

**PACKET OF PUBLIC COMMENT ADDENDUM**

Advisory Plan Commission

June 1, 2015

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #12**

### **Subject: Tamarack Development**

I write regarding the proposed Tamarack development at northeast corner of 161<sup>st</sup> St. and Oak Road in Westfield. I am a resident of Oak Manor, a community adjacent to the property under consideration for development.

When considering the purchase of our home, we looked at a home on Oak Manor Drive in the Oak Manor neighborhood. We did not purchase it. The back of that house faces the property under consideration for the Tamarack community. One concern of ours when considering to purchase that home was obviously the risk of future development in the vacant field behind it. In its present, undeveloped state, it can be a lovely vista for the affected homeowner's backyard views. We were advised by one of the realtors (I cannot recall if it was ours or the seller's) that the property was unable to be developed because a cross country natural gas pipeline runs underneath it. I am very familiar with that pipeline. I recall when it was constructed as it went through the property (undeveloped) owned by the church and school where my family attends, *i.e.*, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, located at the corner of 146th Street and Oak Ridge Rd. in Carmel. That pipeline runs from a northeasterly to southwesterly direction and appears to me to run through the property at issue with Tamarack.

Perhaps I was misinformed by the real estate agents as to the inability for development on that piece of land. It was not a deciding factor as to why we did not purchase that home. We simply found a home with a more appropriate floor plan for our family in the same neighborhood. That being said, I think serious environmental study needs to occur regarding this potential hazard. Even if the pipeline is buried deep enough so as not to be compromised by any new construction, it would cause me great concern as a homeowner purchasing property directly above it. Assuming the development passes any environmental study, I think the developer must engage in full disclosure with regard to the pipeline to any prospective homebuyer. Additionally, as a nearby resident, I remain deeply concerned about a construction project of this magnitude and the risks it poses to the structural integrity of the pipeline. A gas leak and/or explosion could have devastating consequences not only to the adjoining neighborhoods but to the City of Westfield as a whole. It may also have nationwide impact as it would disrupt the delivery of natural gas to its intended destinations.

I may be speaking out of turn and my concerns may well have been considered already. In my admittedly rudimentary review of the information concerning this development, I have not seen anything regarding the pipeline. If the reason for that is my concerns listed above have not been addressed, I think it would be highly irresponsible if the pipeline concerns were not thoroughly studied and all concerns were satisfactorily addressed prior to any consideration regarding approval of this project.

Thank you for your time and feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Fred

Frederick Vaiana  
VOYLES ZAHN & PAUL  
141 East Washington Street, S. 300  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(w) 317.632.4463  
(f) 317.631.1199  
[fvaiana@vzplaw.com](mailto:fvaiana@vzplaw.com)  
[www.vzplaw.com](http://www.vzplaw.com)  
[www.frederickvaianalaw.com](http://www.frederickvaianalaw.com)  
[www.superlawyers.com](http://www.superlawyers.com)  
[www.thenationaltriallawyers.org](http://www.thenationaltriallawyers.org)  
[www.national-academy.net](http://www.national-academy.net)

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #13**

### **Subject: Tamarack New Development**

**I am writing to voice my concern about the new subdivision that is going in next to Oak Manor.**

When looking at Tamarack's information, I see that their lots are smaller than what is required for Oak Manor. The minimum is about 12, 500 square feet and larger for a corner lot here in Oak Manor. I would ask that Tamarack be made accountable that their lots fall into the same requirements as Oak Manor.

I also request that there be a DEFINED buffer between Oak Manor and Tamarack with evergreen trees. The proposed 6' trees are not acceptable, I request that the trees be 8-10' instead of the 6" they have requested.

Please feel free to call me or email me back if you need more information from me. I will be attending the meeting coming up.

Thank you for your time

Maria Seager

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #14**

### **Subject: Tamarack Comments**

From Ron and Tammy Loera-16405 Oak Manor Dr

Safety concerns:

- 1- Has the pipeline manager and the appropriate state regulators approved the proposed project?
- 2- Does MI Homes have a written comprehensive safety plan to address working in close proximity to these Pipelines?
- 3- Are there specific guidelines for using heavy equipment for excavating near or over the top of the pipeline?
- 4- Have all guidelines and safety considerations been taken into account for infrastructure that will be crossing the pipelines?
- 5- Will a representative be on site if/when pipelines are exposed?

Drainage

- 1- This property has standing water after it rains. There were concerns brought up at the neighborhood meeting last week. The proposed design has drainage flowing into a new pond which will overflow into an existing drainage structure. One comment at the meeting stated that there are currently existing drainage issues in the proposed pond area. What steps are going to be taken to make sure that excess water does not flow back into Oak Manor and surrounding areas?

PROPOSED STRUCTURES

- 1- 1400 minimum square foot home is much too modest a size for comparable area.
- 2- MI Homes needs to commit to a minimum base price, not based on potential upgrades.
- 3- Base price should be in line with existing neighborhoods.

PROPERTY ADJACENT TO OAK MANOR

- 1- Increase building set back on North side of property (lots 3 and 4) from proposed 30' to 50' . This will keep the average back yard to back yard distances more in line with Oak Manor standards.
- 2- Lot 3 to have garage load on the south side of structure.
- 3- Lot 3 to have lowest profile single story. No story and half.
- 4- Cul de sac that accesses lots 1-11, no street light that will illuminate Oak Manor back yards.
- 5- The northern boundary of Tamarack adjacent to Oak Manor should have a heavily landscaped berm which will consist of mature plantings (trees/evergreens) to be maintained by Tamarack .
- 6- Common area behind lots 1-3 to have no structures/improvements, to remain green space.
- 7- No walking paths along northern boundary adjacent to Oak Manor subdivision.

Feel free to call or email Ron: [ronloera@yahoo.com](mailto:ronloera@yahoo.com). 317-504-5092

Respectfully submitted,  
Thank you,

Ron and Tammy Loera

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #15**

### **Subject: Proposed Tamarack Edition**

Westfield council and members,

I am writing to voice my concern with the MI home high density development of Tamarack. The development is on the NE corner of 161st street and Oak Roads. The development will have too many homes for 161st to accommodate and the traffic and overall feel of our area is being compromised. I live in Oak Park and while I realize that the trend is for smaller lots and bigger empty nest type homes; the proposed development appears to pack 3-4 homes on an acre lot. Westfield is championing green space and fitness along with family wellness. The boon of neighborhood developments is really undermining this feel and increasing traffic flow while cutting down trees and native foliage. I urge you to vote NO to rezoning the proposed Tamarack development from SF2 to SF4.

Thank you for your consideration,

Julie Barnes  
3131 Joshua Circle

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #16**

### **Subject: Tamarack Housing Development Concerns**

Dear Westfield City Council,

As a homeowner in Oak Manor since 2012, I have grown to appreciate and love the community of Westfield. To the degree that I have encouraged others to consider moving to Westfield for the focus on family, great schools and a commitment to excellence. As a result of this, I fully support growth and great housing in the community of Westfield.

However, I am also concerned about the value of my home - and the overcrowding of homes in communities. My husband and I lived in Fishers for 7 years, and as we decided to move out of our home, Fishers was not even a choice because of the overcrowding of home communities and what has the impression of a lack of thoughtful planning in the development of housing communities. Fishers is crawling with great subdivisions where the home are on top of each other, and there isn't sufficient green space. Westfield was the top choice for us, because we believe there is a commitment to thoughtful home planning (like Zionsville) and a deep respect for preserving land even within home developments.

As a result, it is of great concern to me to see the development, Tamarack, proposed as it is today at the corner of 161st and Oak Road.

As I review this plan, it appears to me that a buffer between these communities needs to be protected (with an elevated berm, and more evergreen trees planted to create boundaries and that there is a sense of elevated topography to not have "homes simply on cornfields" which is the look of Fishers.

One of the additional drawbacks of the mass housing that has taken place in Fishers is the lack of options and customization. I would request that M/I include more than three floor plans/exterior to residents, to continue with Westfield's approach to a community and not cookie cutter approach to housing.

Lastly, when we purchased our home in Oak Manor - we did this with full knowledge that we could have a housing community behind us, but we were informed that it was zoned to be estate homes. The development M/I has proposed is below this estate home (SF2 or SF3 zoning) as previously communicated. In my opinion, it seems that it is too much of a step down to go from large custom homes to be abutted to not be rezoned to SF4.

I am in full support of housing development in westfield, as it truly is a great place to live. However, I would respectfully request as council members you seek to maintain thoughtful planning and hold builders to the standards (zoning) originally intended for this land to ensure our developments have the appearance of thoughtful and intentional development, rather than mass home building.

Kindest regards,

Amanda J. Biedess

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #17**

### **Subject: Tamarack Community Impact Concerns - Ord. 15-14**

Dear Jeffrey, Council Members:

As impacted adjacent residents, we are responding with our concerns regarding the planned Tamarack Community as outlined in the referenced ordinance. While for selfish reasons we would not like to see that parcel developed, we understand that is an unrealistic expectation in a growing community and the development will happen. It is just what type of development. We strongly feel that any new development should dovetail with the existing neighborhoods and transition into another. Based upon the ordinance presented to the city council and the neighborhood meeting at MI homes, we have the following comments and recommendations. In general, all the adjacent or adjoining neighborhoods are currently zoned AG-1 or SF-2 (low density) housing. As proposed the Tamarack proposal would be an SF-4 (high density) neighborhood. Therefore we would proposed the ordinance and community be changed to meet SF-3 requirements. Traffic is also a major concern for 161st street. It is already a high traffic area prone to back-ups now that the Hwy 31 exit is complete. Our concern is this high density neighborhood will only exacerbate the current bottleneck. Councilman Stokes indicated that a traffic study is underway. We would like to see the city council review the results of that study before any final decision.

Our specific list of inputs is below.

- Square footage be held to a minimum of 1900 SF on main level as a stepped down but transition in size from the adjacent communities.
- Lot sizes to meet SF-3 requirements
- Set back distances likewise to meet SF-3 requirements

Additionally, the directly impacted neighbors may have specific items as it impacts them. I can think of the setback for the cul-de-sac from the property line as an example. I am assuming the MI would be willing to make modifications to accommodate these.

We will not be able to attend the APC meeting on June 1st as we already had business travel planned prior to learning of the proposal and meeting. It was quite irritating that two weeks is the amount of time allotted for community input. While we will not be there, these are strongly felt requests and we will attend all other public meetings on this ordinance.

Sincerely,  
Roy & Adrienne Maynard  
16425 Oak Manor Drive  
Westfield, IN 46074

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #18**

### **Subject: MI Homes Development Concerns**

Jerry Hollan  
2902 E. 161<sup>st</sup> Street  
Westfield, IN 46074

I am representing my wife and I regarding our property concerns by MI Homes, Tamarack PUD Rezoning Approval Petition request.

**Lot and House Sizes:** Lot and House Sizes are small in size.

Solution: Lots and Home sizes should be consistent with Oak Park and Oak Manor subdivision.

**Housing Developments:** Four new Housing Developments are located within a mile of Tamarack proposed development plus the completion of existing housing developments which will have future impact on Streets, Police and Fire Departments and Public Facilities. Additional people will have to be hired to staff facilities.

Solution: Impact Study needed. Take a wait and see approach until we can realize the Impact Study results on new and existing developments on public facilities.

### **Landscaping:**

Leave the existing trees and bushes located approximately fifteen feet West of the entire East North and South Property Line and include a berm with Conifer Trees as a buffer.

### **Retention Pond and Drainage:**

**Retention Pond:** We do not want a Walk Path located on the Buffered Yard easement area between the East Side of the Pond and our property line.

**Drainage:** Concern about the flooding from the Retention Pond when unusual weather conditioners occur. Engineers need to verify that the ditch and the pipe flowing south under 161<sup>st</sup> Street will handle Retention Pond overflow.

The reasons we selected our property several years ago with fewer houses, larger lot sizes, open spaces, more greenery, horse farms and agricultural properties. We respectfully request that you do not approve the Tamarack Housing Addition as proposed.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #19**

### **Subject: Re: MI Homes of Indiana, LP - Tamarack PUD Docket No. 1506-PUD-09**

We would like to express our concerns and requests to be considered with regard to the above mentioned property which adjoins our property to the east.

1. We request that MI Homes not remove any of the growth that is already within the thirty foot set back area (trees and etc.) on their side of the property. This will help to provide more privacy on our side. Currently there is between fifteen and twenty feet of land not being farmed because of this growth etc.
2. We request that a mound (buffer) of dirt at least three or four feet tall be placed all along the east side of the above mentioned property with all evergreen trees on top of the mound spaced close enough and positioned, not in a straight line, but set in two rows (staggered) so that you cannot see between the trees for maximum privacy and to deter people from entering the woods. Evergreen trees should be used versus shade or ornamental trees because in the winter when the leaves are off the trees lights from the houses will shine through the woods and into our house. There should still be enough room for this mounding in addition to not removing the already existing growth mentioned above.
3. Our concern is that people will trespass into our woods which could cause liability problems if they get hurt and/or they will trash our property. Ann Walker Kloc mentioned in our meeting with her that they would be willing to post private property/no trespassing signs on their property to deter people from trespassing. Both parties of adjoining properties are all in favor of this.
4. We also request that no trail or pathway be placed along the entire length of the east side of the property next to our woods and Jerry and Betty Hollan's woods. To put a trail or path there would only encourage or entice people to enter the woods (especially kids).
5. We request that some type of fencing or barrier be placed over the pipeline(s) in the very far northeast corner of the property that abuts our woods as no fence currently exists and people could very easily trespass into our woods. This issue was raised during our meeting with Ann Walker Kloc. She was receptive to address this concern and so to include in this letter.
6. Finally, we would like to request that someone from MI Homes come to the property and meet with Jerry and Betty Hollan and us to walk the property line so that we can physically show and explain what our concerns and requests are.

Again, Ann Walker Kloc stated that she saw no problem with this and thought it was a good idea.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Dennis and Diana Theurer