



Petition Number: 1101-PUD-02

Subject Site Address: Northeast corner of State Road 32 & Casey Road

Petitioner: Wilfong Land Companies LLC

Representative: Jon Dobosiewicz, Nelson & Frankenberger

Request: A change in zoning from the Eagletown PUD to the Springmill Trails PUD.

Current Zoning: Eagletown PUD

Current Land Use: Residential/Agricultural/Vacant

Approximate Acreage: 900 acres

Exhibits:

1. Staff Report
2. Aerial Location Map
3. Existing Eagletown PUD Ordinance (Ordinance 07-07)
4. Springmill Trails PUD (Original Proposal), 12/03/10
5. Springmill Trails PUD (Second Proposal), 06/28/11
6. Springmill Trails PUD (Current Proposal), 08/01/11
7. Springmill Trails PUD_REDLINE (Current Proposal), 08/01/11
8. Summary of Changes Letter, 06/28/11
9. Comparison Table, 06/28/11
10. Detailed Staff Comments, Updated 07/29/11
11. Talking Points for Discussion, Updated 07/29/11
12. Benefits Analysis of the Springmill Trails PUD Proposal, 07/29/11

Staff Reviewer: Kevin M. Todd, AICP

Petition History

This petition was introduced at the December 13, 2010 City Council meeting and appeared before the Technical Advisory Committee on December 21, 2010. It received a public hearing at the January 4, 2011 Advisory Plan Commission (the "APC") meeting. At the June 20, 2011 APC meeting, the APC voted to suspend the rule that requires petitions to be finished with the APC process within six (6) months of receiving a public hearing. The APC gave the petitioner until October 3, 2011 to be through the APC review process. The item was reviewed and discussed at the July 18, 2011 APC meeting.



Procedural

The official public hearing was held at the January 4, 2011 APC meeting. The APC may hear additional public comment at the APC President's discretion, or by a majority of the APC members present.

Project Overview

Project Location

The subject property is located within an approximately 1.5 mile square block that is bound by State Road 32 to the south, Eagletown Road to the west, 193rd Street to the north, and Springmill Road to the east. The subject property is approximately 897 acres in size, and is the existing Eagletown PUD property, with the exception of the property south of State Road 32 and the property east of Springmill Road (the "Property").

Project Description

The proposal seeks to change the zoning of the majority of the existing Eagletown PUD by modifying the districts and standards within the Property (which excludes the areas east of Springmill Road and south of State Road 32 (the "Excluded Property")). In addition to modifying the districts and standards, the proposal calls for renaming the Property to the "Springmill Trails PUD" (the "Proposal"). The Proposal does not modify the Eagletown PUD standards which govern the Excluded Property. The name change is intended to create a distinction of this PUD.

The Proposal combines Residential Districts 1, 2 and 3 from the original Eagletown PUD into a new, single district, called "Residential District 1". In order to combine the three residential districts into a single district, new development standards have been proposed.

The Proposal combines Residential District 4 and the Single-Family Attached District from the original Eagletown PUD and created a new, single district, called "Residential District 2". The standards from the original Residential 4 and Single-Family Attached districts have been combined and modified to create a single set of development standards for the new Residential District 2.

The Proposal combines the Multi-Family District, the Village Marketplace District, and the Garden Office District of the original Eagletown PUD and creates a new "Mixed-Use District". The standards from the original Multi-Family, Village Marketplace, and Garden Office districts have been combined and modified to create a single set of development standards for the new Mixed-Use District.

The Proposal adds a new "Commercial District". The Commercial District is located on the western portion of the existing Village Marketplace District. New standards were created for the new Commercial District.



The Proposal does not modify the standards for the Market Center District, with the exception that the Proposal calls for no rear yard setback requirements for interior lot lines.

Staff Comments

At the APC meeting on July 18, 2011, a few items were discussed that caused the need to make modifications to the PUD Ordinance. At the time of publishing this report, some of those items still needed to be finalized in the text of the PUD Ordinance. In addition to a few clerical modifications, the petitioner has agreed to make the following changes to the PUD Ordinance prior to appearing before the City Council:

1. Garage Door Standards – the petitioner has agreed to include language that requires either windows in the garage door or a single-load door per bay.
2. Commercial District Fencing – the petitioner has agreed to prohibit chain-link fencing with vinyl slats throughout the PUD.
3. Residential District 2, Building Size – the petitioner has agreed to modify the minimum requirement for a single-story to 1,400 square feet (consistent with existing Eagletown PUD) and modify the minimum requirement for a single-family attached to 1,300 square feet (consistent with City's SF-A standards).
4. Market Center District, Road Frontage – the petitioner has agreed to change the standard back to a minimum of 660 feet, which is consistent with the existing Eagletown PUD.
5. Buffer Yard Standards – the petitioner has agreed to add "186th Street" to the list of streets requiring evergreen trees every 15 feet.
6. Little Eagle Creek Trail – in accordance with the Amenity Plan found in Exhibit E of the Springmill Trails PUD, the developer will install the applicable segment(s) of the Little Eagle Creek Trail as development occurs. The developer has also agreed to dedicate the trail to the City.

For additional staff comments, please see the exhibits listed below:

- Exhibit 10, "Detailed Staff Comments, Updated 07/29/11" – This exhibit has been updated, indicating that the petitioner has satisfactorily addressed the items that were still outstanding at the July 18, 2011 APC meeting.
- Exhibit 11, "Talking Points for Discussion, Updated 07/29/11" – This exhibit has been updated, indicating that the petitioner has satisfactorily addressed the items that were still outstanding at the July 18, 2011 APC meeting.
- Exhibit 12, "Benefits Analysis of the Springmill Trails PUD Proposal, 07/29/11" – This is a new exhibit. It summarizes the comparison between the proposed Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance



and the existing Eagletown PUD Ordinance. The summary items are grouped into two categories: Benefits to the City; and Benefits to the Developer.

Public Policy

Westfield Comprehensive Plan (2007, as amended)

The Future Land Use Map of the Westfield-Washington Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan”) identifies the northern portion of the Property as “New Suburban Residential”. Residential Districts 1 and 2 fall within this area. The Future Land Use Map identifies the southern portion of the Property, along State Road 32, as “Regional Commercial”. The Mixed-Use District, the Commercial District and the Market Center District fall within this area. The proposed uses are consistent with the recommendations found in the Comprehensive Plan for the Suburban Residential and Regional Commercial land uses.

Water & Sewer System

City water and sewer facilities are nearby and would need to be extended to serve parts of the Property. With the addition of the interceptor sewer, there are no concerns regarding having the capacity necessary to serve the Project.

Annexation

Over half of the Property is adjacent to, but not currently within the corporate boundaries of the City of Westfield. It is anticipated that a condition of any PUD approval would require the Property be annexed into the City. The remainder of the Property is within the corporate boundaries of the City of Westfield.

Well Head Protection – Ord. 05-31

The Property is not within a wellhead protection area.

Statutory Considerations

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

1. The Comprehensive Plan.

The Future Land Use Map of the Westfield-Washington Comprehensive Plan (the “Comprehensive Plan”) identifies the northern portion of the Property as “New Suburban Residential”. Residential Districts 1 and 2 fall within this area. The Future Land Use Map



identifies the southern portion of the Property, along State Road 32, as “Regional Commercial”. The Mixed-Use District, the Commercial District and the Market Center District fall within this area. The proposed uses are consistent with the recommendations found in the Comprehensive Plan for the Suburban Residential and Regional Commercial land uses.

2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.

The Property is primarily agricultural in use, with some single-family residential throughout.

3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.

The Comprehensive Plan establishes that commercial along the State Road 32 corridor and suburban residential development north of that are desirable and appropriate development in this area. The Proposal is consistent with the recommendations found in the Comprehensive Plan for this part of the community.

4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.

It is anticipated that the Proposal will have neutral or positive impacts on property values within the vicinity and jurisdiction.

5. Responsible growth and development.

The Property is contiguous to other developed areas, and the improvement of the Property would be consistent with the principle of contiguous growth. City water and sewer are nearby and would be able to serve the Property.

Staff Recommendations

If the APC is satisfied with the Proposal, then forward 1101-PUD-02 to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.