Pamela Howard

From: Bobbi Rounds <brounds@indy.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 12:54 PM
To: Chris Bluto; Jim Ake; Noah Urban Farmer Seeds Herron; Jeannine Fortier; Butch Meese; Mark Christoffersen; Jeff Boller; Cindy Spoljaric; Steve Hoover; Wayne Eells; Steve Hoover; Tom McMullen; Bart Ross; Jennifer Beck; dgeorge@crgresidential.com; bdalton@mag-us.com; Pamela Howard; APC; Council Members
Subject: Petition 1506-PUD-11 - PLEASE OPPOSE ZONING CHANGE

June 15, 2015

ATTN: Westfield City Council members
Westfield Advisory Plan Commission
Pamela Howard, Associate Planner, Westfield
Spring Mill Station Task Group
Mr. George, CRG Residential
Mr. Dalton, EdgeRock Development

SUBJECT: Petition 1506-PUD-11 Spring Mill Station SW Corner -
APC Meeting - June 15, 2015

We are asking that the referenced proposed zoning change from Single Family, Low Density to a PUD be rejected.

We are Steve & Roberta Rounds and we live at 730 Hadleigh Pass, Westfield in the Enclave of Maple Knoll. We find the stretch of 161st
Street between Meridian and Towne Rd to be a great area to call home.
All up and down this corridor single family homes have been and are currently being developed. We ask that the parcel of land which is currently the soccer fields remain zoned as Single Family, Low Density to promote the same type of small, friendly neighborhoods that currently exist. In our opinion, dropping an apartment complex into this area will do nothing to enhance our neighborhoods or our property values. I ask each of you to consider what your thinking would be if
this happened across the street from you. There will be many
opportunities for apartment complexes in more appropriate locations within the Westfield community, please don't push or rush this
development into existence at this location. Please keep our
neighborhoods family-friendly and less congested by retaining the SF2 zoning on this parcel of land.

While we know the SMS Task Group was created to represent the neighborhoods in the planning of the corners of 161st St and Spring Mill Rd. and we fully support that purpose, we have found the lack of communication in this matter of the SW Corner PUD to be less than
adequate. It has come to my attention this past week in
conversations with our two neighbors who attend these SMS meetings that their responsibilities are unclear and a feeling of frustration
exists in a sense of not being heard or views valued. That same
sense exists throughout our neighborhood as the majority of us were not informed of the developers' Informational Meeting on May 27th or the Public Hearing on June 1st due to our location in the
neighborhood. Only 'required' property owners nearby the proposed
project were mailed notices of these two events. I understand approximately 40 homes were on the list for the Enclave, and that more than 15 of those had no 'sight line' of the parcel of land, while other homes closer and with a view of the

proposed development were not notified. Does this sound appropriate to you? It is our belief the entire neighborhood should have been notified of these meetings and that more than a week's notice should have been given so that people could plan to attend. The few neighbors I've spoken with who were at the meeting came away with the impression they were outnumbered by SMS members, Developers, and City Council/APC members. That should have been a clue to those in attendance that notice of the meeting was not sufficient. People do care in this neighborhood and will voice those concerns if given ample information and notice. If we had received a notice of the informational meeting, or knew anything about the proposed development, we would have been there. We believe it is the Developers' responsibility as a sign of being a potentially good neighbor to inform every household in the adjoining neighborhoods of their plans...not just those 'required'.

We also understand that Mr. Bluto indicated to SMS members he would post a general notice of the project and public hearing on "Nextdoor" neighborhoods social media account so all homeowners would be notified. Again, we feel that this type of communication is inadequate. Many of our neighbors are not on this notification system and should not be required to be in order to get information which is of importance to our neighborhood.

If you decide to change the zoning to PUD, our specific objections to the developers' proposal for a supposed 290 unit apartment complex include but are not limited to:
Modifications requested on page two of the Petition 1506-PUD-11:
Maximum Density - Doubled from 10 to 20 units per acre Maximum Dwelling Units per Structure - Change from 10 units to 30 units Maximum Number of Dwelling Units - Change from 150 units to 400 units Minimum Building Setback Lines - From 30 foot front yard setback to 0 feet.
Maximum Building Height - From 45 ft max to 60 ft.
Parking - From two spaces per dwelling unit to 1.5 spaces.

Also Elevations for every type of structure being built are needed to comply with neighborhood plan. Not all elevations were shown, ie.
Building 1, Type V that appears to face 161st. St. is not included in the Concept Plan docs.
A definitive plan for the 2 acre portion on 161st St. and it's appearance is also needed.

As indicated in the Neighborhood Meeting Summary and Update there are many unknowns at this point which greatly affect this corner. It would be helpful to get those issues, as well as a traffic plan and flow study, resolved before any change in zoning to this parcel of land.

Again, it is our opinion this current proposal does not meet with the our view of what the Comprehensive Plan for the area should include.
Please oppose this Petition 1506-PUD-11.
Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Steve & Bobbi Rounds
730 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield, IN 46074
brounds@indy.rr.com
srounds@indy.rr.com

Pamela Howard

From: Carol Gwynne-Vaughan <nanagv@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 3:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Zoning Change

My husband and I live on Dursley Ct. the Enclave of Maple Knoll. We just recently found out about the proposed zoning change directly across from our location. We did not received a certified letter and did not see anything about the change in the Current or Indianapolis Star. What paper do you use or did we just miss the one notice you placed? On soccer weekends, it is nearly impossible to get out of our development due to traffic. Can you imagine what it will be like with 290 to 580 or more cars coming and going. Was there any thought given to traffic or quality of life of those living across the street?

Please note for the record that Bob and Carol Gwynne-Vaughan, 16249 Dursley Ct., Westfield, IN 46074 are strongly opposed to this proposed rezoning.

Bob and Carol Gwynne-Vaughan

Pamela Howard

From: deryl <dwbenz@indy.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 12:13 PM
To: APC; councilmember@westfield.in.gov
Subject: FW: Request of zoning change 161st&springmill rd

From: deryl [mailto:dwbenz@indy.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 11:57 AM
To: 'apc@westfield.in.gov'; 'councilmember@westfield.in.gov'
Cc: 'dwbenz@indy.rr.com'; 'Chris Bluto'
Subject: Request of zoning change 161st&springmill rd

To whom it may concern:

My name is Deryl Benz, my wife Chris and I reside at 882 Hadleigh Pass in Enclave of Maple Knoll located northwest of 161st & Springmill. We understand that a developer is requesting a zoning change for the soccer field just east of the school. This would allow a 290 unit apt. complex to be built next to a school.

We are writing to oppose the change of zoning SF2 to PUD. With all the "new" being built right now, our traffic situation will only be worse if this 290 unit complex is built! We know roundabouts are being built & planned but will this solve this traffic situation? Our subdivision had two exit/entrances which create traffic plus when the school is in session it only adds to the traffic flow. I don't understand where the complex would have an exit/entrance??

One last thing, would it not have been proper to let all the homeowners that live across the street know about this proposed change? Do you not think that our quality of life will be affected?
We only found out about this proposal by accident. Someone in our neighborhood took the time notify us.

We hope you consider "other" homeowners before changing the zoning & keep our neighborhood in mind because we bought this property knowing the zones and how it can affect property value.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

Deryl/Chris Benz

Pamela Howard

From: Ed Stewart <estewart1949@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 4:08 PM
To: APC
Cc: Council Members
Subject: Petition 1506-PUD-11 - Change of Zoning Request

To Whom It May Concern

Subject: Petition 1506-PUD-11 - Change of Zoning Request

My name is Edward Stewart, and my wife Sharon and I are homeowners at 16259 Dursley Ct., Westifeld. I am in opposition to the subject Petition requesting a change in the zoning from SF2 to PUD.

My objections are that there are too many changes requested to the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan that make this PUD unsuitable for the site.

First, the Comprehensive Plan, Page 38 states: "For the purpose of this plan, two different categories of Suburban Residential are identified on the map: Existing and New Suburban areas. The Existing Suburban Residential area is generally located in the southeastern quadrant of the planning area. As its name implies, it is the area where most of the existing suburban residential pattern has taken place. The basic policy of this plan for this area is fairly simple: preserve and protect the stability and integrity of the area as it fills in. This area consists primarily of single-family residences. Retail uses have not been part of Westfield's plan for this area, and development of such uses would change the character of the area." The area under discussion is in the "Existing Suburban Residential" category and according to the proposed PUD the development certainly wouldn't comply with the "area consists primarily of single-family residences" or "Retail uses have not been part of Westfield's plan for this area."

Second on page 39 "Existing Suburban, Development Policies":

> "Promote the protection of the existing suburban character of the area." The existing area is almost exclusively low density housing. This high density PUD does not promote or protect the existing suburban character of the area.
>
> "New development should be permitted only upon a demonstration that it will not alter the character of the area, and will not generate negative land use impacts." Again, this high density PUD does not will alter the existing suburban character of the area.
>
> "New retail uses should not be permitted in the Existing Suburban areas." The proposed PUD includes a commercial component.

The changes requested by the PUD seem excessive:

> A 100% increase in density
> A 200% increase in Units per Structure
> A 166% increase in Maximum Number of Dwelling Units
> Minimum Building Setback Lines from 30 foo to zero.
> A 33% increase in Maximum Building Height

The last item that isn't in the Plan but I don't see covered anywhere is the roads necessary to add 290-580 cars daily on the present road configurations. Traffic will be a mess.

Again, as the plan states, "The basic policy of this plan for this area is fairly simple: preserve and protect the stability and integrity of the area as it fills in. This area consists primarily of single-family residences. Retail uses have not been part of Westfield's plan for this area, and development of such uses would change the character of the area.

Also, in a Google search for Westfield Residential Investors, LLC, yielded nothing listed in Westfield, IN. Who are these people?

Please consider my objections to the 1506-PUD-11, in rejecting this PUD.

Edward E. Stewart
16259 Dursley Ct.
Westfield, IN 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Edward Curtis <ECURTIS1@indy.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 5:12 PM
Cc: APC; Council Members
Subject: PUD-11

We have become aware of the meeting tonight discussing the plan to build 290 apartment units on the land currently used as soccer fields located adjacent to Shamrock Springs Elementary School. As home owners in the Maple Knoll subdivision directly across from the school on Hadleigh Pass we have strong opposition to such development on the following grounds:

1: Do no believe that children can be kept out of the PUD11.
2. Do not believe that a high density PUD with no children should be built next to an elementary school.
3. Believe that 580 cars using a single exit will cause a traffic problem far into future.
4. Building on other school property as suggested will cause building over a petroleum pipeline.
5. We were not invited to any meeting related to this.

We request the zoning to stay SF2.

Edward and Mary Alice Curtis
930 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield,In. 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Kathy Johnston <kthyjhnstn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 3:27 PM
To: APC
Subject: 161st&Springmill Zone Change

Advisory Planning Commission:

We are residents of the Enclave of Maple Knoll. Today, we found out that there is a proposal to change the zoning next to Shamrock Springs Elementary School from SF2 to PUD zoning. We had not been informed even though we will definitely be impacted by this change.

More important will be the effect it will have on the school. As retired driver and aide for the Westfield Transportation division, our main concern is the safety of the children.

We feel that a 290 apartment complex will increase both the vehicular and ambulatory traffic to unacceptable levels.

We are opposed to this change [why now?] and ask you to consider the children of today and in the future in your votes.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jerry and Kathleen Johnston

Pamela Howard

From: Cindy Spoljaric
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 12:17 PM
To: Mary Goode
Cc: Council Members; APC
Subject: Re: Petition 1506-PUD-11

Thank you for your comments. As this item is on the APC docket for consideration this evening, I have copied APC members for their review.
Thank you.

Cindy Spoljaric
Westfield City Council
695-6673
Cspoljaric@westfield.in.gov

On Jun 15, 2015, at 10:59 AM, Mary Goode <mgoode_47012@yahoo.com> wrote:

> This is in regards to petition 1506-PUD-11 which would allow a zoning change from SF2 to a PUD proposed on 161st Street.
> My husband and I , Ken and Mary Goode, live at 831 Hadleigh Pass in the Enclave of Maple Knoll. We are against the zoning change. We are concerned about the traffic issues an apartment complex could add to an already busy street. We urge you to vote against this proposal.Thank you for your time and concern in this matter.
> Ken and Mary Goode

Pamela Howard

From: Pam TerBush <pamterbush@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 1:52 PM
To: APC
Subject: Zoning revision

To whom it may concern:

My husband and I are concerned about the possible zoning change near Shamrock Springs Elementary School. We recently moved into the Enclave of a Maple Knoll and cannot imagine how the increased traffic flow could be handled on 161st St.

Concerned residents:

Terry and Pam TerBush
16250 Dursley Court

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: pat.allen13579@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 11:38 AM
To: APC
Subject: Opposition to proposed zoning change

I am writing to express Opposition to the proposed zoning change for the soccer fields on 161st St near Springmill Rd. Although my husband and I cannot attend tonight's meeting be aware that we and many of our neighbors in the Enclave of Maple Knoll subdivision are OPPOSED to changing the zoning from SF2 to PUD.
Thank you
Pat and Ron Allen
16141 Matlock Circle

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Tom Belland <tpbell69@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 4:16 PM
To: APC
Subject: 1506-PUD-11 Change of Zoning Request

To:Pam Howard
Associate Planner
City of Westfield, Indiana

From: Tom and Peggy Belland
16220 Dursley Ct.
Westfield, Indiana 46074

Dear Pam,
I am a homeowner in the Maple Knoll Subdivision. I attended the May 27th meeting at Shamrock School. I have read your notes and would like to make some comments:

1 There was no mention of my request as to who was speaking to us. There were 3 or four people, that I did not know, that kept speaking (other Mr George and Mr. Dalton). When they were introduced as members of the task force and a councilman, there were 12 of them and only 9 homeowners! One who spoke too much, in my opinion, was Chris Bluto. He was doing more selling than informing. I was mad at the homeowner turnout and started asking why people didn't attend and many said they didn't get the registered letter announcing the meeting. Upon further questioning it appears the mailing for the letter was very spotty and not all received it. Our member, Butch Meese, has not corresponded with us once though this whole process. When a neighbor asked him a question he referred them to Mr Bluto!! It appears our member wasn't very involved or should not have been on the task force.

2 Steve Hoover, councilman, said we needed money for schools and need commercial development. I agree to both statements as long the development is appropriate for the area it is being done in. A large apartment complex is NOT, I repeat, NOT appropriate development on this parcel of land in this neighborhood.

3 I also had to ask them to speak English(not in the notes). They were cross talking with themselves about TIFF's and PUD's with no explanation of the terms. It was irritating not to know the abbreviations.

The main body of this letter is to state clearly and firmly my objection to the rezoning of this property to allow a large apartment complex. If one takes a look at the aerial map one can clearly see that all the dwellings surrounding this parcel are family homes. My objections are:

1 The apartment complex is totally out of sync with the surrounding neighborhood. Single houses or maybe townhouses would be appropriate but not apartments. I feel the apartment complex is motivated by greed. There would be enough money to be made with a subdivision.

2 The complex is way too close to an elementary school. It would a prime spot for people who hunt and harm defenseless children. IT IS WAY TOO CLOSE TO THE SCHOOL FOR APARTMENTS!!!

3 290 apartments would create a traffic problem. That is close to 500 residents and close to 300 to 350 cars. I do not believe that this issue was not studied enough if at all . I need more than an assurance than from the people building it that it would not be a problem. Our roads are getting over crowded as it is. It also could interfere with school busses and school traffic.

4 I spoke to a local realtor and he said that the apartment complex would most likely drive home values down. This one I realize is my own selfish one but I did not buy a house in Westfield to see my home value go down. He also stated that a subdivision or townhouses would enhance and blend in to the culture without much of an effect on housing values.

5 My personal opinion is that this proposed changes in the zoning was not completely transparent and rushed. From the time I received the information, through certified letter, until this meeting it has only been less than a month. It was a very short time to get answers and respond and many neighbors received nothing.

BOTTOM LINE: I believe that economic development is both healthy and necessary for a community, as long as it is done properly for the area. This is neither. A large apartment complex would neither enhance or fit in with the surrounding community. NO to rezoning.

Trying to keep Westfield the best community in Indiana,

Thomas Belland

Pamela Howard

From: wdseam@aol.com
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 1:27 PM
To: APC
Subject: Zoning change request for the Southwest corner of 161st and Springmill

Gentlemen,

My name is William Seaman. My wife and I reside at 961 Hadleigh Pass. I'm writing to voice my objection to the possible zoning change for the above referenced property.

After reviewing the available documentation, I'm convinced this apartment complex is simply too large and too dense to be placed at the intersection of 161st and Springmill. The additonal traffic and entry/exit of the proposed apartments onto Springmill will further overload this intersection resulting in increased congestion, and I believe, compromise safety.

Less importantly, I suppose, is the destruction of the existing baseball and soccer fields east of the school. It seems to me that these enhance the community and not detract from it. I realize everything can potentially be moved to Grand Park, but a community needs a little green space, and this is a well maintained and utilized facilty.

I respectfully ask that the city retain the current SF2 zoning, and disapprove the high density apartments as are being requested.

Sincerely,

William Seaman

Pamela Howard

From: Alphonso Deneve <adeneve@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 8:42 PM
To: APC
Subject: Change of zoning of property of southwestside of 161st and springmill Rd.

To the councilmembers of Westfield

Our names are Alphonso and Benny Deneve. We are propertyowners of 819 Hadleigh Pass in the Enclave of Maple Knoll situated on the Northwestside of 161st and Springmill Rd

We strongly oppose of the rezoning of the acreage on the south side of 161st and Springmill Rd from family residential to an apartment complex

There are many retirees in our neighborhood for whom the potential traffic congestion would be a big problem. We are also concerned. about the property values coming down because of the high traffic Please keep the site zoned SF2

Thank you,

Respectfully

Alphonso and Benny Deneve.

Please keep us in consideration in your decision making. Many of us thought to retire here in a quiet neighborhood.

Pamela Howard

From: Ashley Phipps <phipps27@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2015 1:31 PM
Subject: 161st and Springmill Zoning

To Whom It May Concern:

I live in Maple Knoll and was just made aware of the plans to develop the corner of Springmill and 161st into apartments.

When we moved into our home five years ago we loved being surrounded by open farms and natural areas. I understand that development happens and when I found out that that corner was to be developed, I knew it wasn't ideal but that it would provide an asset to the community and made peace with it.

However, the new proposal to develop this corner into high density housing does not make me happy at all. This will not only add a lot more traffic and congestion to the area, but many of the homes that have back yards on 161st are not very happy about the possibility of looking out their back yard to see apartments.

I am greatly concerned that the residents of the Enclave of Maple Knoll (where I live) and Maple Knoll, were not even notified of these proposed changes yet it will effect all of us! The added traffic congestion, home values and re-saleability of our home will greatly be affected by what is built at this corner and the lack of communication and ability for us to have input into this decision is greatly concerning to me. As a homeowner and a taxpayer, I feel the lack of communication about this development has been less the ideal and I feel very under valued as a citizen in this town and in this location.

I am very much in opposition to the proposed zoning change from SF2 to a PUD to accommodate 290 unit apartment complex.

On behalf of the residence in Maple Knoll who love where we live and who do not want our home values to decrease and our roads to be overly congested, please consider keeping the corner of 161st and Springmill zoned as SF2 and do not allow it to become PUD.

Thank you.

~Ashley
Phipps

Pamela Howard

From: Bob Hurrle <bhurrle53@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 7:14 AM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Zoning change 161st and Springmill

Council members,

My wife and I are residents of the Enclave of Maple knoll and are opposed to the proposed zoning change. We moved from Fishers to escape the multi-family units going up around us. We now find we are in the same situation if the zoning is allowed to change.

We researched and were aware that the property adjacent to the Enclave of Maple Knoll was SF2 and expected it to stay that way.

Please respect your taxpayers wishes and keep the property zoned as is.

Respectively,

Robert and Janice Hurrle
750 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield, Indiana

Pamela Howard

From: Dovesong@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2015 2:05 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Zoning Change Request 161st St.

To the APC and Council Members,

As residents of the Enclave of Maple Knoll, we are in opposition to the request to change the zoning of the current soccer fields on 161st St. from SF2 to PUD.

We are concerned about the increase of traffic the proposed 290 unit apartment development will bring to the neighborhood. As presently configured, the street is not adequate for the amount of traffic this will bring.

Secondly, while the buildings proposed are quite attractive, we are concerned about the 3 story plan for these buildings. We think that something like paired patio homes or small single family homes would be a better fit for the neighborhood. In addition, we think purchased homes rather than rental units would be more desirable.

We would respectfully ask that this request be denied and a better alternative for development of this property be found.

Thank you for your consideration,

Eugene E. and Judith S. Pfaffenberger
818 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield, IN
46204

Pamela Howard

From: j94ta@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2015 6:06 PM
To: APC
Cc: j94ta@aol.com; bllfortier@aol.com
Subject: Concern for 1506-PUD-11 Spring Mill Station SWC PUD

Good afternoon members of the Westfield Advisory Planning Commission,

I am writing in response to your next meeting on 6/15 regarding:

1506-PUD-11
Spring Mill Station SWC PUD
Southwest corner of Springmill Road and 161st Street
Westfield Residential Investors, LLC requests a change in zoning of 20 acres +/- from SF2: Single-family Low Density District to the Spring Mill Station SWC PUD District.
I live at 526 Hadleigh Ct. Westfield in the Enclave of Maple Knoll. Our home is five houses north of 161st Street. Our property backs up to the Northwest Quadrant of the planning area. I have been on the Spring Mill Station Task Force since its inception and have worked diligently with this group to prevent 161st Street and Spring Mill Road from commercial creep down both corridors. According to the Spring Mill Station Plan, the Southwest Corner of 161/Spring Mill was included to ensure coordinated design and transitioning with surrounding neighborhoods and the rest of the planning area, most likely to include a large residential or medical component. (page 17 of the Spring Mill Station Plan)

CRG is proposing in 1506-PUD-11 a very large multi-family residential area. They met with the Spring Mill Station Task Group on April 1st and 15th. The first meeting was to ask us what the task force's desire was for a successful community, the second meeting was drawings of their concept of those desires.

They met design and amenity requests. The overwhelming size of the project was surprising to me. At this second meeting, we gave affirmations to their concept. Spring Mill Station meet a week later to discuss as a group any thoughts about the proposal. I voiced in this meeting that three-story apartments didn't fit the sky-scape of the current area, no other houses in near proximity are three stories high and the unit count would be too much for this area.

It was suggested that we could request the buildings along 161st and along the Cross Winds Commons property line be only two story. This fits the Spring Mill Station Plan under 'Massing' (page 33):

"The buildings in Spring Mill Station should have a comfortable scale in relationship to the pedestrians and should not be overwhelming. The following is a list of encouraged massing elements: 1. Curvilinear elements. 2. Broken planes. 3. Staggered/varied styles/textures. 4. Trees/comfort/elements that draw people to space. 5. Ornamental parapets. 6. Three story buildings when used in context sensitive design. Closer to intersection, buildings should range in size for 1.5 - 2.5 stories; however, buildings could range to 3 stories if nearer higher intensity uses and built in proportion and scale to surrounding buildings."

Our group has not met with them as further follow up to any discussion we have had about their proposal.

In my opinion, this proposed area by CRG is neither a higher intensity use or is it in scale to the surrounding buildings. I trust as honored officials of the Advisory Planning Commission that you will take this into consideration for the future formation of the Southwest Corner of Spring Mill Station.

Highest regards,
Jeannine Fortier
317-840-9823

Pamela Howard

From: John Abell <gjabell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2015 7:50 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Proposed apartment complex at soccer fields west of Springmill on 161st Street

Advisory Plan Commission Officials:
My name is John Abell. My wife, Gloria and I live at 807 Hadleigh Pass, Westfield, in the Maple Knoll subdivision across from Shamrock Springs Elementary. I did not receive any notification of the petition or public hearing relating to the proposed apartment complex at the location of the soccer fields east of Shamrock Springs Elementary. I gained knowledge of the proposed project via neighborhood conversations and emails the past few days. I will not be lengthy in my email opposition to this project. I will only say that although I have several reasons for opposing the project, the #1 reason, by far, is that any large concentration of dwellings, especially apartments, will dramatically increase traffic congestion on 161st Street and Springmill. We have lived in Maple Knoll for nearly eight years and traffic has increased exponentially. I understand that with new neighborhoods being constructed nearby and with Grand Park growing in usage, traffic will increase. However, to build a 290 unit apartment complex in such a small space and so close in proximity to the intersection of 161st and Springmill, traffic will become an even greater problem. I also believe that an apartment complex does not aesthetically flow nor structurally coordinate with the surroundings (I'm sure that is why the area was zoned SF2 originally). Without going into lengthy details and point by point concerns about the proposed rezoning from SF2 to PUD, please understand my staunch opposition to the rezoning request for change. Having only heard of this a few days ago, due to work-related issues, I will likely not be able to attend the Planning Commission's meeting on Monday evening June 15. Please use this email communication to voice my strong objection to a zoning change that would allow for any apartment complex to be constructed in said location.
Thank you for you time and consideration.
John W. Abell and Gloria G. Abell
807 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield, IN 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Josh <joshua.p.phipps@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2015 2:00 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Subject: Proposed rezoning at 161 and Springmill

To whom it may concern,
I've been made aware of the fact that there is a proposal to rezone the land at Springmill and 161st for the purpose of building apartments and I wanted to voice my opinion as I live in the Maple Knoll Enclave. I feel very strongly that this would be a horrible decision for this area of our community and ask that you do not allow this change to take place. I know that many of the residents in my neighborhood agree that this would be a bad thing for our area. Please use good judgment and don't change any zoning that would allow for more apartments here.

Regards,

Josh Phipps

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Howard

From: Natalie <ndcumberl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2015 8:12 PM
To: APC; Council Members
Cc: Trent Zolicoffer
Subject: Enclave of Maple Knoll Apartment Complex Zoning Request

Dear Council Members,

We are very much OPPOSED to the rezoning of the parcel of land located at 161st & Springmill Rd for apartments. As residents of Enclave of Maple Knoll the potential for increased congestion, noise, and the destruction of even more green space is alarming and sad. We specifically sought out and built our home in Westfield because of the quiet and natural beauty of the area. It is disheartening to see the elimination of the rural area in favor of unnecessary development. We feel it is unfair to have the peace of our neighborhood severed for increased traffic, school overcrowding and lowered property values of the Enclave of Maple Knoll subdivision. Yet, the land developers will benefit from the loss of our tranquility within their quiet communities. We are strongly advocating that this land remain zoned for single family homes and not for a planned unit development/apartments.

Sincerely,
Natalie & Trent Zolicoffer
920 Hadleigh Pass
Westfield, IN 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Shannon <tablers@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 8:44 PM
To: APC
Subject: Apartments at 161 and springmill

Please do not grant this petition for another apartment complex!!!! There are apartments just south at 146 and just north of 169th. We have enough apartments on spring mill road. Thanks, Shannon Bitler

RE: Petition from a developer requesting a Zoning Change from SF2 (Single Family Residential Low Density) to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) to accommodate a proposed 290 unit apartment complex located on the current soccer fields here on 161st St.

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Howard

From: Bobby Kimball <bkimball@zcklaw.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 3:05 PM
To: APC
Subject: Opposition to Zoning Change from SF2 (Single Family Residential Low Density) to a PUD (Planned Unit Development)

I am a resident of the Enclave of Maple Knoll neighborhood and oppose any zoning change that would place an apartment complex in the soccer fields next to Shamrock Springs. I only just learned of this proposal and would attend on Monday, if I did not have a conflict on my calendar. My opposition is based upon the following:

(1) **First and Foremost**- 161st Street can't sustain that amount of an increase in traffic. We are talking conservatively another 400 cars per day through that intersection for the apartment complex alone. All of 161st street is a nightmare at rush hour. They are already building hundreds more homes in Harmony and other neighborhoods on Ditch that will make 161st/Spring Mill unbearable in the future. Please do not make matters worse.
(2) Apartment complexes get lots of visitors (especially a 290 unit apartment complex). I worry about the close proximity to Shamrock Springs. Sex offenders visiting or short staying with friends? Please protect our children.
(3) I rented in college and every apartment complex I lived at suffered from frequent car break-ins and burglary. I worry about this leaching into our neighborhoods. I worry for my own home, but especially for my neighbors located directly across from the proposed complex. A vast majority of the homeowners in this location are over 55 (neighborhood was initially marketed as such) and some may be vulnerable targets.
(4) The current existing apartments in Westfield are not at capacity. Why do we need more?
(5) Are you aware that people will be using HUD housing vouchers to afford the new apartments in Westfield and the renters under these programs are notorious for inviting friends/relatives to stay with them? The friends/relatives permitted to stay are not like the renters and often have drug problems and criminal records. <u>This is already happening in our community.</u> How many of the new residents of the 290 unit apartment complex will fit this description in the future?
(6) This area should contain single family homes who own and not rent. There is a vast difference between the typical person who rents and a typical person who owns. Our homeowners care about their community, maintain their property and comply with laws.

I do not support this proposal.

Sincerely,

Bobby J. Avery-Kimball
16111 Howden Drive
Westfield, IN 46074

Pamela Howard

From: Rose Wallis <rose@stewartrichardson.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 2:22 PM
To: APC
Cc: Council Members
Subject: RE: Spring Mill Station PUD proposal

To whom it may concern regarding the petition from a developer requesting a Zoning Change from SF2 (Single Family Residential Low Density) to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) to accommodate a proposed 290 unit apartment complex located on the current soccer fields here on 161st St.:

We moved to Westfield 2 ½ years ago because it was growing, had great schools and yet still maintained a bit of that small-town, country-feel. I've watched Westfield grow by leaps and bounds in the last two years. Most of it for the better. However, EVERY single time I drive by another field that was corn and has sense become developed land, my heart just sinks. I love our Kroger and the shops that make up Spring Mill station. My child plays soccer for WYSA at Shamrock Springs. I do NOT want to see apartments go into that intersection. I've heard that the apartments at 32 and Spring Mill have plenty of vacancies so why the need to add more apartments? I worry about the safety of the kids at that school. I worry about the increase in traffic that apartments would bring. I worry about all the JUNK that comes with apartment living.

I know you're going to do what you're going to do, but if you want the opinion of a concerned citizen, I'm offering my two cents. We don't need an already- busy intersection busier. We don't need more apartments or housing of any kind, for that matter – Kroger is ridiculously busy as it is. If you want to add retail, I think people would accept that. There are apartments at 146th Street and Spring Mill, and multiple options at 32 and Spring Mill. Why on earth do we need more at 161st Street?

Please reconsider.

Sincerely,

Rose L. Wallis
Chief Operating Officer

Direct: 317-275-0055
Direct Fax: 317-275-0056

StewartRichardson
DEPOSITION SERVICES
800.869.0873 www.stewartrichardson.com
One Indiana Square, Suite 2425 Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indianapolis • Evansville • Fort Wayne • Valparaiso

Pamela Howard

From: Marcalleni <marcalleni@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 4:12 PM
To: APC
Subject: Apartments at 161st and Spring Mill

Dear Council Members,
When we moved to Westfield 9 years ago we were excited to find a community where traffic was low and access to stores was easy. We liked the small town feel of the area and have loved being in the Enclave of Maple Knoll. Now it seems we're being besieged by developers wanting huge developments that have to be squeezed into small existing areas such as these apartments, several subdivisions on Towne Dr, several new subdivisions north on Spring Mill and even more on 146th st. I think we are creating an overload of housing areas which will in turm create traffic issues as well as "school" issues. Are we really watching the numbers and the areas? Ruth KeenanHillmer, 16270 Dursley Ct

Pamela Howard

From: Shelbie Spiller <sgspiller@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 3:55 PM
To: Council Members
Cc: APC; Rob Stokes; Bob Smith; rhorkay@wetfield.in.gov; Steve Hoover; slehman@westfield.in.gov; Cindy Spoljaric; Jim Ake
Subject: 161st/Springmill Apartment Complex

Dear Council Members & Advisory Planning Commission Members,

I am writing this to express my opposition and concern regarding a proposed apartment complex at the corner of 161st & Springmill.

I live in the Maple Knoll subdivision off Springmill. This area is already a very busy intersection. Adding a large apartment complex is going to make it much worse. This side of Westfield is in desperate need of more retail shops and restaurants. We need a drugstore such as CVS or Walgreens, for example. We need family dining options.

Adding a 300 unit apartment complex is not only going to cause traffic issues, but it will also increase the need for more retail and restaurants.

We also only have one entrance in and out of our neighborhood. The increase of cars on Springmill that an apartment complex would create, is going to make it even more difficult to get in and out.

I am all for retail shops and restaurants going in at that location, as it is something that we desperately need in this area. But with all the new subdivisions already in the works, an apartment complex is the LAST thing we need.

I hope that you all will consider those of us that would be impacted by this when making a decision to approve or disapprove this complex. As a neighborhood controlled by a developer, and does not have our own actual HOA, it is hard to have our opinions heard. I hope you will listen.

Thank you for your consideration,
James & Shelbie Spiller

Sent from my iPhone