



Petition Number:	1412-PUD-18
Petitioner:	Langston Development, LLC by Faegre Baker Daniels, LLP
Request:	A change of zoning from the AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-Family Rural District to the Mapleridge Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.
Current Zoning:	AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-Family Rural District
Current Land Use:	Residential / Agricultural
Approximate Acreage:	59.45 acres +/-
Exhibits:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Staff Report2. Location Map3. Concept Plan Exhibit4. PUD Ordinance (redline)5. Petitioner's Updates6. Neighbor Meeting Summary7. Public Comments (written)
Staff Reviewer:	Jesse M. Pohlman, Senior Planner

PETITION HISTORY

This petition was introduced at the November 10, 2014, City Council meeting. The petition received a public hearing at the December 1, 2014, Advisory Plan Commission (the "APC") meeting. This petition is eligible for the APC's recommendation to the Council at the APC's December 15, 2014, meeting.

PROCEDURAL

Public Hearing: Changes in zoning are required to be considered at a public hearing by the APC. The public hearing for this petition was held on December 1, 2014, at the APC meeting. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with Indiana law and the APC's Rules of Procedure.

Neighbors' Meeting: The Petitioner hosted a meeting for adjoining property owners on November 13, 2014, as required by Article 10.9(C)(1)(f) of the UDO for proposed PUD Districts. The Petitioner has provided a summary of that meeting, which is included at **Exhibit 6**.

Statutory Considerations:

Indiana Code 36-7-4-603 states that in the consideration of zoning ordinance amendments and zone map changes that reasonable regard shall be paid to:

1. The Comprehensive Plan.
2. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses.
3. The most desirable use for which the land is adapted.
4. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction.
5. Responsible growth and development.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Location: The subject property (the “Property”) is approximately sixty (60) acres located on the east side of Oak Road, north of 151st Street (see **Exhibit 2**). The Property is currently zoned AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-Family Rural District.

Project Description: The Petitioner is requesting a change of zoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) District to be known as “Mapleridge”, that would allow for a single-family residential neighborhood, as illustrated on the revised Concept Plan (see **Exhibit 3**). The Petitioner characterizes the proposed development to be similar to the Brookside subdivision.

Default Standards: The proposed PUD District Ordinance, as revised (the “PUD Ordinance”) (see **Exhibit 4**), defaults to the recently adopted Westfield – Washington Township Unified Development Ordinance (the “UDO”), with the **SF2: Single Family Low Density District** as the Underlying Zoning District.

Permitted Uses: The PUD Ordinance permits those uses permitted by the Underlying Zoning District.

Development Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance establishes enhanced or alternative development standards from the Underlying Zoning District (Chapter 6 of the UDO). These modifications are intended to accommodate the unique environmental characteristics of the Property and the Petitioner’s vision for the development. The development standards of note are briefly highlighted below:

1. **Oak Road Lot:** There is one “estate” lot located at the northwest corner of the Property that would not be a part of the rest of the development and would be accessed from Oak Road. As a result, provisions are included to accommodate this lot.
2. **Architectural Standards** (Article 6.3): The PUD Ordinance incorporates enhanced architectural standards, including the incorporation of Character Exhibits to establish the benchmark for the quality and character of the development. The PUD Ordinance also increases the Minimum Living Area square footage requirements.

In response to comments received, the Petitioner has modified the PUD Ordinance and referenced Character Exhibit to incorporate a requirement that the established benchmark also applies to the rear and side facades of homes. As a result of the revisions to the Concept Plan, the rear of homes will no longer be oriented towards Oak Road.

3. **Landscaping Standards** (Article 6.8): The PUD Ordinance: (a) increases the required number of shrubs per Lot; (b) addresses the overlap of the perimeter External Street Frontage Landscaping with the frontage road and floodplain; and (c) establishes that preserved natural areas shall serve as the required buffer yard for those areas shown on the Concept Plan.

Design Standards: As proposed, the PUD Ordinance establishes enhanced or alternative design standards from the Underlying Zoning District (Chapter 8 of the UDO). These modifications are intended to accommodate the unique environmental characteristics of the Property and the Petitioner’s vision for the development. The design standards of note are briefly highlighted below:

1. Street and Right-of-Way Standards (Article 8.9): In working with the Department, Public Works Department, and the Fire Department, the Petitioner has modified the Concept Plan. The revised Concept Plan now includes a loop road (rather than cul-de-sac) and stub street at the southeast corner of the property.

The loop road is planned as one-way street that will better accommodate (compared to the prior design) emergency response equipment while also allowing for the preservation of existing trees. The cross-section and final design of the loop road will be determined in coordination with the Fire Department and Public Works Department at the time of the overall development plan and primary plat review.

The Concept Plan also includes two stub street locations, which are generally located at the northeast and southeast corners of the property. The exact location of the stub streets may vary at the time of the primary plat review, but the requirement for the stub has been included in the revised ordinance to meet the UDO's requirement for connectivity to adjacent properties. In addition, language has been added to the proposed ordinance to require a pedestrian and alternative emergency access path to connect the proposed frontage road to Oak Road.

2. Open Space (Article 8.6): The PUD Ordinance increases the minimum required amount of open space from 8% (for SF2 Districts) to 16%.

In working with the Department, the Petitioner has incorporated a requirement into the PUD Ordinance for trails internal to the development. The potential locations of internal trails have been depicted on the revised Concept Plan. The exact location will be determined at the time of the overall development plan and primary plat review upon final engineering; however, in response to comments from neighbors, the PUD Ordinance includes language that prohibits these trails along the north property line of the District. Trails internal to the District will provide access and connectivity of the preserved Natural Areas and Open Space so these areas better function as an amenity.

3. Floodplain: The Concept Plan has been revised as a result of the new Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), which became effective on November 19, 2014. The exact location of the floodplain will be reviewed at the time of the overall development plan and primary plat review. Any proposed development that would be determined to occur within the floodplain will be subject to both local and state regulations, including review and approval by the State of Indiana and the City of Westfield (see Article 5.5 Floodplain Overlay District of the UDO).

Comprehensive Plan: The Future Land Use Plan in the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan (the "Comprehensive Plan") identifies the Property as "Suburban Residential". The Comprehensive Plan is not law; rather, it is intended to serve as a guide in making land use decisions; however, below is a general summary of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan for this Property:

The development policies for "Suburban Residential" include: (i) promote the protection of the existing suburban character of the area; (ii) ensure that new development adjacent to existing suburban is properly buffered; (iii) ensure development occurs in a way that is contiguous with existing development; (iv) design developments such that back yards are not adjacent to collector or arterial streets unless uniform attractive screening is provided; (v) prevent monotony of design and color that applies to the collective impact of an entire development;

(vi) emphasize connectivity between subdivisions, and avoid creating isolated islands of development; (vii) encourage quality and useable open space; (viii) encourage development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in new development to improve connectivity; and (ix) land that is characterized by steep slopes or other natural limitations should be left natural or developed at rural, rather than suburban densities.

The development policies for “residential design standards” include: (i) encourage neighborhoods that do not have the appearance of “production” housing; (ii) evaluate new residential development on the basis of overall density and the relationship that density to effective and usable open space preservation, rather than on lot sizes; and (iii) encourage variety and diversity in housing while maintaining a distinct style or character and avoiding the appearance of “cookie cutter” subdivisions.

The development policies for “open space and recreation” include: (i) design open space to form an interconnected network, with provisions or linkages to existing or potential open space; (ii) maintain and preserve stream corridors, woodlands, hedge rows, or other valuable natural and historic resources; (iii) provide parks and recreational facilities in new development to accommodate the needs of the community as it grows; and (iv) recognize that in addition to the amount of open space, that the location and configuration of open space is of importance and should not be an afterthought based on a determination of unusable land.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The written comments submitted in advance of the public hearing are attached hereto as **Exhibit 7**. The public comments presented at the public hearing are summarized in the APC’s draft minutes of the December 1, 2014, meeting. The Petitioner’s summary of their revisions in response to those comments received to date from the Department, the Plan Commission, and neighbors is included in the Petitioner’s Update, attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

STAFF COMMENTS

The Petitioner has satisfactorily addressed the Department’s comments and incorporated the Department’s recommendations into the proposed ordinance and Concept Plan. If the Plan Commission is otherwise satisfied with the revisions to the proposed Mapleridge PUD District Ordinance, then the Department recommends forwarding this petition to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

If any Plan Commission member has questions prior to the public hearing, then please contact Jesse Pohlman at 317.402.4380 or jpohlman@westfield.in.gov.