

**PACKET OF PUBLIC COMMENT**

Advisory Plan Commission

June 1, 2015

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

### **Subject: ORD 15-14, Tamarack**

Tamarack at NE corner of 161 & Oak Rd is being introduced to City Council this evening.

It is across the street from Oak Park and next door to Oak Manor.  
These are all pretty much the same house with different facades.  
Is this what we are looking for considering the higher surrounding standards?

Do we allow garages to ALL open to the street and ALL bump out like this?  
Me thinks not!

Respectfully,  
Mic Mead

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

### **Subject: Re: ORD 15-14, Tamarack**

We have lived in Oak Park for over 20 years. During this time we have enjoyed the openness of the area. In the past year this openness has been challenged with the infill of Pedcor/Estridge trying to squeeze a few more houses into Oak Park that didn't look like the other, more spacious, lots in the existing neighborhood. Now the new proposed Tammarack comes along with 1400 SF SF4 sized lots just due north of Oak Park and south of Oak Manor. The additional road cuts will bring safety issues on a very busy 161st street and Oak Road. This is a bad idea. The gas pipeline will squeeze more homes into a beautiful area of Westfield that should be preserved.

I will attend the City Council meeting tonight with some of my neighbors to hear about this new PUD. SF 4 neighborhood that will offer a tax burden for our schools and existing business and homeowners.

Dave Mueller

Homeowner and HOA president

### **PUBLIC COMMENT #3**

#### **Subject: Re: ORD 15-14, Tamarack**

I too am on Oak Park's HOA Board and have lived in Oak Park for 19 years. I agree this proposed development is not congruent with the surrounding neighborhoods and am concerned how this development will take shape with the existing gas pipeline. It has become increasing difficulty to enter/exit Oak Park onto 161st street with the heavy traffic and am greatly concerned how future development will increase the traffic flow even more.

I am not available to attend tonight's meeting. But will be attending future meetings in opposition to this development.

Thank you for your time,  
Nancy Anderson

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #4**

### **Subject: Re: ORD 15-14, Tamarack**

Hello All,

Mick and Dave, thanks for the head's up on tonight's meeting which I won't be able to attend due to a prior commitment.

Our community at 161st and Oak Road consists of beautiful homes in Oak Manor and Oak Park, with more coming at the southern border of Oak Park. Also, Jim Langston is putting more nice homes in across from Acorn Farms south on Oak Road.

Our 7 residents on Oakwoods lane across the street from the proposed new Tamarack development (the field with the diagonal pipeline underneath it), have comfortable homes on 3-4 acre wooded lots that were mostly built in the early 1980's.

Why would Westfield want to cram a bunch of similar floor-plan "ticky-tack" homes on 1400 sq. ft. lots in our 161st and Oak Road neighborhood filled with beautiful homes? (Is Westfield trying to become another "Levittown, PA", which tried that concept 60 years ago?)

When many of us spent 2 years working on "Westfield's Comprehensive Plan", it was with the objective to provide "continuity" within neighborhoods, not doing a "mix and match" of different neighborhood qualities jumbled up together.

Issues like this are the reason that the Washington Township Neighborhood-SE(WTNT), was started by Dr. Terry Parke and Bill Bangs(now deceased) to prevent developers from waltzing into nice neighborhoods in our section of Westfield hoping to "get-rich quick" with housing "not consistent" with that already in place there.

John Boyer  
WTNT-President

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #5**

### **Subject: Re: ORD 15-14, Tamarack**

This is a follow-up note regarding the Westfield Development presentation at the last WeCan meeting.

As I commented at the time, the update only focused on the number of building permits issued. My follow-up question was in regards to how Westfield assesses the quality of construction and how its standards compare to Carmel's. The response in the meeting appears to suggest that there is no overall quality assessment nor associated process.

I understand that a proposal for a new development for the corner of 161st and Oak Road will be introduced at this evening's City Council meeting. This proposal strongly reflects the development quality issue. The development proposal includes 1400 sq ft homes. The single line placement of some of the homes reminds one of the Pulte construction in Viking meadows about which I've heard many derisive comments regarding their appearance along 161st street.. The new development is also inconsistent with surrounding neighborhoods such as Oak Manor, Brookside, Bridgewater, etc.

From a size comparison, I did a quick internet search and noted double wide mobile homes starting at over 1400 sq feet ([www.solitairehomes.com](http://www.solitairehomes.com)).

As a possible reflection on the city's image, I wonder if a developer would even make such a proposal in Carmel.

Thank you for your earlier feedback regarding my question. Your stewardship of WeCan is much appreciated.

Mike

I've copied Jonathan Dilley, Oak Manor HOA president, on this message.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #6**

### **Subject: Tamarack Development**

All,

Just a couple of comments. I am speaking as an Oak Manor resident and not in my position as an Oak Manor board member.

Tamarack Development Concerns --

Traffic at the Oak Road and 161st intersection is of concern as well as the change in zoning.

Why should a change in zoning be granted? This would, as I understand it, allow for much smaller homes as well as smaller lot sizes than the surrounding neighborhoods.

While the 11 lots accessing Oak Road will not affect Oak too much, the others will add to what is already becoming a major traffic issue in Westfield. At the least the future roundabout at 161st and Oak should be completed before approval of this project is even considered.

Perhaps the developer should be required to install this roundabout?

This applies to the proposed roundabout at 161st and Union also. Just drive there at morning or evening rush hours.

I do plan on attending the hearing next Monday.

Thanks,

Larry Clarino  
2533 Live Oak Lane (Oak Manor)  
Westfield.  
317-896-9689

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #7**

### **Subject: MI Homes proposed Tamarack development for NE corner of 161<sup>st</sup> and Oak Roads**

Dear Members of Council,

I'm writing to voice my strong opposition to the current proposed development on the corner of 161<sup>st</sup> and Oak roads by MI homes. I understand that the land will be developed, but I think it needs to be done in a way more consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. The development of Oak Park across the street has single family homes on very large lots. These homes, along with the homes in Bridgewater, have some of the highest property values in Westfield. Allowing a rezoning to SF-4 would create a very dense zero lot-line neighborhood immediately across the street from our homes. There would undoubtedly be a significant negative impact on the value of our homes. The council was very helpful and understanding recently when Pedcor proposed developing the land within Oak Park in way that was inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood. We successfully lobbied for significant changes to lot size and home density, and preserved the character of our neighborhood. Likewise, we feel that compromised should be made by MI homes in their Tamarack development.

I have several specific concerns that I would like to address. The first is overall neighborhood density and traffic patterns. As Oak Road becomes busier over the years, adding a high density neighborhood with an entrance just across the street from Oak Park's entrance will significantly increase traffic and the risk of accidents when neighbors pull out of the neighborhood. We saw this happen to Foster Estates when a young teenager was killed pulling out of their neighborhood onto a much busier 146<sup>th</sup> street.

The increased density will also mean more street parking, effectively narrowing the street. This will absolutely inhibit emergency vehicular traffic. This is especially disturbing given the fact that most of these houses will be sitting 20-30 feet from major gas pipelines and too close together for an emergency vehicle to drive between any of them.

Finally, we'd ask you to consider the overall feel of the surrounding neighborhoods that are currently built. The homes to the northwest of 161<sup>st</sup> and Oak (Oak Woods Lane) are on large lots, as are the homes on Cool Creek Circle between Oak and Westfield. My house sits off of Oak Road on 2.4 acres, and I think it would be crazy to ask to tear it down and replace it with 10 houses on a quarter acre each. That's simply not the character of this part of Westfield that we moved into. I would ask that you please try to keep the new development in the spirit and character of the other neighborhoods that surround it.

Many thanks,

-Matt Priddy

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #8**

### **Subject: Ordinance 15-14 – Public Comment – Tamarack (DILLEY)**

Dear Councilmembers, APC members, and staff,

In response to the requests for public comments on Ordinance 15-4, the Dilley Household (16421 Oak Manor Drive) respectfully submit the following for your consideration. Please confirm receipt of this correspondence.

Regards,  
Jonathan & Kiersten Dilley

#### **ORDINANCE 15-14**

1. **Lot Sizes (Ordinance 15-14, Sec. 4).** We request that the proposed development is a “step-down” from the SF2 zoning of Oak Manor (*i.e.*, SF3). According to the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance (4.5), the minimum lot size for an SF3 subdivision lot is 12,000+ square feet (15,000 for a corner lot). We request that all lots within the proposed Tamarack neighborhood meet the SF3 requirement and not be rezoned to SF4. This would be an appropriate “step-down” from the surrounding neighborhoods.
2. **Square Footage (Ord. 15-14, Sec. 6.5).** To ensure an appropriate “step-down” transition from the surrounding neighborhoods, we request that Tamarack homes begin at 2,061 square feet and limit those to 20% of homes sites.
3. **Setbacks (Ord. 15-14, Sec. 6.1-6.4).** We request that the front, side, and rear yard setbacks and the minimum lot width meet SF3 requirements.
4. **Drainage.** We are concerned about storm water runoff and request assurances from M/I Homes and the city that runoff will be collected and handled within the Tamarack development. There are already concerns about appropriate drainage along the north side of the proposed development.
5. **Safety.** With regards to the cul-de-sac with its entrance off of Oak Road, what happens if an accelerator sticks or someone has a medical emergency and their car continues forward at the end of the cul-de-sac? They would crash into Oak Manor’s south fence line and possibly continue into one of the houses along Oak Manor Drive. We request a raised berm (that would adequately address concerns raised in No. 4 above) be constructed along the Oak Manor fence line. In addition, at the end of the cul-de-sac, we request a stone retaining wall be constructed within the berm.

6. **Headlights.** We are concerned about headlights shining into the homes along Oak Manor Drive. Please see Nos. 5 and 8. We believe our requests will address this concern.
7. **No. of Model Options.** We request that M/I provide potential buyers with additional model/elevation options of the same quality to the three model options currently proposed.
8. **Buffer to Oak Manor (see attached).** With regards to the 30 foot buffer between the Oak Manor fence line and the Tamarack development, we request that 1) it be an elevated berm, 2) there are more evergreen trees planted instead of shade trees, 3) those evergreens are 8' instead of the proposed 6', and 4) the shade trees are 3" instead of the proposed 2".
9. **Lot #4 Location (see attached).** With regards to the location of the proposed home on Lot #4, we request that M/I Homes—should the development proceed—agree to locate the home as close as allowed to the adjoining Lot #5 property.
10. **Traffic.** Prior to any recommendation from the Advisory Plan Commission, we request that the traffic study be completed and provided to the public. At the very least, we respectfully request written assurances from the city prioritizing the construction of roundabouts at 161<sup>st</sup> and Oak Road and 161<sup>st</sup> and Union. These roundabouts should be built with no intrusion on existing single-family properties.
11. **Over-development for Similar Target Populations.** Look no further than the proposed Lantern Park (161<sup>st</sup> and Union) and in-development Viking Enclave (1,600+ sq ft, starting at \$206k) neighborhoods. How are we positive of market demand? We request that the APC and City Council clearly state their philosophies on Westfield residential, commercial, and industrial development.

Jonathan Dilley  
*Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff*  
Project Lead The Way, Inc.  
3939 Priority Way South Drive, Suite 400  
Indianapolis, IN 46240  
[phone: 317.669.0869](tel:317.669.0869) | [mobile: 202.714.4154](tel:202.714.4154)  
[fax: 317.663.8296](tel:317.663.8296)  
[@Dilley\\_PLTW](mailto:@Dilley_PLTW)  
[www.pltw.org](http://www.pltw.org)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #9**

### **Tamarack Development- M/I Homes- 161st and Oak Road**

To the Westfield Planning commission, and Council Members of the City of Westfield,

Thanks for your time and consideration, in regards to our concerns about the M/I Development planned at 161<sup>st</sup> and Oak Road.

I wish to keep my concerns simple, but I strongly believe my neighbors and friends concerns will be similar.

I believe the current planned development will negatively impact the surrounding neighborhoods of Oak Manor, Oak Park, Brookside and Bridgewater. I believe the lot sizes and home sizes being 30-50% smaller than the surrounding CURRENT neighborhood does not reflect the value of homes that we would like to see built immediately adjacent to our neighborhoods.

In addition, I have learned that there is another approved plan to construct larger homes.... On smaller lots.... At 161<sup>st</sup> street and Union. To rephrase that development, it is looking for empty nesters or "maintenance free" home buyers.

I support the plan for the development at 161<sup>st</sup> and Union, and would urge our council and APC to request that M/I homes increase the lot size and minimum home size for the planned Tamarack Neighborhood.

I would like the minimum size of the home/dwelling to match the current planned development at 161<sup>st</sup> and Union.

I hope my simple request makes sense, and my concerns are reasonable.

As a homeowner and business owner in Westfield, I thank you for your service to my City, family, and clients

#### **Ben Brown, Agent**

State Farm Insurance

2750 East 146<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste 204

Carmel, IN 46033

Ph: 317-569-9200

Fx: 317-569-9232

Email: [ben@bbrown.com](mailto:ben@bbrown.com)

Visit us at [www.bbrown.com](http://www.bbrown.com)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #10**

### **Subject: Tamarack Development**

I am a resident of Oak Manor Neighborhood and have followed the process of this proposed ordinance concerning the Tamarack Development. I can understand the difficulty of the council and a person in your position of balancing the projects that are brought to the council and the underlying economics of these transactions, along with the overall well being of Westfield. I would ask that you and the council consider a few adjustments concerning the scope/quality of this proposed development, in order to be consistent with the surrounding developments:

#### *Lot sizes:*

The proposed lot sizes are concerning in that they are much smaller and less desirable than the corresponding neighborhoods (Oak Manor / Bridgewater). I understand that they are desired to be smaller, since they are targeting empty nesters, but it is my desire that the lot sizes meet the definition of SF3, instead of SF4 as proposed.

#### *Exterior of Houses:*

The pictures presented in the ordinance are fantastic, but are only optional and not mandatory for the individuals that would buy in this neighborhood. Can you please address the concern that the buyers will put it in homes that are not up to the standards of the pictures?

#### *Drainage:*

We are concerned that drainage is not adequately addressed. Can we please be provided with protections against drainage being contained in the development?

#### *Setbacks:*

We request that the front, side, and rear yard setbacks and the minimum lot width meet SF3 requirements.

#### *Buffer to Oak Manor:*

We request an elevated berm with evergreens on top to insulate us from this new community.

#### *Traffic:*

Prior to any recommendation from the Advisory Plan Commission, we request that the traffic study be completed and provided to the public. If that is not possible, I request written assurances from the city prioritizing the construction of roundabouts at 161st and Oak Road and 161st and Union, as these are needed currently without the proposed subdivision.

I appreciate your time and will be attending the meeting on June 1. I would appreciate a confirm receipt and any further understanding to these topics above.

Thank you,

Matthew J. Howard, CPA

16402 Chalet Ci, Westfield, IN 46074

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #11**

### **Subject: Concerned Oak Manor Resident: Tamarack Development -- for Public Comment Period**

For the new neighborhood development--Tamarack--proposed for the farm at the corner of Oak Road and 161st Street.

Oak Manor, Oak Park, Brookside, and Bridgewater surround this proposed development. Assurances should be made to guarantee an appropriate level of quality housing consistent with the area.

I am an Oak Manor resident, and these are my concerns & requests regarding the proposed development.

1. Lot Sizes (Ordinance 15-14, Sec. 4).

Please require that the proposed development meet the SF3 lot size requirement set forth in the Westfield-Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance (4.5). All lots within Tamarack should meet the minimum SF3 lot size (12,000+ square feet, or 15,000 for a corner lot). The proposed Tamarack neighborhood should not be rezoned to SF4.

2. Square Footage (Ord. 15-14, Sec. 6.5). Tamarack homes should have a beginning 2,061 square feet and limit those to 20% of homes sites.

3. Buffer to Oak Manor. The proposed 30 foot buffer between the Oak Manor fence line and the Tamarack development should be an elevated berm with evergreen trees planted at 8' instead of the proposed 6'. All trees should be evergreen to ensure a year round "buffer".

4. Traffic. Prior to any recommendation from the Advisory Plan Commission, a traffic study should be completed and provided to the public. The city should commit to prioritization of roundabout construction at 161st and Oak Road.

5. Drainage. Storm water runoff must be addressed. M/I Homes and the city should ensure that runoff is collected and handled within the Tamarack development.

Donna Van Huis  
Oak Manor Resident