



JAMES E. SHINAVER
LAWRENCE J. KEMPER *
JOHN B. FLATT *
FREDRIC LAWRENCE
VALERIE L. MATHEIS **
JANE B. MERRILL – Of Counsel

JON C. DOBOSIEWICZ
Land Use Professional

*Also licensed in Kentucky
**Also licensed in Illinois

Via E-mail

January 4, 2022

City of Westfield Planning Department
Attn: Pam Howard

**Re: Courtyards at Spring Mill PUD (2111-PUD-28)
Platinum Properties Management Company
Ordinance resubmittal and response to “Issue List”**

Dear Daine:

Per our recent discussions on the above referenced matter, please find attached an updated PUD Ordinance, red-line of the PUD Ordinance and updated exhibits as well as the below response to issue list comments:

Courtyards at Spring Mill Issue List

From Public Hearing:

- Density – Too dense for the area/too many units **The number homes has been reduced by 14 to 184. In addition the overall density of the development is consistent with other residential developments in the vicinity and slightly higher to the extent that the neighborhood is a transition adjacent to commercial and industrial uses planned for properties to the south and east of the subject parcel.**
- Road Upgrades – 186th needs upgraded **The City of Westfield continues to invest in 186th Street improvements including the street cross section and round-a-bout at 186th and Spring Mill. The majority of traffic generated by this development is anticipated to travel south on Spring Mill and then east or west on State Road 32 or further south on Spring Mill for access to US 31 or other commercial amenities along or south of State Road 32. Additionally, the proposed resident profile don't travel at the typical AM/PM peaks so there will be less traffic impact than a typical subdivision including the same number of homes.**
- Airstrip – Be mindful in general. Also concerns on ponds/wildlife brought by ponds & proximity to airstrip. Possibility of several small ponds instead of larger pond. Concerns on home proximity to airstrip. Could this be a “fly-in community”? **The development of the site shall comply with all state and federal rules and requirements associated with the proximity of the airstrip as other developments to the south, east and west have done or will be required to do (including features such as stormwater management and building heights). The parcel to the east has**

been rezoned to permit commercial and industrial uses. The developer does not have a concept for a “fly-in community”. To the extent that the market would support a “fly-in” community, the owner of the airstrip would likely be an active participant and develop their real estate to facilitate such a development.

- Appropriateness of use – Is it appropriate considering the proximity to Grand Park? Development of the site with a higher-intensity residential home product is consistent with the Addendum to the Comprehensive Plan associated with Grand Park (see notes below).
- Age Targeted – Why targeted and not restricted? Text has been added for the development to be “age-restricted”.
- Comp plan – Goes against The Comprehensive Plan identifies the real estate as residential. The location is also in the area identified as the “Family Sports Capital” Addendum. The Addendum supports higher density residential uses, after development of the Sports Campus, in addition to sports related uses with and surrounding the sports Campus as illustrated by other higher density resident uses along 186th Street, Horton Road, 196th Street, and Wheeler Road. The distinction here is that the proposed use is an age restricted development attractive to seniors desiring to make a significant investment in continued single family detached home ownership rather than multi-family for rent or attached residential in areas where such restrictions do not exist.
- Layout – Courtyards at Westfield layout better – not grid See revised site plan which provides modifications which eliminate the “grid” like layout. Modifications eliminate the “grid-like” layout by creating an overall design with a large, centrally focused and accessible amenity area, green spaces within a walkable community of interconnected loop streets and cul de sacs.”
- Quality – Needs to be upgraded to an “upscale neighborhood” The anticipated home style and architectural requirements will result in a community of homes with significant amenities and values ranging from between \$400,000 and \$550,000.
- Shouldn’t be a PUD – it only reduces standards and increases density. The proposed development includes significant enhancement in terms of dwelling architecture and amenities over those standards required under the UDO. The City of Westfield has been consistent in its direction to applicants that development should occur under requirements established under a PUD format, rather than free standing commitments which could be considered as part of a straight zoning request. However, in this case, open space, higher amenity requirements, home architectural standards, and home product type are all positively addressed in a location where higher residential development density is supported under the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Nonetheless, the requested plan revisions have resulted in 14 fewer lots that proposed originally.

From Supplied Written Comments (**Note: All proposed PUD language for which comments were supplied, with exception of proposed modified Fence standard language, is the exact same as the unanimously approved Courtyards at Westfield PUD Ordinance**)

- “Add something committing to covenants not allowing rentals”
 - **Note:** Staff does not support this as language within the PUD Ordinance itself as it is not enforceable from a zoning perspective All homes will be individually for sale. Home values (\$400,000 to \$550,000) will not lend these homes to be attractive as rentals. Based on this and Staff recommendation, no change has been made to the Ordinance.

- Front Yard Setback
 - “Oddly worded. Driveway needs to accommodate parked vehicle while not impeding sidewalk” The minimum distance between the garage doors and the street right of way shall be 20 feet. The minimum setback from the front porch, front door or courtyard fence shall be 10 feet.
- Architectural Standards
 - Building Elevations
 - “Garages should be behind plane of home” Some element of each home is forward of the garage in all cases
 - “Essentially no standards provided – vague, no min windows, corner breaks” See revised PUD standards.
 - “Only front elevations shown” Side elevations are not visible from outside the development, as this is the space occupied by exterior courtyards.
 - Building Materials
 - “Need more info” See Section 7.1 B of the PUD.
 - “No Min. Masonry Anywhere” See revised PU Ordinance requirement for masonry on the front elevations.
 - Perimeter Lots
 - “There is really nothing here...refer to point system for facades facing ROW in UDO” Rear facades on perimeter lots shall include: (a) maximum 1 ½ story dwelling; and (b) a minimum of one or two windows with 5 ½” trim as deemed appropriate based upon the façade’s massing; and (c) landscaping consistent with the Spring Mill road external street frontage 30’ buffer detail outlined in the Buffer Yard Plan; and (d) Twelve (12) inch overhangs around the entire Dwelling, as measured prior to the installation of Masonry Materials; and (e) a minimum roof pitch of 8:12 around the entire dwelling on all main roof areas.
 - “Courtyard - ?” Exhibits in PUD illustrate courtyard spaces
 - Front Building Façade orientation – “is not an architectural feature” Understood.
 - Garages and Driveways
 - “Garage door should not protrude from main plane front elevation...no snout nose” The PUD standards prohibit this design orientation.
- Fence standards
 - “What kind of fence?” These fences may be ornamental metal or vinyl and shall not exceed six (6) feet in height.
 - “No fences 6 feet in height in front yards unless visual provided deemed acceptable”
 - **Note:** UDO permits fences in the Established Front Yard today, but at a max height of 42 inches See designs in Exhibit K. On corner lots, fencing shall not be located within the Front Yard Setback. Fencing with gate(s) may be located behind the Setbacks, within the side and rear yards to enclose courtyards. These fences may be ornamental metal and shall not exceed forty-eight (48) inches in height. Additional landscaping may be planted between the fence and the front, side or rear Setbacks but shall not restrict site visibility.
- Lot Landscaping

- “No landscape required at all except front yard” – correct. The courtyards are enclosed by a fence and the rear yards are not used. They act as common space
- Mounding in Buffer Yard/External Street Frontage Landscape Area
 - “UDO would prescribe mound” – The applicant has provided an alternate plan that they believe provides a more appealing look along the Spring Mill site perimeter. Again, rear yards are not used with the courtyard product.
- Temporary Use and Events
 - “Don’t like unlimited number of temporary model home uses”
 - “Permit for temp model home shouldn’t be unlimited...could always have unknown number of model homes” – A maximum of two (2) shall be permitted.
- Open Space and Amenity Standards
 - “open areas permitted as parkettes could literally be a few feet of grass between structures per language” – See conceptual amenities plan for typical parkette. Text can be added if necessary
 - “COA should be issued prior to 101st permit otherwise could legally start but never finish the clubhouse amenity” The PUD text has been amended to require a Certificate of Occupancy for the Clubhouse amenity prior to the issuance of 80 home building permits.
- Duration
 - Modify language See revised Text.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and please contact me should you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

NELSON & FRANKENBERGER, LLC

Jon C. Dobosiewicz

Jon C. Dobosiewicz
Land Use Professional

Enclosures