

Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on Monday, June 3, 2013 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

Opening of Meeting: 7:00 PM

Roll Call: Note Presence of a Quorum

Commission Members Present: Steve Hoover, Robert Horkay, Ken Kingshill, Charles Lehman, Bob Spraetz, and Danielle Tolan.

City Staff Present: Jennifer Miller, Assistant Director; Andrew Murray, Associate Planner; Jesse Pohlman, Senior Planner; Sarah Reed, Associate Planner; and Niki Finelli, City Attorney

Approval of Minutes:

Motion: To approve the minutes for the May 20, 2013 APC meeting as presented.

Motion: Horkay; Second: Tolan; Vote: Passed by voice vote

Reed reviewed APC Rules & Procedures.

Case No. 1306-PUD-05

Petitioner Springmill Trails PUD Amendment

Description West side of Casey Road between State Road 32 and 186th Street; MI Homes of Indiana, LP requests an amendment to the Springmill Trails PUD to modify the vinyl siding and garage door design standards applicable to the Waters Edge at Springmill Trails development of approximately 37 acres.

Murray presented the second reading of the requested amendment to the Springmill Trails PUD. This item includes the reduction to the required vinyl thickness from .048 to .046. The modification provides the petitioner a wider array of siding colors and encourages greater streetscape diversity. Overall, staff is satisfied with the ordinance as written and would suggest a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

Motion: Hoover; Second: Horkay: Approved

Case No. 1306-PUD-06

Petitioner Viking Meadows PUD Amendment

Freeman Custom Homes requests an amendment to the roof pitch requirement for Lot 29 in the Valley View section of the Viking Meadows PUD.

Murray presented the proposed amendment to the Viking Meadows PUD that was approved in 2004. The proposal is to modify the roof pitch requirement for lot 29 to accommodate a home in the Valley View Section of Viking Meadows. The petitioner, Charles Freeman with Freeman Custom Homes, has engaged the neighbors and has not received any negative feedback from them to date. The proposed home is Mediterranean style and approximately 9,600 square feet.

Tolan supported a variety of architecture.

Hoover indicated he had no objection but was interested in any public comment.

Public Hearing opened at 7:12

No cards/comments. Public Hearing closed at 7:13

Motion: Hoover; Second: Horkay: Passed by voice vote.

Case No.	1306-DP-09 & 1306-SIT-06
Petitioner	Shooting Academy
Description	17777 Commerce Drive; Badger Engineering, LLC on behalf of Tim Tomich, requests Development Plan and Site Plan review for indoor shooting range on 1.38 acres +/- in the EI (Enclosed Industrial) District.

Jesse Pohlman presented details of the development plan for a 7,883 square foot single story structure for an indoor shooting range that includes approximately 3,100 SF indoor for administrative uses such as classrooms, storage, offices, restrooms and retail display areas. The remaining square footage is for 15 firing lanes (5 rifle and 10 pistol), including the shooting stalls and bullet traps, and for the range safety officer station.

The proposed use is not a specified use in the City's Zoning Ordinance. As a result on April 9, 2013 the BZA approved a Variance of Use to allow the use. That approval included a handful of conditions which were included in the staff report.

This item was reviewed at the May 21st TAC Meeting. The petitioner has since revised their plans to address staff's comments. The Development Plan complies with the applicable zoning ordinances and with the variance conditions. The petitioner is continuing to work with the Surveyor's office and Department of Public Works regarding their minor comments.

The petitioner does intend on making a presentation this evening, on behalf of the petition are the petitioner, Tim Tomich and Chris Badger, the engineer with Badger Engineering.

Hoover asked about sound: petitioner noted the building structure is such that the sound of a bullet will be less than a whisper from outside the building and will be quieter than required by the zoning ordinance for industrial developments. Hoover asked about deterioration over time; Tomich explained the ceiling baffles and noted that the range is designed to US Navy standards to slow down the bullet before stopping it. The Petitioner noted that to use the range, a course will be required.

Kingshill asked about retail sales and membership: Petitioner noted the facility would be open to the public but that memberships would allow for members to reserve times and that limited gun sales would be high end guns but sales would primarily be of accessories and safety equipment to use the facility like targets and ear plugs.

Petitioner provided anticipated hours.

Spraetz asked about rifling lanes/clarified class requirement; petitioner noted depth of range/class is 15-20 minutes.

Public Hearing opened at 7:26

No cards/comments. Public Hearing closed at 7:27

Hoover asked if proposed location is within 32 overlay, Pohlman confirmed it is not.

Case No. 1306-DP-08 & 1306-SIT-05
Petitioner Weas Engineering
Description Custom Commerce Park; Weas Engineering requests Development Plan and Site Plan review for its new building located on 6.190 acres +/- in the Custom Commerce Park PUD District.

Pohlman presented the new location of Weas Engineering building in the Custom Commerce Park, south of SR 32 on the east side of Oak Ridge and just south of the new Automatic Pool Cover facility. The site will consist of 6.2 acres of the existing 15.6 acre Lot 4. A secondary plat to split Lot 4 has been filed. The DP is for a 51,808 square foot building with a planned 10,000 square foot expansion in the future. This item was reviewed at the May 21st TAC meeting and the petitioner has since revised their plans to address staff's comments. Staff is available should there be any questions.

Public Hearing opened at 7:30

Bobbi Robertson at 660 Overcup Street, Westfield, Indiana was not happy with the speculative nature of the project, asked about the distance from Foundation Pkwy to the building. Robertson stated roads are bad, residential housing and this park are located too close to each other, sorry she moved to Westfield, doesn't like bridge proposal at 31/21.

Public Hearing closed at 7:35

Pohlman noted the distance from Foundation Parkway to the south end of the subject site is 363', and he further explained the comprehensive plan policies, as set forth in the staff report. Hoover also asked about zoning. Pohlman noted the current PUD zoning was approved in 2003 and was amended in 2011 for the Automatic Pool Covers property.

Hoover inquired regarding the front elevation design and Lehman inquired regarding building color. Bob Dugar, on behalf of Weas Engineering, Matt Oman with Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC and Mike Ong with Curran Architecture responded the intent was to create architectural interest and break up the solid surface of the front elevation. Dugar described the color in more detail as blue and gray and presented the color elevation. Kingshill asked for a hard copy of the color samples at the next meeting.

Case No. 1306-PUD-07
Petitioner Village Park Plaza PUD
Description Village Park Plaza, LLC requests a change in zoning of approximately 46.84 acres +/- acres from the SB-PD District to the Village Park Plaza PUD District.

Horkay recused himself at 7:41

Pohlman presented the Village Park Plaza. The property is zoned and received its original approval under the SB-PD (Special Business-Planned Development) zoning in 1988. The property also received a variance from the BZA in 1988 that established sign criteria that varied from the City's sign standards at that time. Over the years, the property has been developed in accordance with those original approvals.

The petitioner has begun reassessing and planning for improvements to update the commercial center as well as adjust to outside factors that have impacted the center, primarily relating to surrounding road improvements to 146th Street, new Cool Creek Road and the US 31 improvements.

The petitioner desires to establish new sign criteria from their existing 1988 plan. The Staff recommended rather than revisit the original sign variance, that the petitioner seeks a change of zoning. The PUD

District would accommodate the sign standards and create and facilitate a structure that will better accommodate the existing improvements as well as in the future. Pohlman summarized the primary factors, as outlined in the staff report that warrant reasonable consideration for modifications to the Zoning Ordinance's sign standards.

Presentation by Tim Ochs, Ice Miller. Ochs presented that in addition to the factors outlined by the staff, that uniformity in the signage was an important reason for the modified signs standards. Ochs presented a comparative summary between the current Zoning Ordinance sign standards and the proposed PUD District sign standards.

Kingshill asked about front to rear sizing and overall sign sizes. Ochs, confirmed the rear will be slightly smaller and overall signage would be larger than what's permitted now through the variance.

Hoover noted there are a lot of changes to comprehend to sign standards that the City spent a lot of time creating recently and he asked for an illustration showing the difference between the Zoning Ordinance's sign standard and what the PUD Ordinance proposes for both a smaller tenant space and then for a larger tenant space.

Kingshill asked about the sign changes as it related to the façade improvements and how temporary would be addressed while the facades are being worked on. Kevin Sims with Simon, explained they would remove the sign and use temporary banners that can be relocated through the duration of the project. J Miller confirmed for Kingshill the Zoning Ordinance's temporary sign standards and explained the PUD Ordinance would need to address the temporary signage.

Tolan asked about excluded lots, petitioner explained the Zoning Ordinance's requirement for control of property to be included in a PUD District.

Lehman asked about new existing signs and whether or not they will be enlarged. Simes confirmed recently installed signs would not be replaced.

Public Hearing opened at 8:07

No cards/comments. Public Hearing closed at 8:08

Case No.	1306-DP-10
Petitioner	Village Park Plaza
Description	Simon Property Group requests Development Plan review for the renovation of exterior building facades for an existing shopping center located in the SB-PD (Special Business-Planned Development) District.

Pohlman presented that in addition to addressing signage that in was being addressed with the prior item; the petitioner desires to update the center's building facades for buildings it owns within the Village Park Plaza shopping center. No site plan changes are proposed at this time.

Kevin Simms with Simon Property Group explained the design changes to the facades including increasing sign band heights, adding inviting architectural lighting and new awnings and canopies.

Kingshill noted the rear of the building along 146th Street was truly a rear building and appreciates the screen wall to screen roof mounted equipment, but he requested that more be done to improve the appearance. Simms responded that part of the building is utilitarian and functions for loading, but said they would be willing to consider other colors/patterns to give it a more finished look.

Hoover noted that he would like to see some architectural changes to the rear of the building; similar to what's seen in Clay Terrace, such as faux windows, varying rooflines, doors and columns. Simms noted they were limited vertically due to structural and snow load limits. Also discussed perspective from road way, plans to maintain current landscaping and willing to consider dressing it a little more.

Kingshill noted the sign request asks for 360 permissions and they believe the architecture should consider it as well.

Lehman noted that the concern is a plain wall and the proposal as presented is plain too and he would not want to call attention to the wall with signage if there are no other enhancements.

Hoover stated that signage should not overwhelm the façade and is not convinced different sign standards are warranted.

Lehman stated the front is very nice, but the concern is for the back.

Public Hearing opened at 8:29 p.m.

Mic Mead addressed the Plan Commission commenting he wanted to reinforce the Plan Commission's comments regarding the rear elevations. He showed a picture of the rear of building and noted the proposed wall will not screen the mechanicals on the roof and that there are no trees to screen the view. He requested they do more to address the rear wall and proceeded to show his proposal using varying overall height, variety of color and awnings.

Public Hearing closed at 8:35 p.m.

Hoover suggested that when Wal-Mart renovated their building that they enclosed their downspouts with brick columns, which was another way the rear elevations could be enhanced.

Case No.	1305-PUD-04
Petitioner	The Enclave & Springs at Viking Meadows PUD
Description	Southeast corner of 161 st Street and Oak Ridge Road; Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC requests a change in zoning of approximately 63 Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC requests a change in zoning of approximately 63 acres +/- from the Villas at Timber Ridge PUD District and the AG-SF1 District to the Enclave and Springs at Viking Meadows PUD District.

Reed summarized the petition. She then presented the issues identified to date which include: sharing the existing Viking Meadows amenities, connectivity between the Enclave and springs sections of the proposal, connectivity to the Viking Meadows, Helios, and Oak Ridge subdivisions, and safety of residents crossing Oak Ridge Road. Reed identified that the Petitioner, David Compton with Pulte Homes, is working with neighbors and staff on a resolution to the issues.

Horkay rejoined the proceedings at 8:37 pm.

The petitioner, David Compton highlighted details of the project regarding size, architectural styles, and materials in his presentation.

Hoover noted the monotony of the garage doors and asked for variation.

Kingshill asked if Mr. Compton planned to return in two weeks. Mr. Compton stated his intent is to be back in July with color renderings for The Enclave.

Public Hearing opened at 8:51 pm.

David Graham, resident of Viking Meadows, feels that the the amenities are not suited for the number of

additional units. He also stated that the architectural guidelines are no longer viable and the covenants are out of date. Mr. Graham asked the APC to not support the project.

David Helm, resident of Viking Meadows, said that homeowners have signed a petition against the filing due to: increased traffic, overcrowding, safety, (both due to shared amenity center) and lack of green space. This expansion of Viking Meadows has not been disclosed during sales meetings for new home buyers.

Hoover asked how many signed the petition: 102.

Spraetz asked for clarification between number of signatures and actual lots: 102 lots.

Helios resident Janet Lome noted the traffic concerns through the Helios subdivision. Ms. Lome is concerned about flooding and ponds behind them (on septic/water). She is also concerned about the impact on the aquifers.

Aaron Bell, resident of Viking Meadows felt that Westfield is in a rush to develop. Further study should be done on what other communities are doing right and wrong. Mr. Bell asked what “lifestyle” we want to create for Westfield and to consider what may be destroyed to create it. He also said that urban sprawl does not have to lead to suburban discomfort.

Dan Ernst, resident of Viking Meadows was not advised about the potential expansion and stated that the expansion does not contribute to the amenities. He stated that the existing amenities are not sufficient. Mr. Ernst said that new neighborhoods should stand on their own with regard to amenities. He asked how the HOA would be impacted with influx of new homes.

Helios resident Jeremy Callahan stated that there is no need to connect Apollo Court with the new subdivision. Mr. Callahan asked if Citizens Energy would force them to connect if/when the utility transfer takes place?

Jim Grose, resident of Viking Meadows, questioned the safety of crossing Oak Ridge. He noted that Parcels E and F have not yet built and could add over 200 units in addition to proposed Enclave and Springs at Viking Meadows PUD. he suggested that Pulte donate land for roundabouts at 156th and 161st to handle the increased traffic.

Jeff MacDonald said that the map in sales office does not include the proposed new sections. Mr. MacDonald stated that some new owners within the Viking Meadows subdivision were not notified of this proposal due to the timing of their sale.

Public Hearing closed at 9:15 p.m.

Mr. Compton responded that HOA documents of record have always included this as a potential expansion. He also clarified that maps within the sales office do not show prospective plans, only approved developments available for sale.

Case No.	1209-PUD-11 (continued)
Petitioner	Springmill Corner PUD
Description:	SE corner of Springmill Road and 161 st Street; Cooperstown Partners, LLC request a change in zoning of approximately 6.5 acres from AG-SF1 to the Springmill Corner PUD.

REPORTS/COMMENTS

No report.

APC MEMBERS

No report.

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON

No Report.

BZA LIAISON

No Report.

ECD STAFF

No report.

ADJOURNMENT (9:17 p.m.) Motion by Tolan, Seconded by Horkay. Motion passed by voice vote.

President, Ken Kingshill

Vice President, Charles Lehman

Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton