

May 31, 2015

Westfield Planning Commission

Westfield, Indiana

Randy Graham, President

Andre Maue, Vice President

William Sanders

Steve Hoover

Nathan Day

Robert L. Horkay

Ken Kingshill

Dear Commission Members:

Re: Proposed Bent Creek Development
159th Street & Towne Road

My wife and I live at 15951 Little Eagle Creek Avenue, a 22-acre property that is the western border to this proposed project by Langston Development. We respectfully request your consideration of our concerns regarding this development before final approval.

Along with our neighbors surrounding this proposed project, our first introduction to the subdivision took place just four days ago on Wednesday, May 27, 2015. Accordingly, we are still digesting the impact of the development and were rather surprised to hear that the final hearing before the Commission is in a couple of days.

That said, we would appreciate the Commission's consideration of our following concerns:

It is our understanding that Westfield is requiring a stub road into our property with the thought that our small tract of land will someday be developed. This future development is not going to happen. We moved to the country to settle permanently, and we designed the property for one home, a barn, and some amenities for our family. Because of this, our property is not suitable for subdivision development. In short, we do not want the stub road.

If the discussion reaches a point where a stub road is unavoidable, please note that stub roads do not have to be paved. If you are requiring Langston Development to provide an easement, please kindly landscape over and around said easement without paving it. This sort of unpaved, grassy area could even be a part of the lots that Langston is developing. If, ultimately, you require Langston unnecessarily to pave this unnecessary stub, we request that a mound of sufficient height, planted with rows of evergreens or Spruce, be constructed at the end of the stub to completely block any subdivision light pollution into our property.

We would appreciate being able to maintain the privacy we worked so hard to acquire. As such, on the subdivision lots that are being planned along our property's eastern

border, we request that a mound of sufficient height, planted with rows of evergreens or Spruce, be constructed to completely block line-of-sight to our home.

If Langston Development anticipates a pool or recreation courts for this property, we request that they be placed as far east of our shared property line (i.e. placed closer to Towne Road) as possible.

We are extremely concerned about the traffic impact on 159th Street and Towne Road. 159th Street, even currently, is not wide enough for two-lane traffic as it cannot accommodate two full-sized vehicles to pass safely. Improvement to 159th Street is already required, and adding 150 additional families' daily use of that road will do nothing but compound the problem. Moreover, the intersection of 159th and Towne Road is treacherous and requires improvement: visibility off 159th on to Towne is minimal at best, and you should expect an increase in accidents if left as-is.

We are curious if fire protection is to be extended down 159th Street. As there are currently no hydrants along 159th Street or Little Eagle Creek Avenue, this would be a perfect time to insert and develop additional fire protection.

Should utilities (including but not limited to sewer, water, and/or natural gas) be brought close to those existing properties adjacent to Langston Development's proposed subdivision, we would expect that mandatory connection to any or all of them not be required.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns of continued enjoyment of our property. In conversations with Jim Langston and Dick Carriger, I believe they are men of character, capability, and integrity. Although the layout of the subdivision has changed since the original design (the Commission-accepted design in 2004 included cul-de-sacs in the proposed lots adjoining our property,) I believe that Jim and Dick will make every effort to provide for the continuance of quiet enjoyment of our home and our property as affected by the Bent Creek development.

Sincerely,

Dennis P. Smith
15951 Little Eagle Creek Avenue
Westfield, IN 46074
317-690-7767

May 31, 2015

To: Westfield APC

CC: Langston Development, Mayor Cook, Westfield City Council and City Planning Staff

Re: Bent Creek Development change in 2004 rezone commitments

From: Ginny Kelleher
3920 W 166th Street
Westfield, IN 46074
317 867-5833
ginnykelleher@gmail.com

The two modifications being requested a) removal of buffer area two and b) replacement of the original first floor brick requirement with a minimum of 18 inches of brick are reasonable and I have no objection to either of them.

There is, however, a third "commitment" that the petitioner is asking to change - Exhibit "B". This shows the layout of the entrances, amenity area and internal streets. It was attached and incorporated by reference to the original commitments. Exhibit "B" was crafted after meetings of the APC subdivision committee (APC, staff, developers and citizens) to address traffic safety and neighbor's concerns. Several design items (underlined above) were significant factors in the approval granted by the APC and Town Council in 2004. They deserve clarification because they still apply today.

Entrances

During the 2004 rezone request, this parcel was thought to be too far out to be developed because of insufficient roads. One factor leading to approval was that each section had an entrance onto Towne Road. Towne was classified as a major arterial, which meant it had priority for funding for major improvements and was designed to handle this load of traffic.

The new layout has only a northern entrance onto Towne and routes many of the southern 79 home sites onto 159th Street. Currently, 159th Street is less than a two lane road and not safe for two cars. **The entrance from Towne Road to the southern lots needs to be added back to the plans.**

The original plans had an entrance onto 159th Street, but it opened into a large undeveloped parcel (which connects to many others to the south). This was good long term planning for connectivity to future development. The current plans show it going into someone's front yard. **Move the 159th St. entrance to the west.**

Better yet, eliminate the 159th St. entrance totally and just make it a stub street for future use when the City has the money to properly improve it. Anything less than total renovation of 159th from Towne to Little Eagle Creek Avenue and west would be inadequate at best and be a waste of tax payers money at the current time. The City has higher traffic areas to address, such as Towne Road. Obtain the ROW on 159th from the developer now and when the property to the south (large undeveloped parcel) develops, obtain ROW from them and then.... improve the whole thing. The City will still need to address the intersection of Towne and 159th with the planning of this development, but if it is not being asked to carry 79 home sites, the remedy may be less costly for the City and developer at this time.

All of the above items should be addressed in a traffic study or at least some serious thought before any approval.

Amenity Area

Another consideration by the APC at the original rezone request was the placement of the amenity area (pool). The area was located near the entrance onto Towne Road. That kept the noise, lights and extra traffic away from the rural neighbors/horse properties to the west (and now a City nature park used by horseback riders and Boy Scouts). The current plan places the pool too close to the western border. I believe anything that creates added noise, light and traffic for the benefit of the subdivision residents should be kept internal to that subdivision. **The amenity center needs to be relocated closer to Towne Road.**

New connecting "bridge" street from north to south

There is an additional through street connecting the north and south sections of the subdivision that was not present in the 2004 plans. This is not a bad idea, but for the reasons stated above, it needs to be moved away from the western border closer to the middle of the property (especially since the pool is planned to be located here). **Move the connecting "bridge" street to the east.**

I am not asking to go back to an exact exhibit "B". I think developers should be allowed creativity. I am only requesting that the parts of "B" that addressed the APC's original concerns for traffic safety and consideration for the neighbors be incorporated into the new site plan.

In summary, please consider the following:

1. Complete a traffic study before any approvals
2. Add an entrance from Towne Road to the southern section of the development
3. Move or remove the entrance from 159th Street
4. Move any amenity center (pool) closer to the center or the eastern border
5. Move the street that connects the north and south areas further to the east.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin M. Todd, AICP

From: longlane@frontier.com
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2015 11:50 AM
To: APC; Council Members; jlangdev@langstondev.com
Subject: Bent Creek development, we are adjoining property owners

Dear Committee and Council members:

We are the property owners immediately west of the proposed Bent Creek development. Our home is at the east end of our property, so we will be the home closest to the development.

We attended the public meeting last week, and heard and presented our concerns at that time.

We wanted to make sure our concerns were included in the public record, and to present them to you and staff, in writing.

Our concerns are these:

1. We always knew development was going to come to this parcel of land, as it was for sale when we purchased our property in 2002. We were somewhat relieved to see this proposal, by a developer with a great reputation, and successful, desirable communities already completed here in Westfield. Still, we would like to request a 50' buffer zone on our property line, like the landowner to the north was given. Our home is a quiet haven. We will be hearing the construction for years to come.
2. The proposed layout of the Bent Creek development, with the north/south street planned behind our house is just not acceptable. It would certainly infringe on our quality of life. We will be losing a lot of privacy and gaining a lot of light pollution and noise of 158 other families, their trash collection and school busses. It would also be a huge mistake to clear cut through the only standing grove of mature trees on the property. We would like to see that connecting street be moved much further to the east, where it would be central to the development. The Exhibit B, attached to the approved plan from 2004, had a layout that included a second entrance onto Towne Rd., which would help significantly. I had heard that part of the reason for the north/south connector was for school bus traffic. I can attest, as a schoolbus driver for WWS, that we turn around in cul-de-sacs every day.
3. We had no idea there was to be a neighborhood pool, and then it was announced that that would also be positioned at the west end of the development, nearest to us! Again, it will bring more cars, kids, and noise closer to our home. Having a pool near a walkway to an undeveloped park doesn't sound like a good idea. Seems like a central location for this community amenity would be better for all involved.
4. 159th St. is not adequate for any more traffic than it already takes. It would be irresponsible of the City to allow any development to begin until that road is upgraded. It is not really even 2 lanes wide at this point. To add construction equipment on it, in its current state would be dangerous. If the City is interested in having a development the caliber of Mr. Langston's, they need to fast-track the upgrade to maintain adequate safety for all concerned. One speaker at the public meeting expressed his concern that the future residents of Bent Creek, coming from the west will use Little Eagle Creek Ave, to 159th St., and not Towne Rd. He is completely correct about that. And, as a resident of LEC Ave., which is a racetrack at rush hour now, I cannot imagine how crazy that will become.
5. Raymond Worth Park. The undeveloped park is our northern boundary. We actually own about 20' on the north side of the Edwards Ditch. It is the mown area on top. We mow it. We have asked the city for several years to work with us

on getting a fence divider between us and the park as we have suffered through the years with wandering hikers, and the decimation of our chicken flock due to loose dogs. People have long believed Raymond Worth Park is a great place to let your dogs run. As a result we have to constantly be on alert with our own dogs on our property, to protect them from wanderers. If the Bent Creek neighborhood is going to have a walk path leading to the Raymond Worth Park, bringing in scores of folks from the east, then we formally request some assistance from the City with a fence to separate our property, and access to it. The ditch itself is a natural draw for kids, and we have a bee yard on the south side of the ditch, as well

as our horse pastures. There will need to be an appropriate, permanent fence, (recognizing the need for utility access), to separate our land from public land.

6. We hope the protocol for land work will not include spraying glyphosate on the property. The glyphosate devastation on pollinators is clearly documented in the midwest. And the chain of death leads upward from the pollinators to the birds. I have 10 beehives in the area, producing raw honey for local sale, as well as the danger of contaminating the waterway which would certainly carry this poison elsewhere, quickly.

Sincerely,

Tom and Tracy Pielemeier
16101 Little Eagle Creek Ave.