



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: 901 acres

Exhibits:

1. Staff Report
2. Aerial Location Map
3. Existing Eagletown PUD Ordinance (Ordinance 07-07), 08/13/07
4. Springmill Trails PUD (Original Proposal), 12/03/10
5. Springmill Trails PUD (Second Proposal), 06/28/11
6. Springmill Trails PUD (Third Proposal), 08/01/11
7. Springmill Trails PUD (Current Proposal), 08/15/11
8. Springmill Trails PUD_REDLINE (Current Proposal), 08/15/11
9. Summary of Changes Letter, 06/28/11
10. Comparison Table, 06/28/11
11. Detailed Staff Comments, Updated 07/29/11
12. Talking Points for Discussion, Updated 07/29/11
13. Benefits Analysis of the Springmill Trails PUD Proposal, 08/11/11

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 and has been in the process of being revised since that meeting.

The petition was scheduled to appear at the August 1, 2011 APC meeting. After all packet materials were published for this item, but before the APC meeting, the petition was continued to the August 15, 2011 APC meeting, which allowed the petitioner time to address the outstanding concerns. Packet materials (including this report) for the August 15, 2011 APC meeting have been updated since the August 1, 2011 packet was published.

Procedural

The recommendation from the Advisory Plan Commission to the City Council may be made at the August 15, 2011 Advisory Plan Commission meeting.

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 901 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

Since the APC meeting on July 18, 2011, there have been a number of modifications to the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance. The August 1, 2011 staff report outlined the changes that the petitioner had agreed to make to the PUD Ordinance. The list below reports that all of those changes (in addition to a few clerical modifications) have been made in the August 15, 2011 version of the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance:

1. Garage Door Standards – In Residential District 2, each garage is required to have either windows in the garage door or a single-load door per bay.
2. Fencing – Chain-link fencing with vinyl slats is prohibited in all districts.
3. Residential District 2, Building Size – The minimum requirement for a single-story is 1,400 square feet (consistent with existing Eagletown PUD), and the minimum requirement for a single-family attached is 1,300 square feet (consistent with City’s SF-A standards).
4. Market Center District, Road Frontage – The standard has been changed back to a minimum of 660 feet, which is consistent with the existing Eagletown PUD.
5. Buffer Yard Standards – 186th Street has been added to the list of streets requiring evergreen trees every 15 feet.
6. Little Eagle Creek Trail – Language was added in the PUD Ordinance that requires the developer to install the trail according to the City’s standards and to also dedicate the trail to the City.

Since the publication of the August 1, 2011 staff report, the following additional modifications to the August 15, 2011 version of the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance have been made:

1. 45’ Front Load Lot – The 45’ front load lot type (Residential District 2) has been removed from the Springmill Trails PUD proposal.

2. Residential District 2, Number of Dwellings – Established a maximum number of dwellings in the Residential District 2 (1,250 dwellings).
3. Stoops & Porches – The stoop/porch on a dwelling is required to be located at the front door of the dwelling.
4. Residential District Dwellings, Rear Architecture & Buffer Standards – Enhanced treatment of rear or side yards/elevations facing Eagle Parkway, Springmill Road or 181st Street by requiring: 1) a double-staggered row of evergreen trees in the open space area between the lot and the street; or 2) front elevation architectural treatment on the rear or side of the subject building.
5. Mixed Use District, Permitted Uses – Limits “Department Stores over 10,000 sq.ft.”; “Furniture Stores”; Hardware Stores”; and Major Appliance Stores” to a maximum of 25,000 square feet within the Mixed Use District.
6. Sign Standards – The Sign Standards have been modified so that window signage and signage in the Mixed-Use District default to the City’s standards. The proposed Sign Standards have also been clarified, so that residential real estate signs for property larger than ten (10) acres can be up to twenty (20) square feet per face. All other residential real estate signs would default to the City’s Sign Standards.

Additional Information Submitted by the Petitioner:

- Exhibit 9, “Summary of Changes Letter, 06/28/11” – This letter highlights the changes between the December 3, 2010 submittal (original proposal) and the June 28, 2011 submittal (second proposal). This exhibit is being provided as a reference, and some of the information it contains may be out-of-date as a result of more recent modifications to the PUD Ordinance.
- Exhibit 10, “Comparison Table, 06/28/11” – This table was submitted with the June 28, 2011 submittal (second proposal) and compares the residential districts of the Springmill Trails PUD to the residential districts of the Eagletown PUD. This exhibit is being provided as a reference, and some of the information it contains may be out-of-date as a result of more recent modifications to the PUD Ordinance.

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

- Exhibit 11, “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. (*NOTE – this exhibit has not been modified since the version that was published for the August 1, 2011 APC meeting*).
- Exhibit 12, “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. (*NOTE – this exhibit has not been modified since the version that was published for the August 1, 2011 APC meeting*).



- Exhibit 13, “Benefits Analysis of the Springmill Trails PUD Proposal, 08/11/11” – This is a new exhibit. It was originally published for the August 1, 2011 APC meeting, and has been updated since its initial publishing to reflect changes made in the August 15, 2011 version of the Springmill Trails PUD Ordinance. 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.