

## WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Docket Number:** 1610-PUD-17

**Petitioner:** Platinum Properties Management Company, LLC by Nelson & Frankenberger

**Request:** Petitioner requests a change of zoning of 265.1 acres +/- from the AG-SF1: Agriculture / Single-Family Rural District; OI: Open Industrial District to the Drexler Woods Planned Unit Development (PUD) District to allow for a mixed-use development to include single-family residential, single-family attached residential, and commercial uses.

### Enclosed Attachments:

- |                            |                                  |            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Kooy, Craig             | 19401 Freemont Moore Rd          | (11/30/16) |
| 2. Smitson, John           | 19653 Six Points Rd              | (12/02/16) |
| 3. McLaren, Andrew         | 931 W. 193 <sup>rd</sup> Street  | (12/04/16) |
| 4. Plumer, Kim             | 19030 Spring Mill Road           | (12/04/16) |
| 5. McLaren, Sandra         | 931 W 193 <sup>rd</sup> Street   | (12/04/16) |
| 6. Pictor, Amy             | 24 E. 191 <sup>st</sup> Street   | (12/05/16) |
| 7. Hamilton, Brian         | 721 W. 193 <sup>rd</sup> Street  | (12/05/16) |
| 8. Boardman, Dan           | 1510 W. 206 <sup>th</sup> Street | (12/05/16) |
| 9. Higgins, Tim & Lisa     | 19411 Six Points Road            | (12/05/16) |
| 10. Smith, Robert & Angela | 19449 Six Points Road            | (12/05/16) |
| 11. Hamilton, Kelly        | 721 W. 193 <sup>rd</sup> Street  | (12/05/16) |
| 12. Carey, Jim & Lynn      |                                  | (12/05/16) |
| 13. Saunders, Don          | 19519 Six Points Road            | (12/05/16) |
| 14. Medlen, Mike & Laura   | 1515 W. 206 <sup>th</sup> Street | (12/05/16) |

**From:** [Craig Kooy](#)  
**To:** [mpleasent@westfieldin.gov](mailto:mpleasent@westfieldin.gov)  
**Subject:** Drexler Woods PUD District  
**Date:** Thursday, December 1, 2016 11:24:21 AM  
**Attachments:** [Westfield.jpg](#)

---

Matt

Thanks for taking the time to talk on the phone in regards to the Drexler Woods PUD District.

First I would like to talk about the problem with water drainage in this area. Each spring the Eagle Creek River Floods because it is unable to handle the large volume of water coming from all the farm lands. If you look at the attached google maps you can see that this area has large volume of water coming from Horton road, 191st street and the woods North of 193rd. Each spring it can get several feet deep in the field North of 193rd and the Creek will flow over the road. With high density housing this will only compound the problem and retention ponds will fill and then dump water into the creek. If the lots were a lot larger and fewer homes being constructed it can allow this water to naturally soak into the soil vs being dumped into a Creek that is currently unable to handle the volume. If you look South at the buildings being constructed on Casey road this land is more suited for High Density home because the land is higher and has adequate drainage.

Second, The home being constructed on 193rd street and in this area are all Higher value homes. It would be better suited to keep land value higher for everyone if we keep areas of affordable homes and high value homes grouped together.

I'm all for development but smart planning can make for a better city. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks,

Craig Kooy  
317-513-0175 Cell

**From:** [John Smitson](#)  
**To:** [prioux@platinum-properties.com](mailto:prioux@platinum-properties.com)  
**Cc:** [Matt Pleasant](#); [Brian Heaton \(bheaton@kdlegal.com\)](mailto:bheaton@kdlegal.com)  
**Subject:** Drexler Woods  
**Date:** Friday, December 2, 2016 1:56:25 PM

---

Paul,

Great to meet you Wednesday night. On the surface, I look forward to seeing the project move forward as well as hearing more details of landscaping and barriers. The Stone Center does not have much retail traffic, but can be very busy with truck deliveries and contractor pick up Mon-Sat 7am to 5pm. We strive to be a good neighbor, but there will be a fair amount of noise and dust from equipment etc.. My overall goal is to turn neighbors into customers, therefore I want to take care of avoidable issues ahead of time.

Cheers, John

John Smitson

President/ Owner

Stone Center of Indiana

317-849-9100 work

317-697-9639 cell

Andrew McLaren  
691 W. 193<sup>rd</sup> street  
Sheridan IN 46069

12/4/16

Re: Drexler Woods Development

Dear Area Planning Commission Members,

Very recently I received notice about the proposed Drexler Woods development and I have some concerns about the diagram that was included. My family moved to Westfield from Carmel over three years ago for several reasons. One of these reasons was that we were interested in the availability of home sites that felt rural while still being included in our fine school system and community. The proposed development jeopardizes much of what brought us to Northwest Westfield in the first place.

The size of the lots in the "Age Restricted" housing portion is much too small. My lot and most of the surrounding lots are at least three acres in size, and some of them are much larger. Having seven homes per acre (or even the 2.6 averaged out with the green spaces that the developer is claiming) is crowded and disproportionate to the existing, surrounding homes. It is my understanding that, according to the city's master plan, lot sizes just North or West of here will be mandated to be three acres or more. There does not seem to be a transition from overcrowded to spacious. The proposed square footages of the houses are similarly undersized

and will potentially attract a population different from the one that the builder claims to be seeking.

There is minimal planned buffer between 193<sup>rd</sup> street and the houses. There should be at least forty yards of space between the road and the first lot in the new development. The diagram shows a pond planned across from the field at 193<sup>rd</sup> and Springmill. It makes sense to relocate this pond to the Western corner of the development on 193<sup>rd</sup> street to provide a larger space between the existing homes and the proposed new ones. There should also be provisions for front facing houses on all road fronts. I believe that this is mandatory per city ordinance. Details of fencing, tree barriers, and entryway appearances need to be outlined as well.

It is my understanding that the long term plan is to expand 193<sup>rd</sup> street in order to allow for the larger traffic burden that would be incurred as the local population expands. Any expansion on the South side of 193<sup>rd</sup> would destroy old growth trees, carefully planted newer trees, and landscaping that exists. For this reason, I would like a guarantee that any sidewalk/path construction or widening/expanding of 193<sup>rd</sup> street would take place on the north side of the road. Obviously, this thinking applies to Horton, 191<sup>st</sup> street, parts of Springmill, Six Points, and others.

The developments of Areas "A" and "B" are of concern as well. First the density of housing in the duplex/quadrplex section is out of place. These types of dwellings will almost certainly lead to the myriad of problems that come with lower end and overcrowded housing developments. Secondly, the "local business" portion of this section is concerning because it has not been defined or limited in any way. Fast food/carry-out restaurants, Gas stations, night-

clubs, concert halls, department stores, and grocery stores are examples of business that should be prohibited from opening in this area. Strip malls should not be constructed.

It seems only fair to have limits to sound and light in the area in general. There is already substantial light pollution coming from Grand Park and any escalation of this would be intrusive and should be disallowed. The quiet and darkness that we enjoy is so special and should not be lost.

My family loves the town of Westfield and we want nothing more than to keep the character of our town while allowing for the controlled expansion that our civic leaders desire. I am proud to say that I will be moving my place of business here, and I truly believe in the future of Westfield. If possible, I would prefer that the historic farm and farm house to the north remains a working farm, but I recognize that this is not a reality. I desire only to enjoy the rural lifestyle that brought me here in the first place.

Sincerely,

Andrew McLaren

**From:** [Kim Plumer](#)  
**To:** [APC](#)  
**Subject:** Drexler Woods Development  
**Date:** Sunday, December 4, 2016 9:43:54 PM

---

December 4, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

My husband and I are raising our family at 19030 SpringMill Rd. We have lived here 13 years but began purchasing our 3 acre dream more than 15 years ago.

We have watched the explosion of Grand Park and sat back quietly and embraced the growth of the "Family Sports Capital of the World". Some refer to this as progress. The families in the northwest quadrant of 31 & 32 have been greatly impacted by Grand Park. We've tolerated traffic-most of which isn't from our community. Farmers pull over for endless lines of cars to pass-most rushing to their sporting event.

Area A of the proposed Drexler Woods suggest local business. This area is roughly 500 feet from our home. With out-of-state traffic from Grand Park this area will be supported by out-of-state guest...people with nothing vested in our community. This could potentially increase crime in the area.

Our school system is working hard to accommodate the current growth. Area B is proposing a quadplex community which will put more strain on the current overcrowding in

our schools.

Area C is proposing very high density housing. There needs to be a transition between what we currently have in the area and growth in the area.

My husband and I chose to raise our boys in the "country". If we wanted high density housing we would have selected an area south of State Rd 32. When we chose to build on SpringMill we were required to have at least a 3 acre parcel. At the time 3 acres seemed to be a fair transition to those who resided north of 32. We feel it's in the best interest of our farming community and families that have chosen to live in this area to maintain or preserve the lifestyle in which we have chosen. The proposed high density homes is not healthy for Westfield or what the northwest quadrant of 31 & 32 is all about.

Kim Plumer  
19030 SpringMill Rd.  
Westfield  
317-339-0148

December 4, 2016

Sandra McLaren  
691 West 193<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Sheridan, IN 46069

Dear Area Planning Committee Members:

I am contacting you regarding the new development, Drexler Woods, which will be located directly across the street from my home. We moved from Carmel to Westfield 3 years ago to get away from the suburban sprawl and to live in the country. We love it up here and feel very much a part of this great community. We were drawn to the smaller town and size of the schools. So having this development coming in directly across the street creates some concerns.

In the zoning regulations of the Comp Plan Compliance with New Suburban it states: *Between new suburban and more rural neighborhood, use larger lots and increased open space.* This plan is suggesting that a high density neighborhood be put smack dab in the middle of a rural area that has no other neighborhoods. So, it seems to me that having larger lot sizes per house would make for a better transition and be more consistent with this regulation. The Comprehensive Plan Map shows the Rural Northwest area right at the edge of this area. This area mandates that lot size be a minimum of 3 acres. It seems that it would be more natural to have homes on bigger lots.

I would like to see the buffer area be at least 100 feet from 193<sup>rd</sup> street to the new lots. I would like to see front facing homes; I think this is necessary to help make this buffer feel more natural. Landscaping, fencing and entrances should be substantial and in keeping with the area. Requiring the neighborhood to be a gated community would provide more privacy for them and us.

Area A is zoned for local business and has not been defined in detail. I am not in favor of gas stations, take out restaurants, night clubs, trailer parks or strip malls. Area B is of concern from a density standpoint as well. It will be too crowded and could bring the wrong type of element to the area. Along with this will come more traffic and more light and noise pollution. Being able to go outside and look up and see the amazing stars will be compromised. We already have a lot of light coming from Grand Park and it would seem unfair to create even more.

I understand that development is a part of the process. I just want the City of Westfield to be careful when approving plans that are not consistent with the needs of the community.

Regards,

Sandie McLaren

**From:** [Amy Pictor](#)  
**To:** [APC](#); [Matt Pleasant](#)  
**Cc:** [jim pictor](#)  
**Subject:** Drexler Woods Development  
**Date:** Monday, December 5, 2016 8:49:44 AM

---

Dear Planning Commission,

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed development and do have several concerns:

- Our big picture concerns is allowing this dense of development when the current zoning calls for a minimum of 3 acres and how to transition from high density within the northwest quadrant. We understood that the NW quadrant was to remain rural. We understand there is demand for development and opportunities for land owners, but this development needs to be driven by responsible growth.
  - How will the infrastructure be supported with utilities, ie: water and sewer? How can development be approved when the support is not in place and without a timeline?
  - How will the traffic be supported with an increase of the proposed 450 homes and potential apartments, which would equate to double the number of vehicles?
  - How is the feel of the last remaining country space in the township going to be preserved?
  
- Why are so many development projects assigned PUD zoning? We are very concerned about the lack of information provided for Area A & B. What proposed plans are in writing for this proposed development? A map with areas identified without any documentation is insufficient to approve this zoning.
  - We would be strongly opposed to an apartment complex along Horton Road, especially if it is similar to Casey Acres.
  - In regards to an age restricted community – what does this mean? Wouldn't a semi-retirement community make more sense closer to 161<sup>st</sup> near stores.
  - We would be concerned for a gas station to be in the middle of a residential area
  - We understand the the UDO standards for Westfield are written at a low standard and may need to be revised.
  - Neighbors in our area need to be given more specific information about plans and there should be strict guidelines for the developer to follow.
  
- *We are very concerned about our road frontage property along Horton Road being eliminated with a roundabout in the middle of the Bray property. How will we be compensated for this loss and de-valuing of our road frontage property?*
  - With all properties developed on a grid and squared – throughout time -- what is the desire to connect 191<sup>st</sup> and 193<sup>rd</sup> Street?
  - 193<sup>rd</sup> Street doesn't go very far until it deadends into Joilet Road.
  - Is there a reason a roundabout couldn't be developed at 191<sup>st</sup> and Springmill Road to encourage traffic to slow down?
  - With 191<sup>st</sup> Street being an exit from Highway 31, wouldn't this roundabout

complicate traffic attempting to park at Grand Park's lot just west of Horton Road?

- There is pressure for development in Westfield, but it is moving at too rapid of a pace
  - There is a rising voice in our community about too much development with the recent developments from Woodland to Auroa. It's time to step back and review what is already approved. Please listen to these concerns.
  - As a Commission you have the authority to pause this development to fine tune requirements.
  - The development along Casey Road is extremely un-attractive and disjointed. We have a large apartment complex with neighborhoods growing out of fields.
  - As a community, we don't want the continuation of random, unconnected neighborhoods springing up within the township. We thought that was the point of developing a master plan. Village Farms is a development with actual streets, uniquely designed homes vs. an isolated neighborhood. We want Westfield to be a community, and not an abundance of neighborhoods like Fishers.
  - Our school system is trying to adapt to the growth that is already approved and address the current student population which is pushing the limits of our 5-12 buildings. Our schools need an opportunity to plan and expand our buildings to accommodate the current enrollment and expected growth. Community focus groups are in progress at this time to collect thoughts on how to address the physical building needs for our students.
  
- Lastly, the Osborne family members are our friends and neighbors. We don't want to deprive them of an opportunity, but we do want responsible development.
  - We want development that is less dense (SF2 zoning vs. SF4) and homes are well built and unique. We understand that the desired AV for new homes is over \$300K. The proposed homes are well below this threshold.
  - We have only known of this proposed development for a few weeks. With sufficient time, we would have more specific requests to green space and detailed amenities.
  - We request that it be placed on hold until more information is provided, particularly with Areas A & B.

Thank you for considering our perspective.

Matt Pleasant  
City Planner  
[mpleasant@westfield.in.gov](mailto:mpleasant@westfield.in.gov)

Area Planning Commission  
[apc@westfield.in.gov](mailto:apc@westfield.in.gov)

Commission members:

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Drexler Woods PUD. I strongly urge this Commission to take further review of the specifics of the proposed PUD.

Platinum Properties has not provided sufficient information regarding the building standards and general requirements of construction as part of the rezoning. This is especially important because of the extremely small lot size and high density re-zoning that is being proposed. Without strong building requirements imposed now, during rezoning, it will be likely that future projects will strive to achieve low cost construction to the detriment of the community. The quality of construction, and connected developments, will have a strong impact on the long term success of Grand Park and surrounding businesses.

Additionally, the location of this development reaches out from Grand Park into a rural setting where homes are constructed on 3+ acre lots. Many of these home sites have been around long before Grand Park pushed development this far north. This commission should assess the rezoning proposal and ensure that the PUD includes a plan to maintain a significant buffer with a berm and the use of mature plantings. The existing trees, that are proposed to be saved, should not offset the need to properly buffer and screen the borders of the development. The use of common area should also be used to create a buffer from established home sites and travel corridors. The commission should consider mandating a 150' building line from surround property lines and roads. The overall density of this proposed PUD is one of the lowest that has ever been proposed. The density and classification should not be allowed to be SF4, but rather SF2 would be more appropriate.

In conclusion, I urge the commission to seriously consider the impact of this decision. Without specific standards set in place at the time of rezoning, I'm fearful that this and future projects will bring down the image Westfield is working to portray with the investment in the Grand Park project.

Respectfully,

Brain Hamilton  
721 W. 193<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Sheridan, IN 46069  
[bahamilton@tcco.com](mailto:bahamilton@tcco.com)

December 5, 2016

Area Planning Commission Members

Matt Pleasant, City Planner

Hello Friends,

Please do not approve the Drexler Woods PUD plans.

We bought our place in 2006 for the rural setting and ask that future development honor the 3 acre per house ordinance.

Note that this proposal is not contiguous with similar densities and should not be allowed in accordance with good planning.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dan Boardman", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dan Boardman

1510 W 206<sup>th</sup> Street

December 5, 2016

Matt Pleasant  
Area Planning Commission Members

Dear Mr. Pleasant and APC

We are home owners on Six Points Road that will be directly affected by the Drexler Woods subdivision. The proposed plan calls for housing behind us (east side) and potential housing and/or a road to the south side of our home. So our home is being directly impacted on two sides. We moved to this location eleven years ago to get away from subdivisions and to be able to enjoy a rural life. With the limited details that are known, our biggest concern is with the devaluing of our home.

Additional areas of concern and questions:

1. Notification and timing
  - a. Timing of holidays and holiday season
  - b. Signs placed in land evening before Thanksgiving
  - c. Meeting during busy holiday time
  - d. No indication land was for sale; blindsided by letter
  - e. What is the rush to push this development through the council?
  - f. How was this introduced to the council prior to any notification?
2. Roads
  - a. Increased auto and bicycle traffic in the area
  - b. Condition of the roads
3. Subdivision
  - a. Size of lots, all existing homes are on 3 plus acres of land
  - b. Impact on property drainage
  - c. Buffering between our home and proposed subdivision; would request at least 100 feet on both side with a fence and at least six foot trees or common area; would be best to have no houses against existing homes
  - d. What are the projected costs of the single retirement homes and attached dwellings?
  - e. Does the subdivision go against the grand park master plan by not preserving the northwest agricultural section?
  - f. What builders have expressed interest in this development?
  - g. Article references housing for athletes visiting the Westfield area. Will this mean areas for rent and families moving in and out each season?
4. Other
  - a. What is happening with Duke property on the corner of 193<sup>rd</sup> and Six Points Road?  
There was never official notice of the sale to that land to Duke.
  - b. Do the development standards apply to the houses and businesses on Six Points Road?  
If not, what are thoughts and concerns related to landscape standards and buffer yard standards?
  - c. How will utilities affect exist homes?
  - d. Proposal calls for a difference with UDO standards and PUD ordinance being requested (9000 vs 6000); why would developer be allowed to decrease the size and not follow at least the minimum standards?

- e. What happens if there is a downturn in the economy and the project is halted or goes bust?
- f. What are the city and councils concerns regarding the homes that already exist? What are the issues you have identified?
- g. If approved, impact on existing homes with dust, dirt, construction materials into the pools and outdoor living areas on the properties around the construction sites.
- h. Impact of additional lighting and noise in the area; we have already been impacted by noise and lighting from Grand Park
- i. Designated business area; would request it not include businesses like liquor stores, taverns, adult entertainment, big box stores, music venues, and fast food.

There is a lot of development occurring in Westfield. It appears there is more of an emphasis on quantity and not quality. The current homeowners in the area are all on 3 plus acres of land and this should be considered when looking at additional development in this area. Zero lot line housing, townhomes, and apartments should not be considered. It would make more sense to have a less dense subdivision or estate lots in this area.

Based on the lack of information provided in the Drexler Wood PUD, we would request that this project be sent to sub-committee or postponed until further review.

Sincerely,

Tim & Lisa Higgins  
Concerned Homeowners  
19411 Six Points Road

Handwritten signatures of Tim and Lisa Higgins, appearing as two distinct cursive signatures.

Robert and Angela Smith  
19449 Six Points Rd  
Sheridan, Indiana 46069

12/5/16

Dear Area Planning Commission Members,

We received notice about a new planned development Drexler Woods on 11/23/2016.

While reviewing the plan the homes in Section C are far too dense compared surrounding homes. Within the last year 4 new homes have went up on 193<sup>rd</sup> street that are on 5 acre lots. Our homes sits in the middle of 3 lots that are all 3 acres in size. The average of 2.6 homes per acre is just too small for this area and will affect the value of our homes.

Our home will back directly up to Section C of the subdivision. Because of this we would like 100 Feet of a buffer between existing homes and the new addition. In this buffer we would like to see a 2x planting of trees from what is required. The addition of a farm/ranch style fence around the entire subdivision would look appropriate for the area. Using the same style fence as Grand Park has would add some continuity to the area. A vinyl fence would not look as positive.

Limits should be set for light in the area. Currently there is a large amount of light given off from Grand Park in the evenings. The Drexler Woods community should work to install streetlight design's that curb light pollution.

Area A of the proposed Drexler Woods states that "local business" could reside there. This needs to be limited in some way. There is no need for Gas stations, Fast food restaurants, department/grocery stores in this section. There is plenty of room for that south of Grand Park.

We love and are very proud of Westfield. We knew that at some point development would head this direction and are not entirely opposed to this project. But this project should not hurt the value of the home where we have lived for 10 years. In these past 10 years we have added 30 + trees, a barn and a pool to the property.

Dec. 5, 2016

Matt Pleasant, City Planner  
[mpleasant@westfield.in.gov](mailto:mpleasant@westfield.in.gov)

Area Planning Commission  
[apc@westfield.in.gov](mailto:apc@westfield.in.gov)

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing today concerning the lack of details before moving forward with plans for an age-restricted PUD, "Drexler Woods." My concerns fall into four categories:

- Fiscal viability
- Design of transition from rural to suburban
- Lack of detail on architectural design requirements
- Overall variance from spirit of Westfield Washington Master Plan

Per the City of Westfield Parks and Recreation Master Plan, over 93% of Westfield residents consist of either Up and Coming Families (59%) or Boomburb residents (35%). Is there really a market for an age-restricted community? What details do we have to support the need? And, what happens if the development is started and there's no demand for it. The potential for a decrease in standards to "sell out" the community is a concern for my since I live across the street.

Per the Westfield Washington Master Plan - Buffers and Transitions, "appropriate transitions between land uses are essential to the full enjoyment of property." Given the fact that the surrounding established home are 3+ acres each, the have 6,000 square foot lots across the street doesn't follow the plan.

A few more bullets from that document include

- Provide appropriate transition between adjacent dissimilar residential areas.
- Ensure proper buffering between existing residences and new development of a dissimilar character.
- Encourage the uses of natural buffers involving "reforestation" of natural vegetation, particularly when buffering between suburban and rural uses, and between existing uses and new development.

I would like to know the details being suggested here before moving forward, and I would recommend you consider the following:

- Neighborhood set back from any existing street or residence property line of 150 feet.
- Mixed user of mature trees/scrubs to be included at increased proportion to typical new subdivision given the drastic transition in land usage from rural to subdivision.

Again per the Westfield Master Plan – Design Standards, we should encourage neighborhoods that do not have the appearance of "production" housing.

- Encourage variety and diversity in housing while maintaining a distinct style or character and avoiding the appearance of “cookie cutter” subdivisions.
- Where subdivisions are juxtaposed, avoid abrupt changes in housing scale, mass, and materials.
- Consider the effect of new subdivisions on the character of existing neighborhoods and mitigate adverse effects through proper design and buffering.
- Evaluate new residential development on the basis of overall density and the relationship of that density to effective and usable open space preservation, rather than on lot sizes.

The plan goes on to offer an implementation tool stating the city should require subdivision proposals to include transition plans, to show how the new development will complement existing adjacent development. Given the existing adjacent development includes custom homes in a rural setting, the architectural details will be important to the design of this proposed community. How can we move forward without seeing those details?

I realize the original Westfield Master Plan has been updated, including a change in the area to new suburban, but even with that in mind, I think there is a spirit to the original document that needs to be considered. The plan states, “It is expected as growth pressure moves northwest, some agricultural land will be converted to other uses.” Some guidelines were included:

- Allow the continuation of the historic rural patterns, including homestead farms, artisan farms, and equestrian uses. New residential development will be accommodated, but only as it fits into the agricultural life style.
- Encourage appropriate transitions from the villages to the open agricultural land.
- Preserve the night sky by limiting lighting.
- Limit the land uses to those that are consistent with and contribute to the rural character
- Create design standards for new buildings to ensure consistency with the character of the area.
- Establish buffering requirements for new development.

In fact, per the Master Plan, the existing suburban development policies include:

- Encourage only compatible infill development on vacant parcels in existing neighborhoods as a means of avoiding sprawl.
- 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.
- Ensure that infill development is compatible in mass, scale, density, materials, and architectural style to existing development.
- Ensure that new development adjacent to existing suburban is properly buffered.
- Subdivision regulations - Substantial open space (at least 60% of gross acreage)

Overall, I feel like there needs to be more detail in the requirements before the commission moves forward with these re-zoning discussions. The devil is always in the details, and without the detail, I as a homeowner directly connected to the proposed PUD have serious concern about how this decision will impact my property value and the vision the city has for the future of Westfield.

Sincerely,

Kelly Hamilton

317-223-8350

Planning Commission Members,

There is great concern about this Drexler Woods. This development has many problems before it even has begun. It seems very obvious that a blind eye has been turned while uninformed neighbors and land owners of the surrounding area are shocked by the lack of communication from the process.

New home owners as well as neighbors that have a life-long residence and have chosen this rural lifestyle are appalled at the lack of detailed information within this PUD.

We are a sixth generation farm family and this area is agriculture. Where does the destruction of the farm land stop?!? And where does the value of peoples livelihood begin?!? Has there been any discussions on the value of businesses like ag at your table? Where does the "Historical Value" of a 150 year old farm (that has received the "Hoosier Farmstead Award") come into play? Where does the education and values start? Have land owners and neighbors been included in this decision making process from the beginning? Isn't it ironical what PUD stands for "Planned Unified Development" ..... a unified plan? Again, where were the neighbors and land owners during the planning development?

There is already a number of transitional housing communities in Westfield....why do it again? Just drive west down 193<sup>rd</sup> and turn south on Casey Rd. and take a look at that mess. And if you don't understand some of the mess there, just call our police and fire department.

There are so many in-depth and serious concerns about this project. Traffic flow is major. We know there is data being collected and looked

at, but planning an age restricted community is absurd....with such heavy traffic, heavy equipment, Grand Park, plus bicyclers are just a few reasons that such a plan as this is absurd! These type of communities should be closer to town.

Now let's go to the issue of development standards and architectural design standards. Where are they? Are local business provisions set? Where is all this information and why hasn't it been presented to the surrounding land owners and neighbors?

What about drainage? Have those been researched? Major concerns in that area. Also tree preservation and reforestation.....is there a plan for this?

So many unanswered concerns. And these are just a few concerns .... There are many people that chose to live out in this area and have a huge investment. They chose it because it was rural and now you are taking this lifestyle of these investors away. And the way we see it, you've done this planning with little or no concern to the current land and home owners. This plan needs to come to a halt!!

Westfield needs to stop and look at its growth. Be more diligent and more informative to our community

Sincerely,

Jim & Lynn Carey

**From:** [Don Saunders](#)  
**To:** [APC](#); [Matt Pleasant](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed Drexler Woods Subdivision  
**Date:** Monday, December 5, 2016 3:48:13 PM

---

This e-mail is to provide specific comments on the proposed Drexler Woods subdivision which will be addressed at the Westfield-Washington Township Advisory Plan Commission meeting, Monday, December 5 at 7:00pm.

I am Don Saunders and my wife Leona and I live at 19519 Six Points Rd, just west of the proposed subdivision and just south of the Stone Center.

We have several concerns with the proposed plan for the subdivision:

#### Housing Density

The proposed plan appears to indicate very high housing density with small lots of 6000 sq ft for example 60 x 100 ft. There are 10 lots along the east property line of the Stone Center which is 576 ft. Using another example, if 6000 sq ft lots were packed together there would be 7 lots/acre.

#### Tree Preservation

The Drexler Woods plan appears to eliminate the forest at the northeast corner of the property. This forest should be preserved and included in the "green area" of the community.

#### Compliance with Westfield and Washington Township Comprehensive Plan

The proposed subdivision does not appear to be compliant with the comprehensive plan.

#### Specific Information on the Development Plan.

Few details appear to be available at this time. For example:

Buffers: Need 100 ft from lots to neighboring property and existing roads.

Landscaping: Need mounds, suitable fencing, and trees (>2 in diameter) in buffered areas.

Quality of Housing: Need examples of proposed housing including floor plans and photographs.

Don Saunders

**From:** [lameds@aol.com](mailto:lameds@aol.com)  
**To:** [APC](#)  
**Subject:** Drexler Woods  
**Date:** Monday, December 5, 2016 5:51:32 PM

---

Dear City Council Members and to whom it may concern,

We wanted to express our concern about the proposed community "Drexler Woods" proposed at 193rd and Six Points Rd. It has been brought to our attention that it appears this would be a high density home community with very little open space or natural boundaries. We are residents close to this area - on 206th St, and we have multiple concerns about how this will impact the look of this rural/farming area, how this would impact home values, and increase traffic. We understand that there is going to be growth, and we cannot stop that. We would just like to see it be done properly. It seems of recent Westfield is going for quantity vs quality in regards to building patterns. It would be nice to preserve this area with some quality standards and not just put the next "cookie cutter" home community in.

We moved to this area, because we could have the feeling of living in the country, it was peaceful and quiet. You could actually look up at a dark sky and see an abundance of stars. Our kids and their friends have learned to have a deep appreciation also for those things. We feel this is going to all be taken away very quickly.

It is our wish, that you take these things into consideration when looking at proposed communities in this area. We would like to see neighborhoods that have less homes on it per acre - for example - 2 homes per acre, farm style fencing, buffers that are 70-100 feet, preserve the forestry areas, have homes that face the existing streets and have more open spaces in general - in keeping with the surrounding area.

We feel like Westfield is growing way to fast, our roads, schools, utilities and businesses cannot keep up. We feel like we know very little about this proposed project (what the quality of home would look like, proposed home prices, what area A and B would look like. We ask that the council take a step back and get more information before approving this project, and take more time to assess how Westfield is growing and the direction they are going.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mike and Laura Medlen  
1515 W. 206th St St