MAY 21, 2015 TAMARACK NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SUMMARY

Project: Tamarack PUD Docket No. 1506-PUD-09

Date: Thursday May 21, 2015 6:30 pm

Location: MI Model Home in Slater Woods subdivision, 16835 Rosetree Court, Noblesville, In. 46062

Attendees: Ann Kloc – MI Homes

Jon Dobosiewicz and Jim Shinaver – Nelson & Frankenberger

Dave Sexton – Weihe Engineers

See attached Exhibit "A" Sign In Sheet for Neighbors who attended

---

Summary of Neighbor Questions and Petitioner's Responses:

1. The drawings shows a "loop" road to 161st Street – what is this?
   a. This is an emergency access point for emergency vehicles only, but based on TAC meeting we will be relocating and redesigning (making narrower and installing bollard) the emergency access.

2. There are 42 home sites on the eastern portion of the site which will generate at least 2 cars per house, plus recently approved Oak Park addition will generate additional traffic. How will traffic work? Will there be traffic issues?
   a. We are working with Staff regarding traffic analysis. We are installing accel/decal lanes along 161st Street. If one were to go east on 161st near the Bridgewater and Brookside neighborhoods, there more homes and the entrances to each of those neighborhoods is accommodating the traffic.

3. A neighbor brought up the Richmond Hill explosion on Southside of Indianapolis and emergency access to neighborhoods.
   a. We are providing an emergency access point and we can provide information on other similarly sized developments that are served by 1 point of access for this or a greater number of homes.

4. Some neighbors expressed desire to have larger homes, larger lots and fewer homes.
   a. We explained that underlying S-2 zoning permits 1,200 square foot ranch homes. We also explained that the target demographic for this product wants lots that are as large so they do not have as much yard to maintain.
   b. We explained that MI will be increasing the minimum square footage of home sizes as we go through the Plan Commission process.
   c. We also explained that this comment on lots size and home square footage should be communicated by the neighbors to the Plan Commission and Council.

5. How much area consists of the pipeline easement?
   a. We estimate that the pipeline area consists of about 5 ½ acres. We also explained that the existence of pipeline easements in and around developed neighborhoods in this general vicinity was not unique.

6. Some neighbors expressed a desire for only "1 step down" between their neighborhood and the Tamarack subdivision.
    a. We explained that it was our opinion that Tamarack was a well-designed subdivision with homes priced from the low to mid $300,000 range. The proposed homes are of high quality and by no means a "step down".

7. Why did the original submittal change and why did it reference a different square footage minimum for the homes from tonight's general discussion regarding square footage?
    a. We explained that it is not uncommon for a petition, after it is filed and the Petitioner begins to hear the input of the neighbors, TAC agencies, the Planning Staff and decision makers, to be adjusted and modified. We explained that MI will be increasing the minimum square footage of home sizes as we go through the Plan Commission process based on comments we have received.

8. Some neighbors expressed a concern about how the Tamarack proposal may impact their property values and whether we worked with the pipeline companies in the design of our proposal.
    a. We explained that we did obtain input from the pipeline company as we have been going through the zoning approval process and we are complying with any requirements or standards the pipeline company may have.
    b. We explained that we anticipated, conservatively, the prices ranges of the Tamarack homes to be between $300,000 to $350,000.

9. A neighbor claimed that we could not build on the pipeline easement.
    a. Again, we explained that our development and its design is permitted by the requirements and standards of the pipeline company in relation to their easements.

10. What size is this model (the model in Slater Woods where the neighborhood meeting was held) and why were we having the neighborhood meeting here?
    a. Again, we explained that the existing S-2 zoning permitted homes of 1200 square feet.
    b. We explained that this Slater Woods model was about 2400 square feet including the main level and upstairs, but excluding the finished basement.
    c. We explained again that MI would be increasing the minimum square footage of home sizes as we go through the Plan Commission process.

11. A neighbor stated that we, at the May 17th Council introduction, said the average square footage would be 2000 to 2400 square feet.
    a. We explained that 2,000 to 2,400 would be the "average" square footage.
    b. We explained that other similar types of MI home products could be found at Westmont in Carmel (which has this home product but also other home product offerings) and Monon Lake in Carmel that was just beginning development.

12. A neighbor expressed a concern that if the economy went through another recession what impact would that have on the Tamarack development and would home buyers elect to build the smallest type of home allowed by our proposal?
    a. We explained again that we were committed to increasing the minimum home square footage in our proposal.

13. A neighbor asked how close is the cul-de-sac near lots 3 and 4 to our northern property line?
    a. We explained that the distance would be approximately 30'.

14. A neighbor expressed a concern about a driver being in the cul-de-sac, their gas pedal becoming stuck and the car driving into the fence on our northern property line.
    a. We offered to sit down with this neighbor after the neighborhood meeting to understand their concern better and determine if we could address it with a design change or landscape buffering.

15. A neighbor asked if the homes on lot 3 and 4 were required to be larger.
    a. We explained that those homes were not required to be larger.

16. A neighbor asked how close would the homes be to our northern property line.
    a. We explained that we could add a provision to the PUD that no home would be closer than 30' to our north property line.

17. A neighbor who lives to the east expressed a concern about animals going onto their property, whether there was a walking path proposed around the pond and what type of trees would be planted along the east edge.
    a. We explained that the site plan shows a proposed pond on the southeastern corner of the site, but no pathway along the pond area.
    b. We explained to this neighbor that we have been asked to extend the path along this pond and if this neighbor was opposed to this change, they should communicate their concerns to the Plan Commission and Council.
    c. We explained that the landscape plan for the eastern perimeter would include shrubs, trees and evergreens per the City's landscape planting standards.

18. A neighbor to the north asked how we would keep people from trespassing onto his land?
    a. We explained that the area already contained heavy landscaping and tree cover as a natural buffer.

19. A neighbor expressed concern about traffic on 161st Street and the number of cars our site may generate.
    a. We explained that we are in the process of completing the same.

20. Some neighbors expressed concerns about density and asked how the passing blister on 161st Street would work.
    a. We explained the density of the proposal and we explained how the passing blister along 161st Street would be designed and how it would function.

21. If this product is supposed to be "empty nester" why does it allow for 3 or 4 bedrooms which would create more cars and more traffic? Also a concern about whether we would allow street parking.
    a. We explained our position and thoughts regarding our home product and our target market and that the public streets were designed to allow parking.

22. Why are we planting street trees – they are hard to maintain and don't grow well.
    a. We designed our street trees pursuant to the City's new street tree planting and design standards.

23. How long have we been talking to the City about this proposal.
    a. We explained that we had been discussing this proposal with the City for about 6-7 months.

24. A neighbor explained that she recalls years ago the pipeline company dug up their pipes for maintenance and it was messy and an annoyance.
    a. We explained again that we were working with the pipeline company regarding our project.

25. Some neighbors asked questions about drainage and how it would work
    a. Dave Sexton of Weihe Engineers explained how our drainage design would work.

26. Some neighbors asked what sort of lot maintenance we would have.
    a. We explained that lot maintenance was not mandatory, but would be offered.

b. We explained that the HOA would maintain the significant common areas.
c. We explained that the CCRs for the HOA would prohibit swing sets, playgrounds, basketball goals and above ground swimming pools.

27. Will there be a community pool.
    a. We explained that there would not be a community pool as there was not a desire by MI to attract families with school aged children.

28. How, from a selling point, do we see homes being sold that back-up to the pipeline easement? Will the pipeline easement have an impact on anticipated home values in Tamarack? Some neighbors asked for more expensive homes.
    a. We explained that MI will have buyers sign an acknowledgement document in the purchase agreement where they will be advised about the location of the pipeline easement so they have knowledge of it.
    b. We explained there are other similarly situated subdivisions in Westfield and Carmel that are adjacent to pipeline easement areas.

29. How does the new proposal for 161st and Union Street compare to the Tamarack proposal?
    a. We explained that that proposal was referred to as "Lantern Park" and we explained that that project had different lots sizes (60' wide; 7,200 square feet total).

30. What is the plan for the parcels at the southwest corner of 161st and Oak Road?
    a. We explained that those parcels were not part of our proposal.

31. A neighbor asked about the notice process and why, if one of our team members was a resident of Oak Manor, we did not give more advanced notice? Why was sign posted on site so small?
    a. We explained the notice process, the neighborhood meeting process and that we have and are complying with all noticing requirements.

32. A neighbor asked, if our proposal were approved, when we would begin site work?
    a. We explained, if approved, we would begin site work in approximately Fall of 2015.

33. A neighbor asked when would the Plan Commission meeting occur.
    a. We explained the Plan Commission meeting would occur at 7pm on June 1st at Westfield City Hall building.

Tamarack 5/21/15 Neighborhood Meeting

Name:	Address	Cell #	Email
Brian Collier	Oak Manor		baskypilot@yahoo.com
Tammy & Ron Loera	16405 Oak Manor		RONLOERA@YAHOO.com
John Boyer	2220 Oakwoode Ln		J8832Gayebo@Frontier.com
Betty & Jerry Hollar	2902 E. 161st St		eahollar@aol.com
Ben Brown	16877 Catkins Ct		ben@bbrown.com
JONATHAN DILLEY	16421 OAK MANOR DR.		JDILLEY@PLTW.ORG
Rob Stokes	14917 Riverdale dr S. Apt 4		
Dennis & Diana Theurer	16200 Carey Rd.		dennistheurer@frontier.com
Susie Tatum	16250 Oak Rd		rskartatum@comcast.net
Pam Sokol	2530 E 161st St		

EXHIBIT "A"