:

District I: Residential and Golf Course Areas: This area makes up the majority of the proposed development and allows for detached single-family residential uses, golf course uses (an 18-hole golf course and par-3 executive course are illustrated on the Conceptual Plan), development amenity areas, and a potential “farmstead” concept.

District II: Mixed-Use Areas: This area is located at the northeast corner of the Property along SR 38 and US 31 and allows a mix of potential uses including those uses permitted in District I, but then also allows commercial, multi-family residential, and attached residential uses.

Default Standards: The PUD Ordinance defaults to the following underlying zoning districts (collectively, “Underlying Zoning Districts”): (i) the SF-4 (Single Family) District for single family and golf course uses; (ii) MF2 (Multi-family) District for multi-family uses; and (iii) the GB (General Business) District for non-residential uses.

Development Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance establishes enhanced design standards and alternative development standards from the Underlying Zoning Districts. These modifications are intended to accommodate the unique environmental characteristics of the Property and the Petitioner’s vision of a mixed-use, active golf course development consisting of residential neighborhoods, recreational corridors, and commercial areas. The development standards of note are briefly highlighted below:

Bulk and Density Standards: The PUD Ordinance establishes a maximum of 1,500 dwelling units within District I, which would generally be developed around and intertwined throughout the golf course. The single family areas of District I would be permitted to be developed a variety of subareas with each subarea having its own set of development standards. The subareas allow lots that range from 60’ wide (7,500 sq. ft.) to 150’ wide (20,000 sq. ft.). Each subarea includes a maximum number of units that may be developed pursuant to those standards, but in no case may the total number exceed 1,500 dwelling units in District I.

The PUD Ordinance allows for District II to be developed for a variety of land uses; however, it establishes the following permitted maximums in District II: (i) 350 units for multi-family uses; (ii) 500 units for the following, collectively: detached single-family, attached single-family, mixed-use residential, and bed and breakfast rooms; and (iii) no maximum total intensity for commercial uses (would otherwise be restricted by the applicable development standards), however, as a result of comments at the APC, the PUD Ordinance includes a restriction that no single retail tenant may exceed 30,000 square feet.

Architectural and Design Standards: The PUD Ordinance establishes basic architectural and design standards, including restrictive façade variety standards for single-family homes. The PUD Ordinance also incorporates graphic depictions (“Character Exhibits”) to more accurately establish a benchmark for the quality and character of the permitted buildings and streetscape.

Open Space Standards: The PUD Ordinance establishes a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the Property shall be open space, which is roughly 150 acres of the 746-acre development. The Conceptual Plan illustrates the majority of the open space would include the golf course uses; however, the conceptual plan and PUD Ordinance also contemplate that the open space will consist of a network of trail corridors, perimeter buffer yards, and smaller park areas that would be integrated and connected throughout the development.

Comprehensive Plan: The Future Land Use Plan in the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan”) identifies the Property as primarily “New Suburban”, with the areas of District II along US 31 and SR 38 identified as “Regional Commercial” and “Employment Corridor”. The Comprehensive Plan is not law; rather, it is intended to serve as a guide in making land use decisions; however, as proposed, Chatham Hills is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as generally summarized below.

The development policies for “New Suburban” include: (i) design developments such that backyards are not adjacent to collector or arterial streets unless uniform attractive screening is provided; (ii) prevent monotony of design and color that applies to the collective impact of an entire development; (iii) encourage compatible and high quality “life span” housing; (iv) ensure proper land use transitions between dissimilar types of residential development; (v) ensure appropriate transitions of businesses located along US31 and SR38 and from adjoining large subdivisions; (vi) preserve existing older structures where possible; (vii) promote flexible design that maximizes open space preservation by regulating density rather than lot size; (viii) encourage development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities; (ix) encourage attractive streetscapes that minimizes front-loading garages, provides garage setbacks from front facades of homes, and minimizes design and material repetition; and (x) locate roadways and house lots to respect natural features and to maximize exposure of lots to open space.

The development policies for "Regional Commercial" include: (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) require 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.

The development policies for "Employment Corridor" (or Highway Corridor) include: (i) prohibit outdoor storage and operations; (ii) promote large-scale employment-generating office uses and related supporting service uses; (iii) permit retail or residential development in designated village locations, strip commercial development is not desired; (iv) encourage building materials and colors that are appropriate to setting and that are enhanced with stone or brick; (v) locate loading to sides and rears of building and screen to hide unattractive views; (vi) maintain attractive and appealing corridor through landscaping, setbacks and building design; and (vii) require parking areas to have interior landscaping and landscaping along street frontages with large asphalt expanses discouraged.

The development policies for "residential design standards" include: (i) encourage neighborhoods that do not have the appearance of "production" housing; (ii) evaluate new residential development on the basis of overall density and the relationship that density to effective and usable open space preservation, rather than on lot sizes; and (iii) encourage variety and diversity in housing while maintaining a distinct style or character and avoiding the appearance of "cookie cutter" subdivisions.

The development policies for "open space and recreation" include: (i) design open space to form an interconnected network, with provisions or linkages to existing or potential open space; (ii) maintain and preserve stream corridors, woodlands, hedge rows, or other valuable natural and historic resources; (iii) provide parks and recreational facilities in new development to accommodate the needs of the community as it grows; and (iv) recognize that in addition to the amount of open space, that the location and configuration of open space is of importance and should not be an afterthought based on a determination of unusable land.

Thoroughfare Plan: The Council recently adopted an amendment to the City's [Thoroughfare Plan](#) at its October 14, 2013, meeting. The PUD Ordinance incorporates language that requires the dedication of right-of-way pursuant to the Thoroughfare Plan and Monon & Midland Trace Trail Master Plan. The following corridors are impacted by the development of the Property: (i) Local Road: 203rd Street; (ii) Collector Roads: 199th Street, 206th Street, Oak Ridge Road and Tomlinson Road; (iii) Secondary Arterial: US31 frontage road (Lindley Farm Road); (iv) Primary Arterial: Horton Road; and (v) Alternative Transportation Plan: includes the Monon Trail corridor, perimeter pathways along perimeter streets and sidewalks along internal streets.

STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

1. The Comprehensive Plan.
2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.
3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.
4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.
5. Responsible growth and development.

RECOMMENDATIONS / ACTIONS

Prior to its recommendation, the APC received comments regarding the proposed PUD Ordinance. Comments that were presented at the public hearing are summarized in the APC's [November 4, 2013, meeting minutes](#). A summary of the written comments that were received by the Department, including ordinance revisions and responses to those comments, can be found in the Department's [December 16, 2013, Staff Report](#) to the APC.

On October 29, 2013, the Petitioner hosted a [meeting for adjoining property owners](#) (as required by WC 16.04.190(E)(2) for proposed PUD Districts) where over fifty (50) individuals attended, including a representative from the Department. In addition since filing, the Petitioner has met with numerous interested parties on-site. The Department has also responded to over two dozen inquiries regarding the petition. The meeting minutes and Staff Report referenced above reflect the comments that the Department received in these correspondences.

APC Recommendation

At its December 16, 2013, meeting, the APC forwarded a **favorable recommendation** of Ordinance No. 13-24 (APC Petition No. 1311-PUD-11) to the Council (Vote of: 8 in favor, 0 opposed).

City Council

Introduction: October 14, 2013

Eligible for Adoption: January 13, 2014

Submitted by: Jesse M. Pohlman, Senior Planner
 Economic and Community Development Department