

Kevin M. Todd, AICP

From: Neal Wixson <nwxn300@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 11:18 AM
To: Kevin M. Todd, AICP
Cc: Cindy Spoljaric; Council Members; Andy Cook
Subject: Parcel J Development

**Kevin Todd
Senior Planner
City of Westfield
130 Penn Street
Westfield, IN 46067**

Dear Mr. Todd:

As residents of the Bridgewater Lakes Garden Homes, we are writing regarding the continued development of the Townhome portion of the eastern most section of Bridgewater directly across Gray Road from Guerin High School. The developers realize that the current product offering for this area does not appear to be a viable solution for completing the development as originally set forth in the PUD. As a result of this lack of viability, they are submitting variance requests for their updated product and platting. We would like to provide you with direct feedback on our neighborhood's concerns with the variance request. Our neighborhood of 35 homes is immediately North of the proposed variances and, in fact, will be impacted with continuation of the main street through our neighborhood, Mystic Rock Drive, its planned completion.

As a framework for expressing our concerns, we understand that the developer would not have to seek any variance to continue the current development as originally planned. The developer recognizes the lack of marketability for this plan and desires to make effective changes. It should be noted that similar changes were made to Bridgewater Garden Homes. It was originally planned to be a collection of shared walled single story homes. When variances for our neighborhood were put in place to accommodate market demands, the development was completed with free standing single story homes. Although the scope of this variance in the Garden Homes changed the architectural flow, no consideration of the transitional area between the Garden Homes and Town Homes was addressed at that point in time. Now seems like a logical time to optimize this merging of what has become a more distinctly different plan than originally set forth.

Peter Wang organized a very informative meeting with his developers and presented us with his plans and thoughts regarding the continued development. There were representatives in attendance from Bridgewater Villas, Bridgewater Lakes and Bridgewater Townhomes. There was good dialogue and open discussion from all perspectives.

Below are the areas of adjustment that we expressed concern with upon reviewing the developer's current plan.

Street Completion

Mystic Rock Drive is planned to continue from a current dead end in our neighborhood and connect to the other end of Mystic Rock Drive which will complete a semi-circular street with two entrances into the neighborhoods from Market Center Drive. We believe a southbound spur off of Mystic Rock Drive on to Guerin Way would relieve traffic through both ends of the neighborhoods, create better flow for all residents and provide better flow for emergency vehicles.

Neighborhood to Neighborhood Transition

As a result of both ends of this neighborhood ending up with significantly different homes than originally planned there, should be a clear and significant transitional space between the Garden Homes and Townhomes.

1. Ideally a gate could be used to separate our community from the new community. Gates are used in almost all of the Bridgewater communities.
2. A community marker Brick Wall commensurate with the other end of the neighborhood should be erected
3. A cul-de-sac turnaround area could benefit all residents as well as service vehicles entering and exiting the area.

Density and Proximity

The plan we saw had suggested a change from 41 units to 36. Our concern lies more with proximity than density. Bridgewater Garden Homes also had to reduce density to adjust to free standing homes.

The proximity barrier of 20' between the Garden Homes southern most homes and the Townhomes northernmost homes is unacceptable. We believe there are two possible solutions for this.

1. Adjusting all green space to the North end of the Town Home plans to maximize the separation.
2. Reduce the density by one lot eliminating the northernmost lot and converting it to green space.

Architectural Diversity

The new plan calls for a change from fully bricked structures with identical facades to multiple styles and combinations of exterior surfaces with varying elevations.

1. This should make the streetscape more appealing as the garage entries facing the streets will look more like the front of a home than an alley entrance
2. We suggested that the end wall of end units be required to be fully bricked.
3. We were unsure of the current maximum height of the townhomes but feel that any new homes should not exceed the current height of any existing unit.

Proof of Concept

A big concern is a lack of proof of concept for this product. We asked if we could go to view an existing neighborhood with this product and received no answer. With no real assurance that the market will exist for a 22' wide free standing vertical living environment, we feel that all other aspects of the development need to be desirable beyond reproach. We received feedback that logical progression of this neighborhood would allow for proof of concept in the southwest quadrant of the development which would be built first. A planned assurance of not continuing to build further until demand is demonstrated would be desirable.

We look forward to seeing final plans delivered to the planning commission for variance. We will be in attendance at the public meetings and share our concerns. We are all very encouraged that the developer has realized the need to create a new product for completion of this area. We firmly believe a viable and amicable plan will be worked out to facilitate profitable completion for the developers and enhanced environments for the residents and not jeopardize the appearance of and traffic flow in our community.

We strongly encourage you to consider the above concerns so that this is resolved in everyone's satisfaction.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Neal and Donna Wixson

Mystic Drive resident

APC meeting Statement – December 7, 2015

My name is Neal Wixson and I live at 15440 Mystic Rock Dr. This development is going in right next to my house.

Bridgewater is a community of separate neighborhoods, each with distinctive entrances. Some have wrought iron gates; some have single entrances with circular or semicircular streets. All have limited access and all entrances are labeled with brick and stone signs. We live in the Garden Homes community in Bridgewater with 35 houses and about 60 residents. It is a low density single family home community of small one story homes with residents primarily being retirees or semi retirees. The Townhouse community is next to us with a separate entrance. It is composed of, at this point, five 3 story brick buildings. In approximately 36 units, there appears to be about 70 residents. It is a high density community. Although the primary road for each community has the same, Mystic Rock Dr., it doesn't connect. With the same road name, it has been fraught with problems, resulting in delayed fire rescue responses, vendor delivery problems, and service call problems.

In short, the Garden Home community and the Town Home community are vastly different. In this proposal, the total number from units will go from approximately 36 to 72, a doubling of the number of units. The total residents the residents will be going from about 70 to about 140, again doubling the number of residents. Yet they are intertwined by the small single street of Mystic Rock Drive, which will now be connected.

I direct your attention to **Section F** of the application submitted to the City Council. It is titled: "**Garden Homes Buffer Landscaping Details.**"

It is blank. The developer has chosen not to have this included for the public comment at the City Council meeting and now at this public hearing. This public hearing by law is intended to allow the public to comment on the application.

To not have a plan for us to comment upon is a farce and does not show any goodwill to our adjoining community. In fact, it may be illegal. It is surprising and questionable that the City of Westfield permits this behavior. Look at the track record of this developer. Page 9 of the presentation to the City Council, shows the mistakes that the developer has made in the previous townhouse development which provide a rationale for the changes in the new development. It shows the side elevation of a townhouse building clustered with electric meters and gas meters. My

view from my backyard includes 8 electric meters and 7 gas meters on end of the townhouse buildings. There is no landscaping or latticework to shield them. The developer says that the utility companies wouldn't let him do any screening. However, on the west side of the townhouse building farthest north, there is a pine tree that screen the utility boxes. As President of the Town Homes HOA, he has been in a position to correct some of these smaller cost problems for over 10 years, but has chosen not to do so.

Now you know why we are so concerned with the landscaping between the communities. At this point, there is no plan for transition landscaping submitted to either the City Council or the Planning Committee for the public comment. This is not consistent with the spirit of the public comment requirements and may be an effort to skirt the law. And yet the City of Westfield condones it.

After this public hearing, we will be told that it is too late to comment or be forced to set aside the decision by appeal or otherwise. I request that a public hearing be held just on Exhibit F, The Garden Home Landscaping Details. If this is not done, this body will be the only one who see it and has input into the real plan. Please be very careful with your decision. It is being made without public comment.