

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING REPORT  
The Maples at Springmill PUD Docket No. 1007-PUD-07  
Neighborhood Meeting – June 29, 2010 7 p.m.  
at the Maples Clubhouse

Attendees: Wayne Beverage, on behalf of the Petitioner, Jim Shinaver and Jon Dobosiewicz from Nelson & Frankenberger

1. Wayne Beverage provided an introduction and Jon Dobosiewicz provided an overview of the project.
  - a. Jon Dobosiewicz reviewed the notice requirements for neighborhood meetings and the notice requirements for the Plan Commission meeting.
  - b. Jon then described the Plan Commission and Council process as it relates seeking an amendment to a PUD Ordinance.
  - c. Jon then explained the specific area that was the subject of the request. Jon explained that the Petitioner was seeking approval to construct three (3) different product types of detached single family homes. Jon also explained that the square footage and the price range for the detached single family homes would be similar to the existing duplexes and four-plexes currently existing in the neighborhood.
  - d. Jon then explained that the purpose of the request was to provide flexibility of product type offerings, issues related to financing of duplexes and four-plexes as compared with single family detached units and that the Petitioner's research suggested that the detached single family homes may sell quicker and allow the neighborhood to finish out quicker. Jon also addressed the fact that the demographic for the single family detached homes would be similar to the demographic for the duplex and four-plexes.
2. Questions from the public:
  - a. Questions were asked regarding the notice required for the neighborhood meeting and the notice required for the Plan Commission meeting.
  - b. Questions were asked regarding who would own the common area.
  - c. Statements were presented regarding why certain residents purchased in this community.
  - d. Questions were asked regarding how the single family detached product was received and how it was selling in other markets .

- e. A question was asked whether a detached single family model would be constructed on the real estate.
- f. Questions were asked about the exterior building materials.
- g. Questions were asked regarding the distances between the detached single family homes.
- h. A question was asked about the view from the adjacent roadways of the detached single family homes.
- i. A question was asked regarding the number of detached homes to be constructed on Lot 26.
- j. Questions were asked about other Epcon developments and the success or failure of the developers in other Epcon Developments.
- k. A question was asked whether other communities within Westfield had sought similar amendments to their PUD's from duplexes and four-plexes to single family detached units.
- l. A question was asked regarding if the request was seeking more density or more units than what was originally approved for the overall development.
- m. A question was asked about a South Bend Epcon community that had introduced detached single family units.
- n. A question was asked about why we have a neighborhood meeting.
- o. A question was asked about the new courtyard configuration and whether the courtyard belongs to the homeowner or is it considered common area.
- p. A question was asked about the HOA dues and whether owners of single family detached units would be paying more for their HOA dues.
- q. A question was asked about the timetable of constructing the single family detached units in the event the zoning request was approved and when build-out of the community may be completed so that the HOA could be turned over to the residents.
- r. A question was asked as to whether the single family detached units increased sales in other communities.
- s. A question was asked about the unfinished units under construction.