

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Docket Number: 1606-PUD-13 (Ord. 16-26)
Petitioner: EdgeRock Development, LLC
Request: To expand and amend The Trails Planned Unit Development (PUD) District, consisting of 21.0 acres +/-.

Enclosed Attachments:

1. Naas Email (08/15/16) Linda Naas (161st Street Neighbors)

Kevin M. Todd, AICP

From: Linda Naas <linaas@logickey.com>
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 5:41 PM
To: Kevin M. Todd, AICP; APC
Subject: The Trails PUD Amendment - APC, Ordinance 16-26

Kevin and APC:

This document is confusing as it says underlying zoning MF-2 applies except as what is listed in this Ord 16-26 with no mention of Ord 15-27.

Maximum number of units per MF2 in UDO:

10/acre
150 per Project
10 units/structure

We are still opposed to the original Ord 15-27 allowing 300 units.

There is no information on the acreage in the whole project or the Lots A, B, or C as Exhibits are still missing from the proposed Ord 16-26.

Is the floodway buildable? Is it a legal drain or a flood plain?

As Oak Ridge Rd expands, how will the right in-right out for Lot B affect traffic flow on Oak Ridge and SR32?

We don't think this development meets the SR 32 Overlay requirements for use and should be in compliance.

Does the right-in/right out comply with the plan for SR32 Overlay?

Are these the best locations for Crew Carwash (any carwash) or a drive-thru Starbucks based on access and SR32?

Shouldn't access have to be from an outer road with access from an existing street or an internal street to The Trails?

We are opposed to more road cuts on SR32 within the Overlay than already exists as this area is becoming congested as it exists now.

We think all parcels of this PUD should have internal access or existing streets and ask you to remove road cuts to private homes/businesses currently existing on SR32 that will become part of this PUD.

Is this project per UDO 3/4 mile from other MF zoning districts?

With the large increase in the number of MF districts, we believe this part of the UDO should be complied with by The Trails.

How does the City cover costs of Public Safety and how does the School District cover costs if all this is built in a TIF district?

If everything is on the table when an amendment comes forth, then we ask that this PUD come into compliance with the underlying zoning and the SR32 Overlay.

This PUD has existing issues and as they are expanding it, brings these more to light. The changes in Lot A already reflect a change in a short period of time. The Comprehensive Plan and SR32 Overlay should have much more consideration in forming this PUD that will work for the future of Westfield growth. It would appear the plans have been short-sighted and prepared in a hurried manner. The language in the original Ord 15-27 and this amendment Ord 16-26 sometimes contradict one another and are confusing. Please give this PUD Amendment more consideration so that it can stand the test of time, considering many of these PUDs take many years to be built, beyond 10 years even. The lack of planning and adhering to a larger overall plan, creates issues as the PUD builds out, reference the Viking Meadows PUD as an example. For one example, It appears there will be another street crossing the Monon Trail for this PUD, streets that are internal to a PUD which create safety issues.

Thank you for your consideration,

Linda Naas
On behalf of the 161st Street Neighbors